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Further Information

If you require any further information or have any queries please contact:
David Rose, Telephone: 020 7926 1037; Email: drose@lambeth.gov.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting. If you have any specific needs please contact Facilities Management (020 7926 1010) in advance.

Queries on reports

Please contact report authors prior to the meeting if you have questions on the reports or wish to inspect the background documents used. The contact details of the report author are shown on the front page of each report.

@LBLdemocracy on Twitter http://twitter.com/LBLdemocracy or use #Lambeth
Lambeth Council – Democracy Live on Facebook http://www.facebook.com/
Digital engagement

We encourage people to use Social Media and we normally tweet from most Council meetings. To get involved you can tweet us @LBLDemocracy.

Audio/Visual Recording of meetings

Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever, non-disruptive, methods you think are suitable. If you have any questions about this please contact Democratic Services (members of the press please contact the Press Office). Please note that the Chair of the meeting has the discretion to halt any recording for a number of reasons including disruption caused by the filming or the nature of the business being conducted.

Persons making recordings are requested not to put undue restrictions on the material produced so that it can be reused and edited by all local people and organisations on a non-commercial basis.

Representation

Ward Councillors may be contacted directly to represent your views to the Council: (details via the website www.lambeth.gov.uk)

Speaking rights at Cabinet meetings

- Cabinet normally has a large amount of business to consider at each meeting;
- accordingly, the order of the agenda and time allowed for each item is decided by the Leader of the Council beforehand;
- Cabinet expects there to have been prior consultation with the public and other interested parties on proposals and a summary of the results to be included in the report. Therefore, oral contributions from members of the public at the meeting should not normally be necessary;
- the time available may allow contribution(s) to be heard on reports on the agenda but this is entirely at the discretion of the Leader of the Council. Anyone wishing to speak must advise the Secretary to Cabinet before the day of the meeting, advising what aspect not covered in the report they wish to cover;
- any such contributions are required to be brief; a maximum of three minutes is likely to be available;
- speakers should ideally be on behalf of a number of people or a specific group;
- speakers will be advised at the meeting whether and when they will be heard; and,
- Councillors may speak at the discretion of the Chair on agenda items, and are entitled to speak on matters that specifically concern their ward.

Public Involvement at Council, Committee etc meetings - public notice questions, petitions, deputations and speaking rights (Standing Order 10)

Please contact Democratic Services for further information – 020 7926 2170 or the number on the front page.
Dunraven School, 94-8 Leigham Court Road, London, SW16 2QB
AGENDA

1. **Declarations of Pecuniary Interest**

   Under Cabinet Rule 1.5.2, where any Cabinet Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (as defined in the Members’ Code of Conduct (para. 4)) in any matter to be considered at a meeting of the Council, a committee, sub-committee or joint committee, they must withdraw from the meeting room during the whole of the consideration of that matter and must not participate in any vote on that matter unless a dispensation has been obtained from the Monitoring Officer.

2. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

   That the minutes of the previous meeting be signed and approved as a correct record of proceedings.

3. **Culture 2020**

   Report 87/15-16

   **Key Decision**
   All Wards

   Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods: Councillor Jane Edbrooke
   Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Growth: Sue Foster

   Contact: John Kerridge, Associate Director Commissioning (Communities), JKerridge@lambeth.gov.uk; 0207 926 2744

4. **South Lambeth – Estate Regeneration**

   Report 86/15-16

   **Key Decision**
   Stockwell Ward

   Cabinet Member for Housing: Councillor Matthew Bennett
   Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Growth: Sue Foster

   Contact: Neil Vokes, Programme Director, Strategic Capital Projects, Business, Growth and Delivery, NVokes@lambeth.gov.uk; 0207 926 3068

5. **Homes for Lambeth: A Special Purpose Vehicle for Lambeth**

   Report 76/15-16

   **Key Decision**
   All Wards
6. **Improving Housing Management Services and Wider Integration**  
Report 82/15-16

**Key Decision**
All Wards

Cabinet Member for Housing: Councillor Matthew Bennett  
Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Growth: Sue Foster; and,  
Strategic Director, Children, Adults and Health: Helen Charlesworth-May

Contact: Neil Wightman, Delivery Director Housing Management  
NWightman@lambeth.gov.uk; 0207 926 7051

Rachel Sharpe, Commissioning Director  
RSharpe@lambeth.gov.uk; 0207 926 3463

7. **Performance Q1**  
Report 83/15-16

**Non-key Decision**
All Wards

Deputy Leader (Finance and Investment): Councillor Paul McGlone  
Chief Executive: Sean Harriss

Contact: Tim Weetman, Head of Performance, Corporate Resources  
TWeetman@lambeth.gov.uk; 0207 926 6438

8. **Lambeth Lewisham and Southwark Council’s Joint Committee**  
Report 75/15-16

**Non-key Decision**
All Wards

Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods: Councillor Jane Edbrooke  
Chief Executive, Sean Harriss

Contact: Adrian Smith, Commissioning Director,  
ASmith2@lambeth.gov.uk; 0207 926 0182
CABINET

Monday 14 September 2015 at 7.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Cabinet Members:            Portfolio:
Councillor Matthew Bennett  Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite Cabinet Member for Environment & Sustainability
Councillor Jane Edbrooke    Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Jack Hopkins     Cabinet Member for Jobs & Growth
Councillor Paul McGlone     Deputy Leader (Finance and Investment)
Councillor Jackie Meldrum   Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
Councillor Lib Peck         Leader of the Council
Councillor Jane Pickard     Cabinet Member for Children and Families
Councillor Imogen Walker    Deputy Leader (Policy)

Apologies for absence       Councillor Jim Dickson

Action required by

1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST
   There were none.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
   RESOLVED: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 July 2015 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

3. LAMBETH LOCAL PLAN
The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, welcomed attendees and invited the Cabinet Member for Jobs and Growth, Councillor Jack Hopkins, to introduce the Lambeth Local Plan which would form the bedrock of future planning policy in the borough.

The Cabinet Member for Jobs and Growth, Councillor Jack Hopkins, noted his thanks to officers, the Planning Committee and civic groups for their input into a considerable body of work; and noted that it was going to Council on 23 September 2015 for ratification. Lambeth was a growing borough and the Council was meeting manifesto commitments by building houses, whilst implementing other policies such as healthy high streets (citing preventing hot food takeaways near schools). This plan provided more powers, more social and affordable housing; and showed the administration was pro mixed communities, was meeting commitments across locations in the borough, and cultivating the proceeds of growth into heritage.

Report authors added that the key point of this policy were getting control over the destiny of planning, with Lambeth one of first local authorities to begin a local plan. A key element was in delivering social infrastructure and transport. Council officers involved in the work were commended for the examination process and had successfully defended every single one of the policies against questions raised by changes in government policy.

Cabinet Members made the following comments:
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Councillor Jackie Meldrum, drew attention to the huge body of carefully crafted work and commended the team, noting that planning was one of the most important areas of Council work. Design was fundamental for those with disabilities, particularly for those with mobility issues; referencing the dangerous conditions posed by the white marble outside Brixton Library in bad weather. A focus on disability design would be helpful with the social care challenges faced by the borough and asked how this might be incorporated into the policy or whether a supplementary planning document could be used.
- The Deputy Leader (Finance and Investment), Councillor Paul McGlone, enquired as to the next steps and evolution.
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, enquired about tempering legislation around commercial to residential conversions, shaping town centres, using powers to good effect, key industrial business sites; and how the Council could publicise planning powers.

Officers responded that:
- Design was really important, especially for disabled persons. There were no further supplementary plans, although it would be useful to publish practices and guidance online and across other media.
- There would be a perpetual revision of the Local Plan as London evolves and pressures for housing become greater, and it would also need to respond to the expected changes to housing targets. This would necessitate a partial review instead of looking at it
again in full.

- On shaping town centres, there were constraints and controls over key industrial and business areas, and the Council was encouraged to restrict transfer of industrial land and to protect reservoirs of science; whilst emphasising the demand for different kinds of employment for which exemptions had been prepared. Publishing policies was also important and the team were liaising with Communications on this.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, praised its delivery ahead of other local authorities and noted the Cabinet's thanks to Councillor Diana Morris, Chair of the Planning Applications Committee, for her work in developing the policy.

RESOLVED:
1) To agree the commendations of the Lambeth Local Plan Inspector's report at Appendix 1.
2) To recommend that Council adopts the Lambeth Local Plan, incorporating main modifications, at Appendix 2.
3) To note that the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 will replace the Lambeth Core Strategy 2011 and the remaining saved sections of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan 2007.
4) To adopt the revised Lambeth Local Development Scheme September 2015 in Appendix 3 to come into effect on 21 September 2015.

4. NEW ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Cabinet Member for Jobs and Growth, Councillor Jack Hopkins, commended the good work of the SPD, but noted that a few typographical errors remained and needed correction. This policy balanced the needs of growth whilst retaining a commitment to heritage, and was generally more permissive of areas for development, going beyond requests of civic groups. He noted that the Council, civic groups and residents had worked positively together to come to healthy compromises, citing growing houses internally instead of forcing residents to relocate.

Officers commented that this was an important piece of work, and met the desire of residents to grow families and homes, not having to move – usually to the south of, or out of, the borough due to increasing house prices. These residents wanted to stay in their chosen locations and the Council felt that this was important. This was balanced with other opinions, and had involved much work and high levels of involvement (noting the Ferndale area). Officers concluded by extending their thanks to local groups in reaching this agreement.

Cabinet Members made the following points:
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, echoed these statements and commented upon the community interest in her ward, whilst noting the constraints and effects of previous policies.
- The Deputy Leader (Finance and Investment), Councillor Paul
McGlone, thanked officers and residents for delivering a pragmatic and consistent planning policy, which would hopefully resolve development guidelines; but enquired whether this could be used to force bad examples of conversions.

- The Deputy Leader (Policy), Councillor Imogen Walker, noted that the plan represented a common-sense balancing act and enquired whether planning applications could be backdated.
- The Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability, Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, enquired around issues of wrap-around extensions and whether it related to single storeys and on which floors.

Officers replied that:

- The only time that new policy would be retrospective was in enforcement matters as it was about going forward.
- On wrap-around extensions, these would be resisted around conservation or heritage areas, but would be considered acceptable on ground floors.

**RESOLVED:**

1) To note the summary of consultation responses at Appendix 2.
2) Subject to the adoption of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 to agree to adopt the final draft Building Alterations and Extensions SPD at Appendix 3.
3) To note that the Building Alterations and Extensions SPD would supersede the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD (2008).

5. **REVISED STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

The Cabinet Member for Jobs and Growth, Councillor Jack Hopkins, commented that the SCI was part of measures agreed in the last year’s budget and related to Council communication on planning, such as residential extensions; cutting down on the thousands of letters sent out, but that notification went out to the necessary persons.

Officers added that the Council was moving to cheaper channels of communication to implement savings, relying more on notices near properties and included work on e-notices, language used, follow-ups and databases.

Cabinet Members made the following representations:

- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, commented that the databases lacked necessary or important persons and groups, and that more accuracy was needed.
- The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Councillor Jane Pickard, asked if the Council was to evolve a new approach to written notices as they tended to be overly bureaucratic and lacked information. She also raised concern of major planning applications and consultations, with persons, including councillors, often unaware of subsequent alterations or implications.
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Councillor Jackie Meldrum, reiterated that letters were often not read, but raised issues with the database, with little notice provided to the Council of changing contact information – it was imperative to improve this if Lambeth was to be a successful cooperative council, a with a mechanism needed to keep these up to date across locations and policy. Notices also needed to be better designed and more visible, whilst tying to lampposts also had issues, especially if they were not seen or fell off. It was noted that it was licensee’s duty to advertise applications, and asked how this could be utilised.

- The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Councillor Jane Edbrooke, commented that she had had a number of conversations around the stakeholder management databases, and wanted further improvement.

Officers commented that:
- They had updated databases, and would further work with councillors for their input.
- One of the SCI’s features was to put a duty on developers to advertise planning.
- There was a commitment to improve the wording of notices which was being worked through with Lambeth’s Communications team.
- On the issue of subsequent applications; this represented a challenge as descriptions of development might not sufficiently capture significant changes, and this needed resolution.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, passed on her thanks to the team on their work.

RESOLVED:
1) To note the representations received on the Statement of Community involvement consultation, and council response as set out at Appendix 1.
2) To agree to adopt the revised Statement of Community Involvement, at Appendix 2.

6. RESOLUTION OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CALL-IN: INVESTING IN BETTER NEIGHBOURHOODS AND BUILDING THE HOMES WE NEED TO HOUSE THE PEOPLE OF LAMBETH - CRESSINGHAM GARDENS ESTATE

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Matthew Bennett, noted that the Cressingham Gardens regeneration (Cabinet, 13 July 2015) had been called-in by Councillor Scott Ainslie, and had gone to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) on 11 August 2015 for the Council to go through the reasons for the decision. It had been a very thorough meeting in a difficult environment, but had been well-chaired and answered many of the queries raised by residents.

The Chair of the OSC, Councillor Edward Davie, commented upon a useful and constructive meeting; it had been heated, but all attendees had
conducted themselves well. However, the exchange of opinions had allowed further information to be disseminated, whilst the OSC Panel observations were quite similar to Cabinet’s which showed that the two bodies had raised similar issues and come to similar conclusions. This represented a process and not a one-off policy, as it was to be repeated at other estates around borough and for future proposals.

The Chair of the OSC, Councillor Edward Davie also noted that the people often missing from the debate were those who were homeless and who the Council hoped to support with these developments. There were a number of issues raised at the committee including the importance of communications (that residents felt they were not being listened to and what the Council felt it could communicate – with problems around commercial sensitivity raised), inadequacy of information, and the long process of the development. The Chair of the OSC also noted that some officers could be risk averse, and that Councillors needed to push to maximise information and clear language. There were also concerns over the test of opinion; but the Council had knocked on a lot of doors and delivered many leaflets. Councillor Davie summarised his discussion by reiterating that the Council needed to further listen to and work with residents on Cressingham and other estates to deliver.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Lib Peck, commented that the Council was testing the capacity of the Council by undertaking large regeneration projects, noting that many of the issues raised were around timeliness and communications. The criticisms received were very fair and that it would be difficult for any person placed in residents’ positions, praising their input during what was a difficult time, but was optimistic for the future, with lessons being learnt and taken on board, which would show in future work.

RESOLVED:
1) To receive the resolution and report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Call-In: Cressingham Gardens Estate.
2) To agree the response to be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The meeting ended at 19:38

CHAIR
CABINET
Monday 12 October 2015

Date of Despatch: Friday 18 September 2015
Call-in Date: Friday 25 September 2015
Contact for Enquiries: David Rose
Tel: 020 7926 1037
Fax: (020) 7926 2361
E-mail: drose@lambeth.gov.uk
Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk
Report summary
This report presents Culture 2020. The first comprehensive cultural plan for the borough. Its priority is people are healthier for longer. The council is faced with taking decisions that it would not normally like to take, but failing to operate within a legal budget is not an option. Culture 2020 seeks to take an ambitious approach by creating the foundations for growth beyond merely reacting to the unprecedented cuts to our funding.

Our Ambition
By 2020 we want Lambeth to be recognised as the destination in South London for those wanting to enjoy world-class cultural activities, or grow a cultural enterprise. We also want all residents to live within 20 minutes average walking distance of a facility where they can enjoy culture, as well as having access to a range of affordable, excellent facilities to participate in culture be it sport, physical activities, parks, libraries, or the wider arts.

Once the plans within Culture 2020 come to their full fruition they will create foundations which will help the borough to navigate some, but not all, of the worst impacts of the deepest cuts known to local government finance. These foundations will include:

- A sustainable library service built around 5 town centre libraries and 5 neighbourhood libraries, which are overall open for longer hours.
- Creating an independent and not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust to drive Culture 2020 forward.
- Adoption of the Active Lambeth Plan, including an indoor and outdoor facilities plan.
- We will continue to invest in our excellent leisure centres and there are no plans to close any of them.
- Three new healthy living centres opening in 2016-17.
- A £10m endowment fund by 2019.
- Facilitating over £60m of investment into the borough’s cultural infrastructure, which will stimulate the continued growth of cultural enterprises.
A revised specification for the parks ground maintenance contract that will secure the council’s statutory obligations and provide opportunities to maximise income.

The Council’s planned total capital investment for parks and open spaces is £9 million by 2018-19.

This report will instigate phase 1 of the Council’s capital investment programme into parks and open spaces totalling £3.8m (through a combination of internal and external funding).

A new library, cinema and cafe facility at West Norwood, which is currently subject to a planning application, open by 2017-18.

An options appraisal into the long term home for the borough archives

A Lambeth Heritage Strategy by 2017-18.

To achieve this we will need a thriving economy of community groups, social enterprises and cultural businesses working together to deliver an exciting programme of cultural activities and facilities.

Success by 2020 will be that 85% (currently 70%) of Lambeth residents will be engaged in culture as part of routine life and they will be increasingly managing their own health and wellbeing needs by participating in cultural activities.

Our Challenge
The council has to cut £90m of its budget by 2018 and as a consequence the revenue budget for cultural services, which funds services like libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts, will be reduced from £10.4m in 2014 to £6.5m by 2018. This will mean some services will stop and some services will be delivered differently. We have to develop plans that are responsive to circumstances and by creating a set of ambitious proposals that will be fully tested and understood as we proceed given the unknown decisions that are due to be taken by government on future local government funding.

We need to be constructive in how we address this challenge, but also be realistic given local government is seeing reductions across all revenue budgets and there is an expectation that these reductions will continue. Whilst business cases need to be developed it is reasonable to assume that given the level of cuts in revenue this will lead to a reduction of approximately 25% of the current workforce.

Cultural Services by 2020
Between 30th January and 24th April 2015 the Council undertook a period of consultation on the future of the cultural services it funds. This was called Cultural Services by 2020 and included libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts. This report provides the strategic plan and framework to how the council intends to manage and navigate a 40% revenue budget cut, as well as:

- Commissioning £7m of cultural services in 2016/17 and £6.8m 2017/18.
- Meet the council’s obligations under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museum Act (1964 Act).
- Prioritise residents most at risk of ill health and social isolation.
- Use buildings, land and assets differently to facilitate the growth of cultural enterprises in the borough and reduce the risk of important facilities from closing.
Library Service
Members should note that whilst the restructuring of the library service forms part of changes to a number of cultural and recreational services in Culture 2020, the duty under 1964 Act is stand alone, and the Council must provide a library service which complies with the 1964 Act regardless of other cultural and recreational provision.

The council currently discharges its obligations under the 1964 Public Libraries and Museum Act through 10 library buildings, a home visiting service for those who are housebound and a network of informal collection points across the borough. The focus of our approach is to retain quality whilst diversifying how space is used, as our key mitigation, rather than spreading money more thinly and reducing quality. This might mean some people will have to travel further for the same service but the quality will remain. The Culture 2020 consultation proposed the following options:

- Brixton, Clapham, Streatham and West Norwood would be our town centre libraries and provide the borough’s statutory service.
- Tate South Lambeth would also act as a temporary town centre library for the north of the borough pending a future review.
- Two neighbourhood libraries, Waterloo and Minet, would be closed and sold.
- Three neighbourhood libraries – Carnegie, Upper Norwood and Durning would no longer receive council funding, but have access to funds through a specific endowment.

During the consultation period alternative proposals and objections were presented to the council from residents, Trade Unions, Friends of Libraries groups and other interested parties. These proposals have now been considered and following further reflection this report recommends changes to the original proposals, which were consulted on.

The library service will be based on a reduced number of buildings dedicated solely for a library service, but access to the service will be maintained and where possible enhanced. There will be significant changes to the library service in Bishops Ward (Waterloo library), Vassall Ward (Minet library), Herne Hill Ward (Carnegie library), Oval Ward (Tate South Lambeth library) and Gipsy Hill Ward (Upper Norwood Joint Library - UNJL).

Where the risk of a disproportionate impact has been identified mitigations have been considered and where possible will be implemented. This includes working more closely with Greenwich Leisure Limited to develop new models of delivery under the leisure management contract, which will reduce the risk of buildings being closed permanently. The underlying ambition is that there is a high quality, sustainable service that is accessible to all.

Finance summary
The budget for cultural services will be reduced from £10.4m in 2014 to £6.5m by 2018 as part of the Council’s overall financial strategy to reduce expenditure by £90m as result of the Government’s policy of austerity. These figures do not include any further reductions, which are likely to be announced as part of the Government’s autumn statement on public spending.
This report proposes the potential development of a not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust which would be tasked with driving the Culture 2020 framework forward. Such a trust could potentially enable funds generated through the operation of the Council’s high quality leisure facilities to be recycled to support further improvement in other cultural services provided and supported by the trust. However, the model involves financial risk and the council will need to think carefully about the respective powers, responsibilities and financial accountabilities inherent in any arrangements proposed.

The estimated costs of the new service arrangements in 2016/17 and 2017/18 across six strategic themes as set out in detail later in this report are planned to be funded through a combination of future residual Cultural services revenue budgets and the Cooperative Investment Fund together with capital contributions. These latter include capital sums generated through phases 1 and 2 of the community asset management plan, s106 funding and Performance Reward Grant. If this report meets its full financial ambitions it will enable in the region of £63m of capital investment into the borough’s cultural infrastructure.

Recommendations
The Cabinet is asked to agree the following:

**Culture 2020**

2. The creation of the Lambeth Cultural Board with a view to undertaking an options appraisal and business case prior to establishing the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Priority 1: Safe and Interesting Spaces**
3. The provision of 5 town centre libraries at Brixton, Streatham, West Norwood, and Clapham libraries. A 4 week consultation period during November 2015 to help determine if Durning library rather than Tate South Lambeth library will provide a temporary fifth town centre library in the north of the borough until 2022.

4. The existing library service at Waterloo, Minet, and Upper Norwood and Carnegie libraries is replaced by the new neighbourhood library service as specified in this report.

5. Pending consultation the existing library service at either Tate South Lambeth library or Durning library is replaced by the new neighbourhood library service as specified in this report.

6. The capital funding towards the delivery of the Nettlefold project, including a new West Norwood library.

7. The business case for the new library service is now developed and implemented by April 2016.

**Priority 2: The Great Outdoors**
8. Phase 1 of the parks improvement plan is instigated with a value of £3.8m capital.
9. The revised specification for the grounds maintenance contract.

10. The governance arrangement for Partnership Parks.

11. A one off £100,000 capital contribution towards the development of a stage 2 Heritage Lottery application for Brockwell Hall.

12. The plan for skate parks.

**Priority 3: Let’s Get Active**

13. The Active Lambeth Plan, including indoor and outdoor sports facilities.

14. The leisure management contract with Greenwich Leisure Limited, which runs until 2022 be revised in 2016 and include the establishment of 3 healthy living centres at Minet, Tate South and Carnegie library buildings.

**Priority 4: Be Inspired**

15. The establishment of a Cultural Sector Task and Finish Group with the aim to support a borough wide forum to strengthen ties throughout the borough.

16. A one off capital contribution of £300,000 to the Old Vic Theatre.

17. A loan of facility of up to £250,000 for the South London Theatre.

**Priority 5: Showing off**

18. A one of capital contribution of £300,000 towards the Garden Museum.

19. An options appraisal on the future of the Borough Archives.


**Priority 6: The Bigger Picture**

21. To note progress on the redevelopment of the Nettlefold site, West Norwood, including a commercial cinema and cafe.

**Endowment**

22. The development of the Lambeth Community Fund and initial contribution of £1.5m towards the underpinning endowment no later than March 2016 to be funded from Phase 2 of the Community Asset management plan.

**Financial resource allocation**

**Revenue**

23. The revenue budget for 2016/17 and 2017/18 as set out in section 12 of this report.

24. The creation of an earmarked reserve to hold the net contribution to the transitional funding of healthy living centres in 2016/17 and 2017/18.
25. Reprofile of £4,181m of capital allocated by cabinet in 2012 as part of phase 1 of the community asset management plan and the allocation of a further £4.5m from phase 2 of the community asset management plan.

26. Earmark £4.1m onto the capital Pipeline Commitments as match funding for the Heritage Lottery application for Brockwell Hall.
1. **Context**

1.1 Between 30th January and 24th April 2015, the Council consulted on a set of proposals concerning the future of the culture services it funds, including libraries, sports, parks and the arts. This was called Cultural Services by 2020.

1.2 The purpose of the consultation was to share these proposals, as well as the alternatives the council had considered, provide information to allow residents and interested parties to engage in the consultation process and then listen to feedback and investigate any further proposals put forward during the consultation before formulating recommendations for council to consider. These alternatives have now been considered and following further reflection this report recommends changes to the original proposals, which were consulted on.

2. **Proposal and Reasons**

2.1 Culture 2020 is the council’s first comprehensive cultural plan that sets out how the council intends to navigate the next 4 years for the cultural services it provides and helps to facilitate in the borough, including libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts more generally.

2.2 The council is seeking to mobilise its cultural resources, buildings, land, partnerships and use its enabling and influencing capacity to encourage a growth in cultural enterprises that will prioritise residents most at risk of ill-health and social isolation by ensuring:

- all Lambeth residents living within 20 minutes average walking distance of a cultural facility,
- 85% of residents being engaged in a cultural activity as a part of routine life; and,
- all residents having access to a range of affordable facilities for cultural, sports and physical activities by 2020.

2.3 Social, psychological and medical research is increasingly identifying a direct correlation between the degree to which a person feels connected to others and their physical and mental health. The most commonly known effects of not feeling a connection to others, includes a greater likelihood of chronic illness such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes, etc. More frequent bouts of sickness, such as colds or flu, and longer recovery times. Increased likelihood of depression, mental illness and shorter life spans.

2.4 The lack of physical activity leads to 37,000 premature deaths in England every year and 126 in Lambeth alone. Sport England estimates the cost of inactivity alone Lambeth was over £4.8m in 2009/10. Whilst all existing service activities will offer some level of prevention, no one service holds the ‘silver bullet’ to tackle the underlying issue of inactivity especially amongst those most at risk.

2.5 The council is losing £90m of its overall controllable budget. As a consequence the revenue budget for cultural services, which funds services like libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts, will be reduced from £10.4m in 2014 to £6.5m by 2018. This means doing things radically differently to achieve the priority People are Healthier for Longer.
3. **Consultation and needs assessment**

3.1 This report recommends such reductions with specific reference to the 1964 Public Libraries and Museum Act. The Supreme Court recognises 4 principles for lawful consultation, which are generally known as the *Gunning* or the *Sedley* principles namely that:

- consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
- the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit intelligent consideration and response;
- adequate time must be given for consideration and response; and,
- the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposals.

3.2 A Local Inquiry in Wirral (September 2009) into the Public Library Service undertaken by the Secretary of State concluded that in deciding how to provide a ‘comprehensive and efficient library service’ the council must assess and take into account local needs. The Secretary of State set out the matters to be considered when undertaking that assessment, including the needs of various adults and of children and the need for a strategic plan. Whilst this does not have force of law, it indicates the circumstances in which the Secretary of State may intervene under his/her default powers. Members need to have regard to the Gunning/Sedley principles and the assessment of need when deciding whether they are satisfied that the proposals within this report will lead to the provision of a “*comprehensive and efficient*” library service.

3.3 **Consultation: Cultural Services By 2020**

Between 30\textsuperscript{th} January and 24\textsuperscript{th} April 2015 the council undertook a broad and comprehensive consultation programme, which presented a set of proposals called Culture Services by 2020. The Council would like to formally thank everyone who has taken an interest, responded and attended or organised events through the Culture 2020 consultation.

3.4 The purpose of the consultation was to share proposals, as well as the alternatives the council had considered, provide information to allow residents and interested parties to engage in the consultation process and then listen to feedback and investigate any further proposals put forward during the consultation before formulating recommendations for council to consider.

3.5 The consultation included 1,648 self-completion questionnaires, 207 written responses, 513 representative on-street surveys, 451 surveys completed by young people, 7 public events attended by over 200 people, 9 focus groups with particular equalities groups and 13 other meetings. A copy of the overview of the consultation report is attached at appendix 1 for members of the Cabinet to consider as part of their decision making.

3.6 The decision to undertake consultation did generate opposition about the proposed changes to library services, which is understandable given the high regard these services
are held in by many residents, although all the proposals, other than those for libraries, received more support than opposition among questionnaire respondents.

3.7 92% of all respondents and 87% of questionnaire respondents feel that it is important to have a library, leisure centre or park within 20 minutes’ walk from their home. Assuming something was within a 20-minute walk, the most popular form of transport considered by far was walking (83%). When asked which of the six cultural service themes are most important to them, questionnaire and on-street survey respondents prioritised the same top three themes:

- Safe and interesting spaces (libraries and community buildings);
- The great outdoors (parks and open spaces); and,
- Let’s get active (physical activity, sports and leisure centres).

3.8 Of lower priority were ‘be inspired’, ‘the bigger picture’ and ‘showing off’ (art, performing arts and theatre, cinema and heritage). Overall, the written responses were predominantly expressing concerns (75%) about funding and staffing for libraries and parks, as well as the relocation of the borough archives.

3.9 The strongest opposition from the self-completion questionnaires are regarding proposals to close library buildings. 56% of questionnaire respondents oppose these proposals. 54% and 53% respectively oppose the closure of Waterloo and Minet Libraries. As well as the library service, the main consultation document set out a suite of proposals concerning the provision of public parks, open spaces, sports and physical activity, heritage and the arts.

3.10 Among respondents to the Culture 2020 on-street survey, parks were identified as by far the most popular place for physical activity (61%) and cultural activity (83%). The consultation also identified that only slightly more respondents supported the proposal to hand over a greater share of income from parks to local management groups (35% vs. 27%), although 80% of respondents expressed an opinion in support of the proposal to implement clustering arrangements for parks.

3.11 Over half of the self-completion questionnaire respondents (56%) support the overall approach of the Active Lambeth plan and there is general support for the activities identified. Among the on-street survey respondents, leisure centres and private gyms are used by just over a quarter of respondents each (28% and 26% respectively). Younger residents are more likely to use private gyms, while those aged 35-54 are more likely to exercise in parks. The most common reasons residents told us for not participating in regular physical activity are time, affordability, accessibility and having the right kit.

Needs Assessment

Commissioning Group - Strategic Vision Statement. The demographic profile and understanding of needs, which has emerged includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Densely populated</td>
<td>With 303,100 residents (2011 census) Lambeth, with 113 people per hectare is one of the most densely populated places in the country. Its population density is twice the London average. A high population within a relatively small space creates challenges for providing opportunities and spaces for physical activity, sport and culture. Moreover, the CCG works to the GP registered population, which is 333,000 suggesting, further pressure on services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A rapidly growing population</td>
<td>Over the next 10 years, the population is predicted to increase by 27,000 - a 9% increase. This population increase will increase the demand for physical activity, culture, sport opportunities and access to health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A significant ageing population</td>
<td>Lambeth’s older population (aged 60+) is projected to grow by 44% in the next 20 years (2012-31). This is likely to put increased pressure on health services. Physical, cultural activities and sport could potentially play a role in limiting the impact of this increased demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High population churn</td>
<td>Approximately 10% of the population leave each year and are replaced by around 10% new arrivals. The high population churn creates a continual need to impact upon new people in relation to their physical activity, cultural and sport behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively high levels of deprivation</td>
<td>Whilst there are areas of considerable affluence, overall, Lambeth is the 14th most deprived borough in England. Evidence has shows that people from more deprived areas have worse health and wellbeing outcomes. Participation in physical, cultural activity and sport is also generally lower than in more affluent areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically diverse</td>
<td>The borough has a complex social and ethnic mix with large African and Portuguese populations. Approximately 140 languages are spoken. Evidence shows that some ethnic groups have lower participation levels in physical and cultural activity and sport than others. The many cultures and languages spoken may present challenges in communicating effectively to create positive physical activity behaviour change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>There are 29,200 people of working age in Lambeth who are disabled (Census 2011). Evidence shows that disabled people have lower physical and cultural activity and sport participation levels. Research also suggests that disabled people face increased barriers to being physically active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>Lambeth males: 77 years compared to England at 78.5 years. Lambeth female: 81 years compared to England average of 82.5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle issues</td>
<td>Obesity prevalence in children is of particular concern as it is considerably higher when compared nationally. 1 in 4, 10-11 year olds are at risk of becoming clinically obese. Healthy lifestyle issues are still an area of concern (e.g. smoking prevalence, worsening obesity levels related to poor diets and lack of physical activity, alcohol and drug misuse; these indicators appear worse in Lambeth compared to national average). Burden of ill-health results from lifestyle issues as well as resulting diseases and/or long term conditions such as heart disease and cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Coronary heart disease (CHD), hypertension (HTN), diabetes mellitus (DM),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**conditions**

chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), cancer and severe mental illnesses (SMI) are the major long-term conditions having an impact on the health of the population in Lambeth. Lambeth has one of the highest incidences of mental health need in London as estimated by the MINI (Mental Illness Needs Index).

**Self reported health (2011 Lambeth residents survey)**

- Overall 71% of people reported very good or good health. 27% reported bad health.
  - Black Caribbean (34%) and Mixed/Asian other (30%) were slightly more likely to report bad health.
  - Those in the lower social class were more likely to report poor health.
  - Users of services for disabled people, social services for adults and those in receipt of housing benefit were more likely to rate their health as bad.

**Literacy levels in Lambeth**

- 16.7% of 16-64 year olds in Lambeth lack functional literacy skills (entry levels 1-3 or below) with 5.4% being only entry level 1 or below. This is lower than the majority of other London boroughs (Lambeth ranks 25th out of 32).
  - Furthermore, of 16-64 year olds in Lambeth, 49% only have entry level or below numeracy skills; 42.8% entry level or below email skills, with 33.6 being only entry Level 1 or below; 44.1% have only entry level or below word processing skills, [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/2011-skills-for-life-survey-small-area-estimation-data](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/2011-skills-for-life-survey-small-area-estimation-data).

**Physical activity**

- Whilst overall Lambeth has a relatively high level of active participation in cultural, sport and physical activities (70%) this masks a disproportionate number of specific residents whose participation trails behind the average in both London and the UK, women and girls, children and young people (18’s and under), older adults (over 65’s), disabled people, black and minority ethnic groups.

**Joint Strategic Needs Assessment: Summary of Needs**

- **Children and young people**
  - Provide a safe & supportive school and community life with skills for life and enable maximum educational attainment.
  - Tackle child poverty and tackle issues such as low birth weight & understand causes of higher rate of infant and child deaths in Lambeth.
  - Target contributory factors – Mental health issues, alcohol /drug misuse, domestic violence.
  - Tackle unhealthy eating and lack of physical activity in children, risk of developing obesity as well as improper and risky sexual behaviour.
  - Early intervention through partnership working to safeguard children and tackle youth crime and youth violence.
  - Reduce % not in employment, education and training.
  - Improve immunisation uptake and new-born screening to prevent disease and early detection of disabilities.
  - Understand the mental health issues and service provision for children and young people.

- **Adults**
  - Promote mental well being through access to employment especially for people with a disability including mental illness.
- Reduce overcrowding and temporary accommodation in households especially where there are children living, as well as tackle homelessness.
- Understand the short and long term impact of welfare benefit changes on health and wellbeing of the population.
- Tackle preventable risk factors such as smoking, alcohol, unsafe sex, hypertension, obesity etc. in the population to provide better outcomes.
- Facilitate early detection of hypertension, diabetes, heart disease, and better management of mental illness with a focus on prevention.
- Tackle risk factors of mental illness such as neglect, domestic violence, unemployment, homeless, inequality and social exclusion.
- Protect and promote local assets ensuring that people at risk of health inequalities benefit from them.

Older Persons

- Reduce social isolation, promote opportunities to contribute, fair treatment of persons as well as patients in care.
- Improve the quality of life and disability adjusted life expectancy for older people especially those with long term condition reporting bad or very bad health and those with depression or mental illness.
- Address the issues of smoking, alcohol misuse and obesity in older adults as their consequences account for 70% of total hospital activity.
- Improve flu immunisation uptake in older population and tackle fuel poverty to prevent unwanted hospital admissions and reduce excess winter deaths.
- Prevent unwanted hospital admissions especially emergency admission in 75+ populations & reduce seasonal deaths from flu, respiratory, heart disease.
- Need for early detection and adequate management of long-term conditions to reduce premature deaths.
- Improve dementia care and quality of life of patients + improve ‘End of life care’ pathway to ensure more people are able to choose the place of death.

Digital Inclusion Strategy

- 9% of Lambeth residents have no access to the Internet.
- 40% of our contact with residents will be online by 2017.
- Implementation of Universal Credit will mean many residents will have no choice but to access the Internet to manage claims.
- Existing services such as Digi-buddies are supporting the digital transition.
- More targeted work needs to be undertaken to support vulnerable residents to develop the skills or get the assistance they need to get online.
- Digital inclusion must always be considered as services become digital.
- It is important to continually review digital provision within the Borough due to the speed of digital change.

3.13 The National Literacy Trust places the literacy agenda at the heart of improving personal wellbeing and has published a profile of a person with poor literacy as:
22% of men and 30% of women with literacy below entry level 2 live in non-working households;
• men who improve their literacy rates see their likelihood of being on state benefits reduced from 19% to 6%;
• individuals with low levels of literacy are more likely to lead solitary lives; and,
• individuals with low literacy levels are more likely to live in overcrowded housing with reduced access to technology.

3.14 The lack of skills in this area has a profound impact on people’s lives in accessing employment, managing personal finance and being able to carry out transactions online. Although more people are gradually getting access to the internet, this demonstrates the need for support in using it and improving skills. Literacy and numeracy levels likewise show the need for adults to be able to access basic skills materials and informal learning and to be sign-posted to courses.

Medical Research
3.15 Researchers from Cambridge’s Medical Research Council Epidemiology Unit used the most recent available data to study 9.2 million deaths among European men and women. Whilst intrinsically connected they identified a lack of exercise is currently responsible for twice as many deaths as obesity. Those who are inactive are more at risk of cardiovascular problems like heart attacks and stroke as well as some cancers, which exercise can ward off. The research recognised that a 20-minute walk each day would move an individual from being classed as inactive to moderately inactive.

Residents Survey
3.16 The 2014 resident’s survey included 1013 interviews with adults (aged 18+). Fieldwork is carried out in residents’ homes using computer assisted personal interviews. Data is weighted to gender, age, work status and ethnicity and quotas are set on gender, age, and ethnicity. The 2015 survey included 1238 interviews, completed with adults (aged 18+). This is an increase of around 250 from last year to boost sample sizes to give better sub-group analysis. Data was sampled at 122 sampling points compared with 42 sampling points in the previous residents’ survey. Quotas were set on gender, age, and ethnicity at ward level.

3.17 The 2014 survey identified that 60% of Lambeth households make use of local parks and open spaces, which they consider as the 4th most important service that makes Lambeth a good place to live. Business owners, owner occupiers, new residents and those with children are more likely to say parks and open spaces are important in making Lambeth a good place to live.

3.18 The 2014 survey also identified that a third of Lambeth households use local libraries and leisure and sports facilities. The 2015 survey found that use of library buildings had increased by 7% and use of parks and open spaces had decreased by 10%. In the 2014 residents survey 8 out of 10 residents said that they accessed the Internet at home and two thirds of residents access the Internet by mobile phone. 11% of those surveyed in 2014 accessed the Internet through the library service and 11% said they accessed the Internet through a place of education such as school, college, or university.
3.19 The 2015 resident’s survey identified that around 9 in 10 residents accessing the internet at home, half on mobile devices and 9% in libraries. The 2014 and 2015 survey both identified that 1 in 10 do not have access to the Internet. Despite such a large proportion of residents having access to the internet, older and retired people, Black Caribbean residents, disabled people, people with long term illness and residents who are not in a job or training continue to be more likely to not to have access to the internet.

3.20 27% of those questioned in 2014 said that they would like to get more involved in leisure and sport activities. 6% in 2014 also said they were active in a local sports and recreational clubs.

3.21 By 2015 participation in local sports and recreational clubs had increased to 10%. In the 2015 survey 4 in 5 described their mental wellbeing as good and 1 in 20 described it as bad. 7 in 10 residents exercise at least weekly, with almost half exercising at least several times a week. 16% do not do exercise at least once a month.

Equalities Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment

3.22 Copies of the Equalities Impact Assessment and Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment can be found at appendix 2 (a), (b) and (c). Given the council’s statutory responsibilities as a library authority a separate Equalities Impact Assessment has been prepared for the library service and other services too. Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in taking the decision about whether to restructure the library service, the Council must have due regard to the need to:

(a) Eliminate discrimination against people with protected characteristics;
(b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and,
(c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

3.23 The equality impact assessments attached to this report gives information on the effect on the library and other services these proposals have on people with various protected characteristics.

4. Culture 2020

4.1 Drawing together the council’s community plan, consultation feedback, resident’s survey, needs assessment and reflecting on both the equalities and health impact assessments enables a Culture 2020 strategic framework to be developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring success by 2020</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ambitious                 | • We are recognised as the destination to be if you want to enjoy world-class cultural activities, or grow a cultural enterprise.  
<pre><code>                      | • All residents will live within 20 minutes average walking distance of a facility where they can enjoy physical activity, sport, or culture. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>People are healthier for longer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All residents have access to a range of affordable, excellent facilities for culture, sports and physical activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A thriving economy of community groups, social enterprises and cultural businesses are working together to deliver an exciting programme of physical, sport and cultural activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accelerate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 85% (currently 70%) of Lambeth residents will be engaged in sport, physical activity, or wider cultural enjoyment as part of routine life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents are managing their own health and wellbeing needs by participating in physical, sport or cultural activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities themes</th>
<th>What this means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe and interesting spaces</td>
<td>Access to spaces including libraries and community buildings where you can learn, socialise and be enterprising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The great outdoors</td>
<td>Activities in your local park and the chance to have more influence on how your local park is managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s get active</td>
<td>Active Lambeth – regular physical activity and sport, including the use of your local sport and leisure centres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be inspired</td>
<td>Opportunities to participate in and enjoy theatre, performing arts and music.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing off</td>
<td>Opportunities to enjoy art, or if you’re an artist, access to show off your work in archives, galleries and museums, celebrating Lambeth’s cultural history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bigger picture</td>
<td>Cinemas in Lambeth’s five town centres and the chance to learn more about the art of cinema and filmmaking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority people</th>
<th>Why they are priorities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women and girls</td>
<td>Active Lambeth physical activity and sports plan identifies low participation by females at 27.9%, with males at 53.5% in Lambeth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and young people (18’s and under)</td>
<td>Active Lambeth physical activity and sports plan identifies 24% of Lambeth children in 2011/12, classified as obese or overweight, compared with 22.5% in London and 19.2% in England.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults (over 65’s)</td>
<td>Active Lambeth physical activity and sports plan identifies falling participation rates for those aged over 65 at 18.9%, compared with 25.4% for those aged 55 to 64 and 33.2% for 45 to 54 year olds across London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>Active Lambeth physical activity and sports plan identifies lower participation by those with a limiting illness or disability at just over 20% compared with just below 40% across London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Minority Ethnic groups</td>
<td>Active Lambeth physical activity and sports plan identifies lower participation by those from a black and minority ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lambeth Cultural Trust

4.2 Emerging from the consultation feedback is a proposal from Greenwich Leisure Limited for the creation of a not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust, which would be tasked with driving the Culture 2020 framework forward. The Council accepts that such a Trust could potentially bring together a cross sector of agencies with the investment capacity to help address the needs identified within this report, which the council could not do alone.

4.3 This model would enable funds generated through the operation of the Council’s high quality leisure facilities to be recycled within the Trust to support further improvement in the services provided and supported by the trust. This model would also have the potential for sharing many of the values embraced within a public service ethos. A Trust with charitable status could potentially take advantage of tax exemptions and efficiencies.

4.4 In the future and if desirable such a model could offer opportunities to transfer further services to it. If feasible this model could significantly reduce the risk of closing buildings, provide additional mitigation to off set the impact of revenue reductions and contribute further towards the priority outcome healthier for longer.

4.5 This model also involves risks, especially if the trust were to hit financial difficulties. The council would need to think carefully about the powers, responsibilities and accountabilities it would need to give up and share with such a trust. Following further discussions with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL), they are offering a stepping stone approach towards the creation of such a trust, although this does not necessarily mean GLL would be the ultimate owner of the trust.

4.6 This stepping-stone is the development of a Lambeth Cultural Board by January 2016 within the GLL business governance. The GLL business is structured as a social enterprise with charitable registration. GLL has been the Council’s partner since 2007 and have steered the borough’s leisure offer onto a much improved and sustainable footing. GLL is contracted to provide the management of the borough’s 6 leisure centres and booking arrangements for sports facilities in parks until 2022, which both parties have agreed to review in 2016, rather than 2017 as originally planned.

4.7 Initial membership of the Lambeth Cultural Board will be drawn from Lambeth Council, Greenwich Leisure Limited and London Community Foundation. Additional membership
will also be sought from Lambeth health providers, Lambeth College and the Southbank Quarter. The purpose of the Board will be:

a) the development of integrated plans to increase the participation of Lambeth residents in cultural activities, especially those at highest risk of ill health, limited disposal income, physical disability and those above the state retirement age;
b) securing new investment into Lambeth’s cultural infrastructure; and,
c) supporting creative enterprises and routes into employment, training and volunteering opportunities for local residents.

4.8 This report recommends the establishment of the Lambeth Cultural Board, initially under the governance of Greenwich Leisure Limited. During 2018-19 an options appraisal and business modelling exercise will be undertaken by partners to assess the benefits and risks associated with establishing a wholly independent and not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust. The Lambeth Cultural Board will be operational in the first quarter of 2016. The board (and subsequently the Trust if constituted) will be leased three buildings with relevant break clauses, which will enable them to be converted into Healthy Living Centres that will also host a neighbourhood library service.

4.9 This will provide an integrated wellbeing offer, which is cost neutral to the council. During the initial transitional period for the centres, GLL have agreed that £1m of council revenue resource that is currently earmarked to support the provision of leisure services can be switched to underpin the initial development of the centres and have also committed to maintaining a budgeted profit share to supplement this.

4.10 In addition, GLL have agreed with the council to apply £1m of the shared development pot capital balance towards the fit out of the healthy living centre trial. Given the level of resource GLL will be investing in this proposal there will be a risk of exit costs under the leisure management contract if the council sought to terminate the agreement for the healthy living centres without mutual consent.

5 Priority 1: Safe and Interesting Spaces
5.1 When fulfilling its duty under section 7 of the Library and Museum Act 1964 the Council must have regard to the desirability:

- of securing that facilities are available for the borrowing of or reference to books, through its own stocks or by any other appropriate means and other printed matter, pictures, gramophone records, films and other materials;
- of securing that these facilities are sufficient in number, range and quality to meet the general and special requirements of adults and children; and,
- of encouraging children and adults to make full use of the library service.

5.2 Case law on this subject has clarified that a comprehensive service does not mean that every resident lives close to a library. ‘Comprehensive’ has therefore been taken to mean delivering a service that is accessible to all residents using reasonable means, including digital technologies, in the light of the community’s needs. An efficient service must make the best use of the assets available in order to meet its core objectives and vision,
recognising the constraints on council resources. Decisions about the service must be embedded within a clear strategic framework, which draws upon evidence about needs and aspirations across the diverse communities of the borough. Lambeth currently has 10 library buildings and a home visiting service for those who are housebound and want to access a library service.

5.3 The recommendations of this report makes provision for 5 town centre libraries, as well as 5 neighbourhood libraries where residents can access the library service. We want to provide safe places for everyone with the opportunity to enjoy learn and socialise. These places need to be homes for community groups to grow and where volunteering and enterprise can flourish. Access to digital facilities and the principle of free study space is an integral part of this approach.

Current Provision, Culture 2020 Proposals and Consultation Feedback
5.4 The Council currently provides its library service through 4 town centre library buildings, 6 neighbourhood library buildings and a home visiting service targeting those Lambeth residents who are housebound. The current service is open an average of 405.5 hours per week (minus public bank holidays) and there were 970,740 visits to these libraries between April and December 2014. The home library service/community service visits 330 individuals and supports 41 small collections in community settings. The Culture 2020 consultation proposed the following:

- Brixton, Clapham, Streatham and West Norwood would be our town centre libraries and provide the borough’s statutory service;
- Tate South Lambeth would also act as a temporary town centre library for the north of the borough pending a further review;
- two neighbourhood libraries, Waterloo and Minet, would be closed and sold; and,
- three neighbourhood libraries – Carnegie, Upper Norwood and Durning – would no longer receive council revenue funding.

5.5 As part of the proposal, the Council set out the ways in which it would mitigate the impact in the areas, which would no longer have a library service or see their service changed or reduced in some way. Using the money generated by the sale of the sites at Waterloo and Minet the council would be able to set up an endowment fund and utilise this fund to provide a revenue stream for Carnegie, Upper Norwood and Durning. However, this situation would also be predicated on independent charitable trusts and social enterprises running these services and managing the buildings to avoid closure.

5.6 The majority of respondents to the consultation, including the Friends of Lambeth Libraries and Unison were opposed to the proposals put forward on libraries. There was strong opposition on the proposal to close Waterloo and Minet libraries with opposition from 54% and 53% respectively.

5.7 In opposing the proposals Unison feedback that they felt the consultation was inadequate and that the council would not be fulfilling its statutory duty. Staff consultation feedback is also included within the consultation report. As part of the Culture 2020 consultation the council also shared alternatives to what was being proposed. These were as follows:
Continuing to spend the same amount of money on the library service.

- We need to reduce costs because there is less money available

Focus the library service at Streatham, Clapham and Brixton Libraries.

- We don’t feel this would meet the council’s statutory obligations for providing a library service.
- Working with local people, we’re developing new approached for supporting literacy and a love of reading that means we can be more ambitious.

Spreading the available budget across the existing 10 libraries.

- We don’t feel this would provide a comprehensive library service across the borough.

5.8 The council was also asked to consider a number of alternative options during the consultation, some of which are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative proposal</th>
<th>Why the Council rejected it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not dispose of the Minet library site to establish the proposed endowment fund.</td>
<td>Following further reflection on the consultation feedback the council has changed this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not dispose of the Waterloo library site to establish the proposed endowment fund.</td>
<td>The council intends to withdraw the library service from this site and explore how the site could best deliver both a capital receipt and potentially a revenue stream to the community and this report provides adequate mitigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use any surplus income from the leisure management contract and income from the proposed endowment fund to resource the existing in-house library service.</td>
<td>This proposal is being rejected because of the following reasons: 1. The priority for Culture 2020 is people are healthier for longer, which requires a holistic approach and whilst libraries are an important contributor they are not the only contributor to this outcome. 2. This proposal would have a disproportionate impact on other services, especially on parks and open spaces. 3. Adequate mitigations have been developed. 4. The recommendation not to sell the Minet Library and delay in disposing of the Waterloo site, the endowment will not be fully operational until 2019. 5. There are restrictions placed on charitable endowments, which will not allow charitable endowments to fund a local authority provided service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of a staff mutual or dedicated</td>
<td>Whilst not objecting to this proposal on principle, the council does not favour this approach at the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lambeth library trust to run the service. moment. Whilst there is interest from the senior management team there is insufficient capacity to develop this model, which will need to deliver the necessary savings by April 2016. The council will keep this under review, but is pursuing an in-house service model at this stage. It will consider any trust, or staff mutual model after the 2-year improvement plan has been delivered.

**The submission from the Friends of Lambeth libraries included:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce high management costs, use of consultants and agency staff by the council.</td>
<td>There is already a savings target of £8m in the council’s financial strategy for back office, efficiencies and the smart support programme. The use of technical consultants is strictly monitored and used to fill temporary skills and knowledge gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the £1m heritage funds identified in the Culture 2020 consultation document (page 25) to fund libraries.</td>
<td>The allocation referenced in the consultation document concerns one off capital to support partners with external funding applications. It is not on-going revenue. Financial restrictions placed on local government prevent the use of capital to fund on-going revenue services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending “pet projects” like the new town hall development.</td>
<td>The new town hall project will in the medium term save the council revenue costs of £4.5m per year and help reduce the pressure on frontline service budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace expensive and inefficient contracts, notably with Balfour Beatty for maintenance &amp; with JCDecaux for advertising. By contrast, the library service is efficiently run.</td>
<td>Following a competitive procurement process, Lambeth’s contract with Balfour Beatty (now Cofely) delivered a 20% cost reduction to the council for FM services and an increase in performance levels across the borough, as well as delivering community benefits such as the London Living Wage. The current contract is due to expire in 2017 and the council will be seeking stakeholders’ views as to how to progress. We have a contract with JCDecaux who manage the on-street standing adverts. There are 80 panels across the borough and they cost approximately £600 each time we replace the adverts. We are looking at ways to ensure we achieve suitable levels of income from a range of on-street advertising opportunities. We do not have any other contract with JCDecaux.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The submission from UNISON included:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We oppose the closure of Waterloo and Minet Libraries.</td>
<td>The report recommends the decommissioning of Waterloo library and sets out clear mitigations. The report also addresses the proposed closure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the Minet library.

- We oppose the ‘outsourcing’ of Durning, Upper Norwood and Carnegie Libraries.
  - This report does not recommend the outsourcing of library services, but makes a clear distinction between ‘service’ and ‘building’.

- We oppose the idea that unstaffed book collections can represent a library.
  - Noted. The report recommends a revised Lambeth Library Standards, which concentrates services where the vast majority of residents access the service and provides self-service points at 5 static neighbourhood service points.

- We oppose the idea that Tate South Lambeth is big enough to represent a Town Centre library.
  - The issue is further addressed in the body of the report.

- We don’t believe that you will continue to run West Norwood or Brixton Libraries as Town Centre libraries.
  - The report makes budget provision for town centre library services at West Norwood or Brixton Libraries.

- We don’t believe you are fulfilling your statutory duty.
  - The council does not accept this given the reasons set out in this report.

- The council has not undertaken adequate consultation.
  - The council does not accept this given the reasons set out in this report. The council believes it has both met and gone beyond the Sedley/Gunning principles.

- Terminate the employment contracts of other council staff to save the library service.
  - This is a matter of council priorities.

- The future of the archives should be planned with care.
  - This report sets out proposals for the future options for the borough archives.

### Revised Proposals

5.9 Following reflection on the consultation feedback, this report recommends changes to the original proposals for the library service in the borough with the biggest impact centering on the existing neighbourhood library service. The focus of our approach is to retain quality whilst diversifying how space is used, as our key mitigation, rather than spreading money more thinly and reducing quality.

5.10 As a result of this report residents will have increased access to the service from 405.5 hours per week (minus public bank holidays) to 583.5 per week (minus public bank holidays). The service will be provided from 9 out of the 10 existing service points meaning that there will be no significant change to the distance residents will need to travel to access the service. Although this might mean some people will have to travel further to access a town centre library but the quality will remain. This report will make significant changes in the way the service is provided, including:

- Diversifying how library buildings are used, so they are able to deliver the Culture 2020 outcomes and generate additional income in order to keep them open.
• No budget reductions to the home visiting service, which caters for approximately 0.6% of current users who are housebound.
• A minimum of 10 locations where residents can access the service, (5 town centre libraries and 5 neighbourhood libraries). The same number as present.
• A £10m endowment fund by 2019, which will provide small grants to local charities seeking to achieve the priority healthier for longer, including, the love of literacy and life-long learning programmes tailored to priority groups.
• The report does not propose changes to the total book stock, although Lambeth library service will be responsible for efficient book rotation across all 10-service points.
• More opportunities for residents to volunteer in the service.
• Given the funding arrangements are different for the Brixton Prison Service this service is out of the scope of this report and no changes are presented in this report.

Lambeth Library Standards
5.11 The Lambeth Library standards were initially adopted in 2013 and are based heavily on the Welsh Public Library Standards (there is no English Library Standards). These standards provide a core level for the service to work to and on which to build improvement given Lambeth does not presently meet all the standards. Some of these standards have also been adapted to reflect Lambeth’s population density and the current standard of provision. As a consequence of the recommendations of this report there will be a need to update these standards to cover the period 2016-18. A copy of the revised standards can be found at appendix 3 and will be subjected to further development over the course of the next 2 years in partnership with staff, friends of library groups and other stakeholders in the library service.

Five Town Centre Libraries

5.12 The recommendations within this report make provision for 5 town centre libraries at Streatham, Clapham, Brixton, West Norwood and Durning, or Tate South Lambeth. This is where 77% of users currently access the service. By providing additional capacity at Durning library we anticipate this figure will increase to 80% by 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Current opening hours</th>
<th>New opening hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>30.5 to be increased shortly to 42</td>
<td>54 (When Nettlefold reopens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning, or Tate South (Temporary North Lambeth Library)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Norwood Library
5.13 The development of a new public library in the Nettlefold centre, West Norwood is currently under statutory planning consideration. This report makes available the necessary budget for West Norwood Library to operate on a town centre library basis and managed by the Lambeth library service. Subject to final apportionment of construction
costs this report also makes provision for the necessary capital investment required from the council to contribute towards the construction and delivery of this project. Once construction is complete in 2017-18 the temporary library provision in West Norwood will close and will be relocated back into the redeveloped Nettlefold Centre.

Durning Library and Tate South Lambeth Library – Considering a New North Lambeth Town Centre Library

5.14 It was proposed that Tate South Lambeth library would act as the interim North Lambeth town centre library as a first step towards exploring a new and modern North Lambeth library offer, which was highlighted in the consultation report. Opinion was fairly evenly divided between those who support (24%), oppose (31%) and neither support nor oppose (28%) the proposal for Tate South Lambeth library to become the temporary town centre library for the north of the borough until a review of town centre library provision is completed in 2020.

5.15 Over a third of the comments received (169 out of 443) felt that the Tate South Lambeth library would not serve the needs of all the residents in North Lambeth and that people living in this area would not have the same level of access to libraries as elsewhere in the borough. The following tables provide a snap shot of the current library membership, visits and issues for Tate South Lambeth and Durning libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>16-17 Year Old</th>
<th>Adult Over 18</th>
<th>Adult Over 60</th>
<th>Child 1-2</th>
<th>Child 3-5</th>
<th>Child 6-11</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South Lambeth</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>83,625</td>
<td>82,695</td>
<td>73,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South</td>
<td>86,578</td>
<td>94,186</td>
<td>96,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library issues</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>48,549</td>
<td>49,169</td>
<td>45,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lambeth</td>
<td>49,262</td>
<td>45,687</td>
<td>49,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.16 The practical layout of the building at Durning Library is difficult and the business model underpinning the healthy living centre proposed within this report is more suited to the Tate South Lambeth library site and will ensure library provision at both Tate South Lambeth and Durning. After considering the service user profile, visits, issues and consultation feedback this report proposes that Durning Library rather than Tate South library should provide the temporary town centre library in the north of the borough.

5.17 To prepare Durning library for its temporary status the council is proposing to invest £800,000 in building alterations to improve accessibility and the facilities on offer. This will
also form a sound basis for a sustainable future for this well loved listed building, either as a community hub or to generate income for the council, beyond its temporary use.

5.18 This investment is also required given the current condition of Durning library following the protracted removal of a large tree, which was located at the rear that has held up investment for over 2 years. The consultation has confirmed a lack of capacity in the local community to take on additional responsibilities for managing the Durning library building.

5.19 This is a change to what was proposed during the Culture 2020 consultation and this report recommends that a 4-week period of consultation be entered into during November 2015 on this single proposal, which will not require any delay in the implementation of the wider recommendations of this report. The council’s ambition is to secure a new purpose built library facility in the north of the borough by 2022. Should a site for this new facility be identified a business case will need to be agreed by the council. This approach would also enable the library service to be relocated from Durning library. During the consultation a number of sites were suggested, which could potentially house a new North Lambeth Library, this included the Oval Gas Works; all available options will be pursued that come forward as we embark on the North Lambeth library review.

Five Neighbourhood Libraries

5.20 Approximately 21.4% of current library users access the service through Waterloo, Tate South Lambeth, Carnegie, Upper Norwood and Minet Libraries. Following further reflection on the consultation feedback this report recommends changes to the service delivered in these neighbourhoods. As a consequence of the recommendations of this report and the proposal for Tate South library those residents accessing the service at Minet library (Vassall Ward), Waterloo library (Bishop’s Ward), Tate South Lambeth library (Oval Ward), Carnegie library (Herne Hill Ward) and Upper Norwood library (Gipsy Hill Ward) will experience a change in the services they have previously received at these static locations.

5.21 Residents accessing the service at these neighbourhood locations will experience a reduction in the physical space and the existing service will be decommissioned to be replaced with the revised neighbourhood library service. This service will consist of self-service facilities providing residents with access to a limited supply of books which they can loan and drop off, as well as:

- Free Wi-Fi access.
- Computers.
- Study space.
- Book stock will be planned and managed by the Lambeth library service on a rotating basis, which will reflect local needs, culture and community languages.
- Where the building permits there will be space for community groups and small enterprises to hire.

5.22 Whilst there will be no permanent Lambeth library staff on site, provision will be made in the budget for the Lambeth library staff to curate and tailor activity in these safe spaces to meet local needs.
Our plan is by diversifying the use of library buildings through the proposed Lambeth Cultural Trust we will be able to safeguard both the buildings and services housed within them from future cuts. At the same time residents in these locations will have increased hours to access the service, as the buildings will be open for longer hours. When reopened as healthy living centres the access to the revised library service will be coterminous with the opening hours of healthy living centre, or in the case of Bishops ward the Oasis Centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood service point</th>
<th>Current library opening hours</th>
<th>New spoke library opening hours once reopened as healthy living centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oasis Centre (Bishops ward)</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Norwood Joint Library (Gipsy Hill ward)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minet Healthy Living Centre: (Vassall ward)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Healthy Living Centre (Herne Hill ward)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South Lambeth Healthy Living Centre (Oval ward)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>308.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further details on the healthy living centres can be found under priority 3: Lets Get Active in this report. Those managing the whole site will provide on-going security for the buildings and the facilities. The council will continue to fund and provide a library home delivery service for residents who are housebound. If access to a town centre library is required then disabled and elderly residents who are more mobile will be able to use their Freedom Bus pass, to access a library town centre. Overall there is no significant change in the distance any disabled or elderly person is required to travel to access the service through either a town centre, or neighbourhood library static service point than is required now.

**Waterloo**

The closure of the Waterloo library service was proposed during the Culture 2020 consultation. This report confirms this proposal, which will be implemented no later than April 2016. At this point the service will close and the site will be declared surplus to requirements for the provision of a library service. There was strong objection to this proposal during the consultation process.

In mitigation, the council is proposing to partner with Oasis Charitable Trust to initially provide a temporary neighbourhood library at the Oasis Centre, 1 Kennington Road, London, SE1 7QP from May 2016. The ambition is for Waterloo library to have a permanent home on the proposed redevelopment of the Johanna school site.

The Oasis Centre is 0.7 miles from Durning library and 0.3 miles from the existing Waterloo library site. As well as hosting a neighbourhood library spoke the site would also provide:
- A Community coffee shop (open 7 days per week).
- A home for the Waterloo Food-bank.
- The Oasis Debt advice service.
- A Credit Union.
- A space for general community activities.
- Volunteer opportunities.
- Access to a gym and sports hall in the evening and over weekends.

5.27 Lambeth will work with the London Community Foundation to facilitate a 2 year funding agreement for the provision of a volunteer-led community literacy programme that will be provided by the Oasis Charitable Trust. This report recommends the current library service at Waterloo library is decommissioned by April 2016 and is replaced by the revised neighbourhood library service thereafter at The Oasis Centre.

5.28 The existing Waterloo library site has drawn interest from a variety of organisations. This report does not determine the long-term future use of this site once declared surplus to requirements. This will be determined at a later stage.

Upper Norwood

5.29 The Upper Norwood Joint Library is within 1.6 miles of West Norwood library. The service is jointly funded by Lambeth and Croydon council's and is located at 41 Westow Hill, London, SE19 1TJ. Both local authorities also jointly own this site. The Upper Norwood Joint Library Trust, a community-led charity, has been seeking transfer of the building to provide a wider range of activities and services to the community for several years. Croydon council are overseeing the lease agreement for the building on behalf of both authorities.

5.30 Like most social enterprise models there is a degree of risk if the Trust fails to achieve a sustainable level of income to maintain the building and its associated services. If this unfortunate circumstance did materialise in the future, then the building and assets, will revert back to both Croydon and Lambeth. The Upper Norwood Joint Library Trust has previously sought management of the library service as part of this package. This report adjusts this approach and recommends the Trust host a Lambeth provided neighbourhood library service in the current building.

5.31 Lambeth will work with the London Community Foundation to facilitate a 2 year funding agreement for the maintenance of the building as a wider community facility. It is anticipated that Croydon council will maintain their match funding arrangement. This report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and is replaced by the revised neighbourhood library service thereafter.

Minet

5.32 Minet library is within 1.1 miles of Brixton library. The council originally proposed disposal of the Minet library site, 52 Knatchbull Road, London SE5 9QY, with the resulting capital receipt being used to part fund the establishment of a library endowment fund. There was strong opposition to the disposal proposal.
5.33 The Council has also received a proposal to redevelop of the existing Minet library site to include mixed use, including residential, community and potential small enterprise and business units. Following further reflection of the consultation feedback, this report recommends that disposal of the site is no longer sought and that the redevelopment option be pursued by 2020 which links to the ambitions of the Lambeth Cultural Trust and our aspiration to build new homes in Lambeth.

5.34 In the meantime the site will be transformed during 2016/17 into a healthy living centre providing access to a gym, neighbourhood library and the holding of the borough archive, until options appraisal has been concluded into the long-term location for the borough archives. Once redeveloped the Healthy Living Centre should be re-provided on site. This report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and is replaced by the revised neighbourhood library service thereafter.

Carnegie

5.35 Carnegie library is 1.1 mile from Brixton library. Stepping up the challenge set in our Community Hub Programme, a community-led steering group, supported by Lambeth Council, has been seeking to establish a local charitable Trust, which would take on the management of Carnegie library building, 118 Herne Hill Road, London, SE24 0AG. The ambition of the steering group is to develop the facility into a broader community hub providing a wider range of services, cultural activities, a base for social enterprise, as well as a library service. These plans are unlikely to be fully realised by April 2016 given the complexities of setting up the trust, establishing a sustainable business model and securing the necessary grants from external agencies for example the Heritage Lottery Fund. We are still committed to supporting these aspirations under our community hub programme.

5.36 We have also received an alternative proposal from the Friends of Carnegie Library. At the point of writing this report, no further details are available on the sustainability of this alternative proposal other than that they are seeking to establish community-led management of the library to preserve the building for use by the community and to continue the library service as the central public service. These community aspirations do not alter the financial challenges facing the Council nor do the recommendations of this report prevent any interested party from developing proposals for the council to consider in the future, although there is a potential risk of exit costs linked to any successful asset transfer of Carnegie to a community group, if they did not wish GLL to remain a provider in the building.

5.37 In the meantime, to ensure continued community use of the building, the site will be transformed into a healthy living centre providing a gym; neighbourhood library, community rental and small business and location of the library stock management system. This report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and is replaced by the revised neighbourhood library service thereafter.

Tate South Lambeth (Proposal)
5.38 Tate South Lambeth library, 180 South Lambeth Road, Vauxhall, London SW8 1QP is 1.3 miles from Clapham library and 1.4 miles from Brixton library. Tate South Lambeth library was originally proposed as a location for the library hub servicing for the north of the borough. Following further reflection on the consultation feedback and a review of the financial impact of not having the endowment operational from 2016, this proposal is no longer being pursued. This constitutes a change to what was proposed in the Culture 2020 consultation and we recommend a 4 weeks consultation period during November 2015 on this specific issue. The remainder of the recommendations of this report will continue to be implemented.

5.39 The layout of the Tate South Lambeth library building provides a much more practical location for housing a healthy living centre, which will provide a neighbourhood library service, spaces for community groups to hire and gym facilities. This model will provide a future for Tate South Lambeth beyond any new North Lambeth Library site being established, securing future community use.

5.40 Tate South Lambeth also hosts a weekly Sensory Impairment Group. Space will continue to be made available once reopened as a healthy living centre. During the refit period the council will work with the group to seek suitable alternative accommodation. This report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and replaced by a revised neighbourhood library service thereafter.

Parent and toddler groups

5.41 Minet, Carnegie, Waterloo, Tate South Lambeth and UNJL libraries currently run weekly parent and toddler sessions providing storytelling for under 5’s. These sessions run for approximately 90 minutes and are free of charge. In mitigation, space will continue to be made available for this provision at each of these static neighbourhood library service points, as well as town centre libraries. Budget will be provided to the Lambeth library service to curate activities in these spaces to meet local needs and the council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grants programme that will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes from May 2016.

Residents whose first language may not be English

5.42 For those who may not have English as a first language, provision will be made available through each town centre library and book stock management through the neighbourhood library service will be tailored around local needs. Budget will be provided to the Lambeth library service to curate activities in these spaces to meet local needs and the council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grants programme that will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes from May 2016.

Volunteering in the Library Service

5.43 The service is making good progress in achieving a comparative rating for the number of volunteered hours worked in the service across the Charted Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) comparative data of London library authorities Lambeth. To facilitate this revised service standard will further support each town centre library with
clearly defined leadership, recruitment, and support for volunteers. This will include a training programme to enable volunteers to complement service delivery and work confidentially within a multi-cultural and diverse community, as well as understanding the council’s legal duties under equalities legislation.

Service Improvement

5.43 Since 2013 the library service has been on a journey of service improvement that has also included capital investment, which has overseen and will further see significant improvement in library buildings. To maintain the current journey of service improvement the Service Manager (libraries and archives) has produced a revised set of Lambeth library standards, which will provide the basis for driving the service forward over the next 2 years. These standards will be further developed with the input from staff and stakeholders over the coming years. The Service Manager (libraries and archives) will also produce an improvement plan by March 2016, which will be reported to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods on a quarterly basis.

Business Case

5.44 This report tasks the Director of Education and Learning to lead on the development of the business case and its implementation by April 2016 based on the recommendations and budget allocated by the report. Whilst business cases need to be developed it is reasonable to assume that given the level of cuts in revenue this will lead to a reduction of approximately 25% of the current workforce.

5.45 On balance the council feels that revised Lambeth library standards, budget allocation and the recommendations in this report will meet both the spirit and letter of the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums Act.

Community Buildings

5.46 As set out in the Culture 2020 consultation the council will continue to stimulate and support a thriving network of community buildings that provide safe and interesting spaces, as well as housing cultural enterprises, which are managed and in some cases owned by independent charities. Examples of this work (not exhaustive), include:

- The Brix at St. Matthews Church
- Black Cultural Archives
- Waterloo Action Centre
- The Woodlawn Centre
- The Longfield Hall Trust
- Stockwell Partnership
- Slade Gardens Adventure Playground

5.47 Those projects in council owned buildings will continue to be assessed on individual merit and must satisfy the obligations of the community management and ownership policy, which requires a public interest test to be met. The council next priorities under this programme will be Angell Town Enterprise Zone and Community Facilities and the Brixton Domino Club.

Brixton Domino Club

5.48 The historic Grade II listed building, located at 297-299 on Coldharbour Lane, Brixton has been occupied and run since 1985 by the Brixton Domino and Social Club. The Brixton Domino Club in Brixton has a long history within the Caribbean community and the asset provides a real opportunity to undertake work with communities identified at high risk from
5.49 Following the securing of capital investment from Lambeth First the council intends to work with Brixton Domino Club to support the sensitive refurbishment of the building to its former glory to create flexible space that will provide services and activities for the borough’s elders within the West Indian community whilst increasing opportunities for new and emerging social enterprises. The redeveloped space on the Coldharbour site will also provide a long term home for Brixton Soup Kitchen, a community group established in 2013 to provide support to homeless people or people in desperate need in the Brixton area.

Angell Town Enterprise Zone and Community Facilities

5.50 Capital has been secured through Lambeth First to instigate work on the Angell Town Estate, which is classified as a severely deprived neighbourhood. In addition the estate has a number of issues around poor health and high levels of crime and unemployment. Working with a range of local organisations the shopping parade on the estate, which is currently underutilised, will become an enterprise zone for small business start-ups, social and creative enterprises. The retail units, which are owned and by the Council provide the ideal opportunity to use community assets in a different way by providing a platform to support the delivery of activities without the need for ongoing revenue support. Long term there may be the opportunities to develop a neighbourhood management model that has the remit and responsibility for managing the units and re-investing income generated to support the delivery of activities and services within the local area.

5.51 Demolition of the redundant boiler house on the estate creates the opportunity for a new mixed-use development, including community facilities aimed at addressing some of the lifestyle challenges facing young people in the neighbourhood. A local partnership is starting to emerge on the estate, which includes ward councillors, community representatives, The London Community Foundation and the Evening Standard (dispossessed fund) that will start to harness resources to address many of the challenges facing local residents.

6. Priority 2: The Great Outdoors

6.1 This priority is about the borough’s parks and open spaces and providing residents, if they so wish, with the opportunity to have a bigger say in the upkeep and maintenance of their local park and open space. The borough has over 64 parks and open spaces, which are home to play areas, community food growing projects and sports facilities. At a time of deep cuts in budgets, local residents have worked alongside the council to secure public parks, which are amongst some of the best in the country, with 11 Green Flags, venues for artistic performance, as well as being a destination for tranquillity.

6.2 Working with our friends of groups, our approach to combating the impact of cuts to our funding is to ensure we meet our statutory requirements, accelerate capital investment, diversify use where possible and maximise other sources of income before we consider the risk of closing any facilities. As part of the consultation we shared with residents the
need to save £2m from the parks budget, as well as alternatives we had considered and rejected, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative proposal</th>
<th>Why the Council rejected it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to spend the same amount of money on parks and open spaces</td>
<td>• We need to reduce costs and we have less money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the number of parks, common land and open spaces available to the public.</td>
<td>• We think access to open spaces is invaluable to residents’ health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We think parks and open spaces are an important asset for Lambeth’s economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working with community organisations, we’re developing new approaches for maintaining and investing in our parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 As set out in the consultation and needs assessment section among respondents to the on-street survey, parks were identified as by far the most popular place for physical activity (61%) and cultural activity (83%). The consultation also identified that only slightly more respondents supported the proposal to hand over a greater share of income from parks to local management groups (35% vs. 27%), although 80% of respondents expressed an opinion in support of the proposal to implement clustering arrangements for parks.

6.4 The 2014 resident’s survey identified that 60% of Lambeth households make use of local parks and open spaces, which they consider as the 4th most important service that makes Lambeth a good place to live. Unison support the general attempt to generate income from parks which is not inconsistent with the provision of public open space freely available for the benefit of local people and recognise that parks have long benefited from the work of volunteers and Friends’ groups, which they also support.

6.5 However, Unison would not support “local management” if this became simply a mechanism for the council to try to wash its hands of the responsibility which it has, as the only democratic representative body for the borough as a whole, for the maintenance of our public open spaces as a resource for all local people. Unison is also concerned that the Council states that it will, by the end of this year, launch an “alternative parks partnership model” about which only limited detail is provided.

6.6 Unison does not believe that the council can or should make the level of reductions in spending on parks set out in the Culture 2020 document. That said Unison stands ready to participate in meaningful consultation on the future of parks. The consultation provided an opportunity for residents to let the council know what they thought of the Cooperative Parks programme since its launch in 2013, as well as express new ideas and listen to their practical experiences to date. The council was challenged to learn from others, sense checks the direction, as well as assess the ability to deliver given the deep cuts already agreed and the government’s continued austerity policy.

Revised Approach
6.6 As an inner London borough we are navigating the challenges of a growing population, increased density of living, deep cuts in funding whilst seeking at the same time seeking to meet the ambitions of the Culture 2020 plan. The Culture 2020 approach for parks and open spaces is based on the following:

- Investing in our parks and open spaces
- Diversifying usage where possible
- Maximising income
- Working within agreed revenue budgets
- Streamlining the cost of engagement
- Brockwell Hall as a designated project
- Securing borough owned skate parks

6.7 To achieve this will require things to be done differently, it will require some things to stop and where possible the nurturing of community-led approaches to horticulture, gardening and food growing projects in our parks and open spaces. The 2013 Cooperative Parks policy stated the council’s commitment to protecting the borough’s green spaces and this commitment remains an integral part of the Culture 2020 plan, which recognises that having access to a local park and open space is critical to delivering the ambitions of people being healthier for longer. In a nutshell we need to increase people’s participation in keeping active and this includes using our parks to promote physical, as well as mental health. There are no proposals to dispose of any of the council’s parks and open spaces, as a consequence of this report.

**Investing in Our Parks and Open Spaces**

6.8 The first line of both protecting and mitigation against the deep cuts in revenue funding is to invest and grow alternative sources of income, as well as ensuring old and costly facilities and equipment is replaced where possible, so that on-going maintenance costs can be safely reduced. In January 2015 the council approved the boroughs first integrated 5 year Parks Investment Plan valued at £20m with over 50% of overall investment being generated through external funding and development agreements.

6.9 This report sets in motion phase 1 of the parks capital investment plan, which is valued at £3.8m and which includes £2.03m as part of the council’s total capital commitment of £9m over the term of this administration. A delivery programme for phase 1 will be presented to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods by the end of 2015. The amount above also includes an allowance towards the costs associated with project delivery.

6.10 Closing any facilities in our parks and open spaces will be at a last resort, which will only following after we have examined with friends of groups:

- How capital investment can be used to improve facilities, so to reduce on-going maintenance, running costs, or help secure new income sources.
- Diversifying use where possible.
- Maximising income through events, sports and rental opportunities.
- Exploring all the alternatives at our disposal.
Diversifying usage where possible

6.11 Whilst recognising that not all parks and open spaces do not provide the right environment or infrastructure for the development of community food growing projects, some of our smaller parks and open spaces do. During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop community managed food growing projects in up to 5 parks and open spaces. We will consult and work with ward councillors and the Friends of Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces in identifying the 5 locations for the proposed pilots and establish a one off fund (£50,000) to support the development of these proposals and monitor the impact before considering any expansion of this proposal.

Maximising Income

6.12 A separate report will be presented to cabinet to consider the adoption of a new event strategy for parks and open spaces that will aim to increase income. One of the key priorities of the parks capital programme is to invest in infrastructure such as cafés, shops and sports facilities, which will provide improved or new sources of income. The issue of sports facilities in parks and open spaces is picked up in Priority 3: Let’s Get Active.

Working within agreed revenue budgets

6.13 Following further reflection of the consultation feedback, priorities for Culture 2020 and the available budget this report recommends a revised specification for the maintenance of the borough’s parks and open spaces, which can be found at appendix (3). Any community led models under the proposed new policy will not be able to undermine any relevant contracts or arrangements that have been lawful procured by the council. The revised specification will prioritise revenue around the following principles:

- The use of our parks and open spaces is significantly higher over the summer months and school holidays and that maintenance services need to increase during these seasons.
- The borough’s larger parks and open spaces, recognising they offer more diverse recreation activities, attract greater visitor numbers and have higher maintenance costs.

6.14 The revised specification will focus on:

- Meeting the council’s statutory obligations for litter collection and waste management, to provide clean and safe parks.
- Provide mown grass areas for informal recreation, sports and events and un-mown grass areas, which support nature conservation.
- Meeting European safety standards for children’s plays areas and paddling pools
- Maintaining sports facilities, which support the Culture 2020 priorities and generate income, which can be reinvested in services.
- Maintaining the Heritage Lottery investments at Brockwell Park, Myatts Fields Parks and Kennington Park.

Paddling Pools
6.15 On average it costs up to £40,000 per year to keep a single paddling pool operational once utilises and maintenance has been taken into account. One option could have been to close all paddling pools in parks and open spaces, but given the heaviest use of paddling pools are those located at Brockwell Park, Myatt’s Field Park, Norwood Park and Clapham Common and we propose to keep these open. The council will instigate discussion with friends of groups and welcome proposals from interested parties to maintain the paddling pools at Streatham Common, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens, but being realistic within the budget available if no proposals are forthcoming the Council will need to consider converting these facilities to less costly such as a skateboard park, children’s play areas or returning to grassed open spaces.

Seasonal Bedding

6.16 The council’s seasonal bedding and ornamental planting programme will be replaced with a mixture of perennial planting and conversion back to grassed open space at Archbishops Park, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Myatts Fields, Ruskin Park and Vauxhall Park. The Council will maintain planted heritage features and also establish a small grants fund in partnership with the London Community Fund that will seek to fund Friends of Groups, local schools and organisations to establish gardening clubs and undertake planting projects in local parks and open spaces who may choose to adopt seasonal bedding and ornamental planting areas in order to retain them.

Public Toilets

6.17 The approach to public toilets in parks is a mixture of investment, integration with other parks facilities, alternative provision and rationalisation. If none of these options provide a solution then as a last resort the council may have to close some toilet facilities. This approach will help mitigate the concerns raised in the health impact assessment and may avoid the impact of public toilets facing permanent closure across all parks.

6.18 Public toilets reach peak usage during the summer months between May and September each year. It is the larger parks, which witness the heaviest usage. The plan is therefore to focus on them as priority and keep them open:

- Brockwell Park: Stable, Temple and children’s play area.
- Clapham Common: Windmill Drive and children’s play area.
- Myatts Fields Park: Park toilets.
- Kennington Park: Children’s play area
- Streatham Common.

6.19 Alternative plans will be drawn up and assessments made up for Archbishops Park, Norwood, Hillside Gardens, Ruskin and Agnes Riley Gardens. This will include amongst others a requirement for operators to provide access to public toilets within their lease agreement for sports and café facilities, the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where there is no commercial facilities to be leased exploring closer synergy with the network of community toilets provided by local businesses. If none of these options come to fruition then there could be a risk of closure in some cases. If faced with the prospect of closure the council will provide a public notice in the park affected for a period of 6 weeks.
Park Gates

6.20 Brockwell Park, Ufford Street, St Johns Churchyard, Vauxhall Park, Archbishops Park, Tivoli Park, Ruskin Park, Loughborough Park, Kennington Park and Myatts Fields Park will continue to have their gates locked overnight. The council will carry out a risk assessment of other parks before exploring the option of phasing out night locking by April 2016. Any negative impact of phasing out will be monitored, including any increases in community safety concerns. The council will also explore options to work with neighbourhood and community organisations, such as Business Improvement Districts or neighbourhood watch’s, or operators within our parks, who could step up and open and close these parks.

Streamlining the Cost of Engagement

6.21 Cabinet signed off the Cooperative Parks policy in June 2013. A further report in December 2013 effectively set in motion a process to enable community-led models to emerge. Since then we have also had new expressions of interest mainly from social enterprises and third sector organisations. This policy has allowed the council to test new models of local management, which has resulted in the first ever community managed green space, The Rookery in Streatham Common.

6.22 The experience with helping to set up the Streatham model is that it has been resource intensive, and took over 14 months to establish. Lessons have been learned from this work and equally important given the financial constraints facing the Council it will not be realistic to rely only on these types of models across the borough in every park. Based on the experience at Streatham and the emerging model at Myatt’s Field Park we realise these types of models may not be the norm, although this does not mean such models cannot emerge in the future.

6.23 In addition, these types of approach do not mask the reality that the vast majority of residents simply want to enjoy the borough’s parks and the facilities rather than take on more responsibilities in managing the service. Following reflection of the consultation feedback this report sets out how the council intends to engage with those residents who want to have a deeper influence on how their local park is managed.

Clustering: Partnership Parks

6.24 Residents keen to influence how their local park is managed are asking for more transparency around events, how capital is allocated, the pace of project delivery and more input into monitoring the quality of our maintenance contacts. The Culture 2020 consultation proposed clustering around the concept of partnership parks using the existing five neighbourhood areas Lambeth is split into. This is an adjustment to the Cooperative Parks policy.

6.25 This structure also mirrors the parks capital investment plan, which in turn forms the basis of the partnership park model on a North Lambeth, Brixton, Clapham, Streatham and
Norwood model. Under this model the Council will appoint one lead councillor for each of the areas. The lead councillors will have the following remit:

- Provide the link back to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods.
- Monitor delivery of capital investment in the designated cluster and make recommendations on the prioritisation of the parks capital programme.
- Review and comment on the events forward plan.
- Review park management plans and masterplan.
- Raise issues around maintenance of parks
- Provide a contract-monitoring role.

6.26 Partnership Parks will provide places where residents, Friends of Parks groups, ward councillors, key officers, events and project officers and contractors can hear feedback and take this on board. These meetings will take place no less than twice a year. This model will also ensure that the significant proportions of open spaces that do have an active friends group are not forgotten. This revised approach will enable resources to be pushed to the point of delivery and help safeguard services in our green spaces.

6.27 There will always be a mixture of small enterprises, social businesses, sports clubs, community groups and larger enterprises providing services in local parks. The priority for the council is to ensure delivery of the Culture 2020 priorities in a safe and legal manner, which does not compromise the Council’s values. Any proposal to manage a service in a park, which is directly commissioned by the council, must always remain in the public interest. The organisation charged with the responsibility for overseeing this public interest remains the council.

6.28 The policy, which the Council uses to discharge this responsibility, is called ‘Enabling Community Ownership and Management’. As well as requiring a well thought out business plan, the policy also requires interested parties to meet both an organisational and public interest test. This approach will be prioritised for those organisations that have already come forward through the Cooperative Parks policy. When contracts are being determined for individual parks or neighbourhood clusters there is an expectation that representatives from partnership parks, and local friends groups, will be engaged in the design and procurement of such contracts. The work schedule of any subsequent contract will also be published and all residents will be encouraged to help monitor works being carried out in accordance to the published schedule. This process cannot duly undermine any contract that has been procured in line with council policies.

Brockwell Hall as a Designated Project

6.29 Over the past decade Brockwell Park has been subject to a major redevelopment programme, which has witnessed significant improvements to its grounds, water play area and refurbishment of the Lido. The two remaining pieces of the jigsaw requiring attention are the sports infrastructure and Brockwell Hall, as well as an integrated management plan across all facilities (including the Lido). Sports infrastructure in parks is picked up under the Let’s Get Active section of this report. Brockwell Park Community Partners with the support of the council undertook a study into the future options and long term sustainability of Brockwell Hall in 2015.
6.30 This report recommends that £100,000 of capital is approved to support the preparation of a stage 1 Heritage Lottery application. The total value of a successful stage 2 application is expected to be in the region of £4m capital in 2018-19, which will require match funding of approximately £1.4m capital. It is too early to determine the revenue implications of the projects, although the notion must be revenue neutral to the council.

Skateboard Parks

6.31 Skateboarding has a long history in Lambeth. The council currently hosts 3 skate parks in Norwood Park, Kennington Park and Clapham Common, as well as a further facility at Stockwell. Whilst not a council facility the borough also hosts the famous skate park on the Southbank. The council recognises the rich sub culture the skating community brings to a neighbourhood, as well as the direct health and wellbeing benefits for those participating in skating.

6.32 We will adopt an approach, which will positively embrace and protect the important contribution skate parks bring to the boroughs culture, heritage, health and wellbeing. This plan will protect and maintain the 4 sites within the grounds maintenance contract for current and future generations.

6.33 The council will undertake technical appraisals of these sites to evaluate their state of repair. Skateboard groups active at these facilities will be offered the opportunity to inform the specification for these surveys prior to them being undertaken. Any resulting requirements for capital investment will be considered as part of the capital pipeline for the council to consider.

7. Priority 3: Let’s Get Active

7.1 Let’s get active is about regular physical activity and sport, including the use of local sport and leisure centres. During 2014 there were over 1.8 million visits to council owned leisure centres and 251,000 visits to sports playing pitches in local parks. Based on population trends and the needs assessment this demand will continue grow over the next 10 years.

Active Lambeth Plan

7.2 During the Culture 2020 consultation we shared information and sought input into the development of Active Lambeth, which also included indoor and outdoor sports facilities strategies which will oversee:

- Improved access to and participation in sport and physical activity for Lambeth residents.
- Development of a strong club/group network and wider partnerships to provide access to good quality and accessible sport and physical activity.
- Improvement in the management of all sports facilities in Lambeth.
- The priorisation of investment in those sports facilities that have potential to generate revenue and to best meet demand.

7.3 The Active Lambeth Plan (including indoor and outdoor facilities) can be found at appendix 5 and this report recommends agreement of the plan, which consists of 5 steps to physical activity and sport:
1. Identify those in need, working with the community and partners.
2. Define each individual's physical activity goals and barriers to participation.
3. Provide a physical activity and sports programme over 10 to 12 weeks to meet individual need.
4. Provide an exit route pathway for continued once per week participation, and become an Active Lambeth champion to inspire others.
5. Follow up with participants at 3, 6 and 12 months to evaluate success and individual needs to maintain once per week participation.

Lambeth Girls Can' Programme

7.4 The Council has secured a 3-year partnership project, partly funded by Sport England that will focus on 5,238 14 to 25 year old females, to increase participation and develop sustainable pathways for physical activity and sport, and including those currently inactive, in areas of low participation and high deprivation, and those at risk of preventable health conditions. The value of grant is £250,000 over 3 years. Female participation in physical activity and sport is known to decrease with age. Tackling the post 16 drop off in participation through a better understanding and the removal of barriers such as confidence and lack of time, will serve as a key outcome of the project.

7.5 We intend to use this project as the first in a programme of commissioned activity to 2020, as we implement our Active Lambeth approach to address community need, and scale up activity, which increases sustained once per week participation in physical activity and sport. We also plan to develop participation and outcomes monitoring tool with academic evaluation of the project will be undertaken with London South Bank University. We also proposed during the Culture 2020 consultation to work with Greenwich Leisure Limited and undertake a renegotiation of the existing leisure management. Following reflection on the consultation feedback and cultural budget this report recommends revision of the existing contract, which runs until 2022, are completed in 2016.

Revised Leisure Management Contract

7.6 The revised leisure management contract will be provided at no additional cost to the council and no change in the general specification. There will be an increased emphasis on income generation, whilst securing savings in contractual fees. Initial negotiations have been held and a framework has been agreed with GLL, which whilst subject to final agreement includes:

- Moving towards surplus generated through the contract being recycled to tackle the impact and prevent ill health through the Lambeth Cultural Trust.
- A dedicated proportion of income earmarked to fund the up-keep and modernisation of leisure facilities.
- The provision of 3 healthy living centres.
- A Sports Innovation Fund.
- An intervention programme targeting 100 Lambeth's residents who are considered to be most at risk from involvement in violent gangs, long term and high cost care and older residents considered at risk of social exclusion.
• The provision of discounts cards for those residents who are elderly, disabled, or on job seeker benefits.
• Payment of the London Living Wage for those employed under the agreement.

7.7 The revised agreement enables modest flexibility within the budget that was consulted on, although this does not change the overall financial bottom line of this report and the same level of savings is required.

Leisure Centres

7.8 We will continue to invest in our excellent leisure centre facilities. There are no proposed changes to Brixton Rec, Streatham and Ice Leisure Centre, West Norwood Healthy and Leisure Centre, Clapham Leisure Centre, Flaxman’s Sports Centre and Ferndale Recreation Centre. The council has earmarked £7m capital investment for Brixton Recreation Centre to maintain this important facility until a long-term plan has been secured for plant replacement and structural improvements by 2022.

Healthy Living Centres

7.9 During 2016-17 the revised leisure management contract will make provision for the creation of 3 healthy living centres, which will provide access to a community lounge where residents can access the neighbourhood library service, fee paying access to gymnasium equipment, physical activities provided by self employed trainers targeting priority Culture 2020 groups, and via GP referral, and where space permits room rentals for community groups, clubs and cultural enterprises. Healthy Living Centres will be located at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet Healthy Living Centre</td>
<td>Vassall Ward</td>
<td>52 Knatchbull Road, London SE5 9QY is within 1.1 miles of Brixton library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South Lambeth Healthy Living Centre (proposal)</td>
<td>Oval Ward</td>
<td>180 South Lambeth Road, Vauxhall, London SW8 1QP is 1.3 miles from Clapham library and 1.4 miles from Brixton library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Healthy Living Centre</td>
<td>Herne Hill Ward</td>
<td>118 Herne Hill Road, London, SE24 0AG is 1.1 miles from Brixton library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minet Healthy Living Centre

7.10 Minet Healthy Living Centre is located in the Vassall ward, which has a population of 15,600. It is the borough’s 7th most populated ward. 52% of the ward population is black and minority ethnic. 11,900 of the residents in Vassall are agreed between 16-64 years old. Local transport links include Loughborough Junction (0.5 mile), Brixton (0.9 mile), Denmark Hill, Stockwell and Oval (1 mile).

Tate South Lambeth Healthy Living Centre (Proposal)
7.11 Tate South Lambeth Healthy Living Centre is located in the Oval ward servicing the community of Stockwell. Oval ward is the 4th most populated ward in the borough. Of the 16,600 residents 13,150 are aged between 16-64. 36% of the population comes from black and minority ethnic backgrounds with a large Portuguese speaking community. Local transport links include Stockwell (0.5 mile) and Vauxhall (0.7 mile).

Carnegie Healthy Living Centre

7.12 Carnegie Healthy Living Centre is located in the Herne Hill ward with a population of 15,600 it is the borough’s 7th most populated ward. 39% of residents come from a black and minority ethnic background. Of the 15,600 residents 11,450 are aged between 16-64 years old. Local transport links are Loughborough Junction (0.5 mile), North Dulwich (0.6 mile), Demark Hill (0.7 mile) and East Dulwich (1 mile).

7.13 Between October 2015 and January 2016 floor plans will be prepared, which will be signed off by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods. Once layout and business cases have been agreed the buildings will be closed from April 2016 for refitting and modification and reopened by January 2017. The plan is to simultaneous programme the work across all 3 healthy living centres. Following Cabinet approval of the healthy living centres proposal a joint GLL/LBL project team will be in place October 2015, which will report to the Lambeth Cultural Board.

Sports Facilities in Parks and Open Spaces

7.14 Once these Healthy Living Centres are operational the priority of the Lambeth Cultural Board will be to undertake a series of option appraisals to test out the feasibility of attracting capital investment into the sports facilities located in public parks and open spaces, as well as improving their day to day management to ensure income is being maximised. As part of the £1m transitional contribution £200,000 in 2016-17 and £200,000 in 2017-18 is provided to underpin the parks and open spaces grounds maintenance contract towards the up keep of the sports and physical activity in parks and open spaces.

Statutory Planning

7.15 The proposals in the Culture 2020 strategy are considered to be in alignment with the Council’s Local Plan. A number of the proposals will require planning applications to be in relation to specific sites and the Planning Service will work with the relevant service providers to provide advice to ensure that these applications are made in line with the proposed timelines for implementation. Some of the proposals to ensure that there is greater income generation from parks will also require planning permission either temporary or permanent in nature. Dialogue will continue between the services in respect of this matter.

Brockwell Lido

7.16 There are no changes proposed to the current management arrangements at Brockwell Lido. Upon renewal of the lease agreement in 2033 the council will secure increased
integration of the lido facility within the wider sports, leisure and cultural offer across the whole footprint of Brockwell Park.

8. **Priority 4: Be inspired**

8.1 Be inspired is about creating more opportunities to participate in and enjoy theatre, performing arts and music. This section gives an overview of some of the activities the council will be involved into to support the arts and music, but is not exhaustive of the full range of investment and future involvement. The borough’s flagship Southbank quarter, which is home to the likes of the Southbank Centre, Old Vic, National Theatre, Young Vic, Rambert Dance Company, etc. is integral to securing our cultural prosperity. The Southbank cultural quarter not only provides a national and international stage for the borough, but also generates substantial benefits to Lambeth’s local economy.

8.2 How we harness the cultural powerhouse of the Southbank for the whole borough will require sensitive formation of policies, investment and collaboration. During the Culture 2020 consultation we heard from our partners on the Southbank around how the council could support the continued cultural growth of the area. This did not always come down to money, but a requirement of the council to:

- Improve how policies on planning, the environment and licensing are better coordinated locally.
- Make access to its buildings and open spaces more flexible for artists to test out new performance, rehearse, or provide a home for a fledgling creative enterprise.

8.3 We recognise that our partners on the Southbank have forged links with local schools over the years. The challenge is to develop this approach further to include our smaller cultural enterprises, groups and clubs who maybe struggling to reach their full potential, especially in the South of the Borough.

8.4 It is these smaller cultural groups, clubs and enterprises where the young aspiring talent of the future is often found. How we work together to nurture and provide safe spaces for these fledgling enterprises to grow and reach their full potential will be critical for the delivery of Culture 2020. Our ambition is to secure the whole of Lambeth as a major culture player and recognised for developing performance arts and creative enterprises, as well as a destination for audiences. We will achieve this by:

a) Working with our Southbank quarter colleagues to consolidate and help grow their role locally and in turn strengthen their position on the national and international stage.

b) Invest one off council capital to secure external investment in our cultural infrastructure.

c) Where appropriate utilise development agreements through the likes of the Community Infrastructure Levy to improve the borough’s cultural facilities.

d) Create more spaces where cultural enterprises, performers, artists and audiences can grow in our library buildings, leisure centres, parks and open spaces, etc.

*Cultural Services Task and Finish Group*
8.5 We will offer to set up a task and finish group Lambeth based creative industries, which will explore how the council can further enable and support the continued growth of the cultural sector in Lambeth. The council will be represented on this task and finish by:

- The Leader of the council
- Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
- The Chief Executive
- Further officers on a needs basis

8.6 A range of creative industries, chair of the friends of parks, etc. will be asked to nominate members to the group, which will meet no more than 4 times over the next 6-8 months. This will not be a standing group and is not intended to replicate existing structures in the area. The purpose of the task and finish group will be produce a brief report on the issues that may restrict, or enable the continued growth of the major cultural enterprises and their continued benefit to Lambeth as a whole.

**Old Vic**

8.7 The proposed contribution in this report will support The Old Vic Capital Campaign thereby guaranteeing the sustainability of The Old Vic’s education programming and work on the stage, providing wider community benefits for the Lambeth residents. In addition the Old Vic will provide Lambeth with a tailored Stage Business programme that will offer young people opportunities to explore the so-called ‘soft’ skills required to appeal to employers: communication, confidence and leadership. Using theatre techniques, students will develop the transferable skills required for today’s competitive job market, whether that’s in the theatre or elsewhere. Industry professionals have inspired the programme. Young people will learn practical skills in presentation, communication and leadership, supported by an online programme of learning.

8.8 More specifically Stage Business is designed to focus on the skills that theatre creative brings to their work, which can then be applied to everyday living. The very best of Theatre facilitation involves imagination, spontaneity, energy, resilience and courage. These are some of the key skills that will be developed and explored, which will, in turn, improve confidence, communication skills, flexibility, leadership and teamwork.

8.9 This report provides a one off £300,000 contribution in capital funding to support the Old Vic’s £30m campaign for the restoration of their grade II listed building. This programme aims to ensure the building is fit for purpose as a 21st Century theatre, which create a more accessible, safe and interesting space for local residents that will provide new facilities for learning programmes, study space and free Wi-Fi access as part of integrating these activities into the daily life of the theatre. This contribution recognises the importance of the Old Vic as an historical, listed building on a Lambeth, London, national and International stage.

**Ovalhouse**

8.10 The Oval House Theatre will continue to be supported with its move into a purpose built new theatre building in Brixton, which is part of the regeneration programme for Somerleyton Road. The theatre will be accessible to the whole community and aims to
put arts and culture at the heart of the social regeneration of Brixton. The new building will provide theatre spaces and studios for youth theatre, rehearsals, training events and community use. Providing support for this programme will help Ovalhouse’s sustainability and ensure the organisation is in a strong position to continue to provide a high quality arts offer for the local community. Acting as a creative hub, offering workspace and office space to a wide range of artists and creative enterprises.

The South London Theatre

8.11 The South London Theatre has been a part of the cultural offer in West Norwood since the 1960s. The South London Theatre Building Preservation Trust is about to undertake a capital programme to renovate the grade II listed Old Fire Station building they occupy in West Norwood. The Council owns the freehold of the building. This report recommends the provision of a loan facility of up to £250,000 to the South London Theatre in support of their fundraising programme. The loan will be paid back over an agreed period of time. Providing this loan will enable the project to obtain £2m through the likes of the Heritage Lottery Fund.

8.12 This will result in a refurbished heritage asset that would further enhance the value of the building, which is in a poor state and will bring a community asset into better use. The project will safeguard this community theatre for both adults and young people, widening access to the theatre for new audiences, volunteers and open up the building during daytime to create a safe and interesting space that young people can access.

Streatham Community-led Theatre Provision

8.13 The council aims to encourage the sustainable development of the new purpose built theatre space in Streatham by offering advice to the developer of the Streatham Megabowl site. This will require helping interested parties in finding a suitable company to take on the shaping and management of the space to encourage the creation of a flexible and viable arts offer for the area.

The 198 Contemporary Arts and Learning

8.14 The council has agreed to the freehold sale of the property occupied by 198 Contemporary Arts & Learning in Herne Hill to the organisation at a premium of £75,000, under the Council’s Enabling Community Ownership and Management policy. The aim in agreeing this sale at less than best consideration was to support the long-term sustainability of the organisation and secure the long term future of the building for cultural use and the benefit of the local community.

8.15 In return, the organisation will provide a safe and interesting space that gives residents the opportunity to access the arts and engage in cultural activities as well as provide opportunities for young people to access jobs within creative and cultural industries, through apprenticeships, work based placements, training and mentoring programmes; for a period of 5 years.

9. Priority 5: Showing off
Showing off is about providing more opportunities to enjoy art, or if you’re an artist, access to show off your work in archives, galleries and museums, whilst celebrating Lambeth’s cultural history. Lambeth has a rich cultural heritage, that includes Lambeth Royal Doulton pottery factories in Vauxhall, artist and poet William Blake lived in Lambeth, Charlie Chaplin spent his formative years in the borough and Vincent Van Gogh spent time here. Whilst Brixton Academy continues to be one of the best musical venues in the country and Lambeth has an incredible, diverse musical history. The Windrush generation that first started to arrive in Lambeth in 1948 infused the borough with the music of the Caribbean that continues to influence the music of today.

Over the last few years the Council has invested, enabled and facilitated several projects of historical significance, Black Cultural Archives, 2010 refurbishment of Brixton Windmill, Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens, and Refurbishment of Streatham Library. With the increased pressure on revenue the council is seeking to use it asset base, capital and enabling capacity to safeguard and enhance our heritage and put assets on a sustainable future.

**Garden Museum**

The Garden Museum are about to undertake a £6.6m capital programme to restore, upgrade and extend their museum based in St Mary’s Church, which is Lambeth’s second most ancient structure. The works being proposed will safeguard this landmark and enable the Museum to continue as an independent self-sustaining venture. This report recommends a one off capital grant of £300,000 towards the overall capital costs for the project. Once complete the new facilities will open up new spaces, doubling the amount of room for their collection. It will create a new publically accessible learning and study spaces, enable the organisation to ensure its sustainability, grow and deliver a more effective cultural offer to the community, including the provision of safe and inspiring spaces for Lambeth residents.

**Black Cultural Archives**

We are currently in positive discussions with the trustees of Black Cultural Archives concerning how the council will support this incredible important culture asset into the future and beyond our initial agreement. The council will continue to provide support to BCA subject to the outcome of these discussions. During the Culture 2020 consultation we shared finance information, which profiled the removal of revenue support to Black Culture Archives (BCA) by 2017/18.

This profile reflected a funding agreement reached with BCA in 2012 to support the stability of the project through its initial launch. We recognise that the economic environment has changed considerably since the original support was agreed between the council, BCA and the Heritage Lottery Fund.

As a consequence of the Culture 2020 consultation Greenwich Leisure Limited have stepped forward to offer BCA a sponsorship deal worth in the region £100k pa, which will include £50,000 revenue and £50,000 in-kind technical support. The council intends to continue support the BCA with their business plan and is committed to securing the project for future generations.

**Borough Archives**
This report recommends that an options appraisal into the long term home for the borough archives, which are currently located in the basement of the Minet library. These options will include, whilst not exhaustive:

1. Brixton more generally.
2. A split site arrangement with front of house to the service maintaining high use stock and bulk archive stock situated elsewhere. This option might include maintaining storage at Minet library as part of the redevelopment of the site.
3. Any other option that has the capacity to fulfil the criteria in para 9.12

Interested parties are invited to submit options they would like the council to consider as part of the options appraisal by January 2016. The council will publish the draft terms of reference for the options appraisal prior to commissioning the work, as well as sharing the findings of the work prior to formalising recommendations for the council to consider.

The Culture 2020 consultation proposed the relocation of the archives to Brixton Library and to work more closely with Black Cultural Archives. This would then establish Brixton as the key destination in the borough for anyone interested in archives and information on heritage. In response to this proposal, UNISON is seeking reassurance that the future of the archives would be planned with care. They believe the suggested location, Brixton Library that is already full at times, cannot accommodate another service without severe reductions in the library service. They also believe that there is no possibility of co-working with the Black Cultural Archives because it is a national service, differently funded and with a completely different remit. UNISON recognise that providing British Standard storage conditions for archives is expensive, and must be properly planned and that any proposal that falls back on an 'out of borough storage and front of house provision' solution would not be acceptable to them.

The Lambeth Local History Forum (LLHF) is a forum of civic and amenity societies, friends groups, museums and archives from across the borough which have an active interest in local history. As part of the Culture 2020 consultation LLHF pressed the council to not only fulfil its statutory duty to preserve and make available certain documents relating to the borough, but to pursue a moral duty to posterity and preserve (and, indeed, add to) the extensive archive which it holds beyond the minimum statutory requirement.

The LLHF also believe that Brixton Library does not provide adequate space and, even if it had, there is no prospect of rendering the Victorian accommodation compliant with current standards in the timescale envisaged in Culture 2020. LLHF are not aware of any other location in the borough that could be made “compliant with current standards” in the timescale. They are not opposed in principle to the relocation of the archives from its current home provided this is done with sufficient time and resources made available to meet the agreed criteria. The LLHF would be willing to constructively engage with the council to seek a way forward and are offering their considerable expertise and experience. This report does not recommend a reduction in the revenue budget for the provision of the borough archives.

It is generally recognised that the present location for the borough archives, the basement of Minet library, is not fit for purpose. Following reflection on the consultation feedback this
report recommends that an options appraisal be undertaken on a wider range of options concerning the future of the borough archives. The council rejects the notion that stronger working links cannot be developed between the borough archive and BCA such as sharing resources and expertise without requiring full integration. The council is very aware of the unique status of BCA given the financial and technical support offered to the project from its humble origins to the project opening its purpose built facilities on Windrush Square, Brixton.

9.13 The council notes the concerns about the archives being located at Brixton Library, but without objective, technical and financial appraisal it must at this stage remain an option for consideration. We agree that this issue needs to be managed carefully and that a wider range of options made available to consider. This report recommends that options appraisal on the future location of the borough archives is be undertaken and completed no later than September 2016. All options to be considered must:

- be affordable both in terms of the capital and revenue required of the council to maintain both service and facilities;
- improve accessibility;
- utilise new technologies;
- maximise income generation;
- provide a destination where people can access the service, discover and learn about local identity and heritage; and,
- meet the necessary standards for archive storage.

West Norwood Cemetery
9.14 The council has been leading on the preparation of a Stage 1 Heritage Lottery Bid for the cemetery, alongside the Scheme of Management for the Cemetery and the Friends of West Norwood Cemetery.

Heritage Strategy
9.15 The council aims to develop and publish by April 2016 Lambeth’s first Heritage Strategy that will create an overview of priorities and projects, which protect and enhance the borough’s heritage.

10. Priority 6: The Bigger Picture
10.1 The Bigger Picture is about working with partners to secure a cinema in Lambeth’s five town centres and the chance to learn more about the art of cinema and filmmaking. The council is very much a facilitator in regards to this priority rather than a revenue investor.

West Norwood Cinema
10.2 The planning application for West Norwood Cinema has now been submitted for consideration. In the meantime negotiations are on-going with Picturehouse, who are the private sector partner with regards to the scheme. Whilst parties have come to a working agreement on the overall costs for the project, agreement has not been reached at this point on the apportionment of capital costs. This report makes available the necessary investment for the council to meet its contribution in the delivery of the overall scheme.

11. Endowment Fund
11.1 The Culture 2020 consultation proposed the establishment of a £10m endowment with the aim of funding a dedicated Lambeth Community Library Fund, which would then provide a revenue stream in perpetuity. The original concept required the utilisation of capital receipts resulting from the sale of Minet and Waterloo library sites, which would help create the financial capacity for the council to part, fund the establishment of the endowment.

11.2 The balance of the required investment needed to help create the financial capacity for the council to establish the endowment fund was to be generated through the second phase of the Community Asset Management Plan, which was agreed by Cabinet in July 2012. The first phase of this plan has to date generated £11.3m of capital receipts of which £7m was earmarked for the library buildings improvement programme and £6m has so far been allocated.

11.3 Following reflection on the consultation feedback, the recommendation not to dispose of the Minet library site, the establishment of healthy living centres and the delay in disposing of the Waterloo library site the original proposal for the endowment is no longer fully financially viable by April 2016.

11.4 This report still recommends the establishment of a £10m endowment in partnership with the London Community Foundation, but with a broader remit and the incremental building up of the £10m endowment fund by 2019. This approach will involve the council match funding investment with other sources, which will allow a phased allocation of smaller awards to start from April 2016-17.

The Lambeth Community Fund

11.5 The report recommends the council work in partnership with the London Community Foundation to further develop the Lambeth Community Fund and secure a £10m endowment to underpin the fund by 2019-20. Allocations from the fund will be distributed through a flexible grant-making programme, which will be reviewed every 5 years with the initial priority theme being healthier for longer.

11.6 The Council will be invited to nominate a member to the panel, which make awards from the Lambeth Community Fund and the senior officer champion of the Lambeth Community fund within the council will be the Chief Executive.

11.7 The value of the current endowment, which is held and managed by London Community Foundation, is approximately £3.8m. We aim to bridge the £6.2m gap in the endowment by 2019-20 through the following sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Council Community Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>£1.5m</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£1.5m</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lambeth based public sector partners</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0.5m</td>
<td>£1.5m</td>
<td>£1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate contributions</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0.1k</td>
<td>£0.1k</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.8 This financial profile will enable the following priorities to be supported by the Lambeth Community Fund in 2016/17 and 17/18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small grants to support literacy and the love of reading through the likes of parent and toddler groups for example, which targets the Culture 2020 priority neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning the Upper Norwood Joint Library Trust to provide an accessible community hub.</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis volunteer literacy outreach programme</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small grants to support community growing and gardening projects in Lambeth’s parks and open spaces.</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Finance

12.1 This report proposes that the Council explore the potential development of a not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust which would be tasked with driving the Culture 2020 framework forward. Such a trust would be a social enterprise with charitable registration. The creation of such a Trust could potentially enable funds generated through the operation of the council’s high quality leisure facilities to be recycled to support further improvement in other cultural services provided and supported by the trust.

12.2 It could also bring together a cross sector of agencies with the investment capacity to help address the needs identified within this report, which the council could not do alone. A Trust with charitable status might also be able to take advantage of tax exemptions and efficiencies not available to the Council. However, the model involves financial risk and the council will need to think carefully about the respective powers, responsibilities and financial accountabilities inherent in any arrangements proposed.

12.3 GLL are contracted to provide the management of the borough’s 6 leisure centres and booking arrangements for sports facilities in parks until 2022, which both parties have agreed to review in 2016, rather than 2017 as originally planned. As a first stage, it is proposed that a Lambeth Cultural Board will be established by early 2016 within the GLL business governance. The board (and subsequently the Trust if constituted) will be leased three buildings on a 25-year peppercorn rent with a break clause in 2022. These 3 sites will be converted into Healthy Living Centres that will also host a neighbourhood library service, providing an integrated wellbeing offer, which is planned to be cost neutral to the council.

12.4 During the initial transitional period for the centres, GLL have agreed that £1m of council revenue resource that is currently earmarked to support the provision of leisure services can be switched to underpin the initial development of the centres. They have also committed to maintaining a budgeted profit share to supplement this. It is recommended that an earmarked reserve is set up to hold these contributions.

12.5 In addition, GLL have agreed with the council to apply £1m of the shared Development Pot capital balance towards the fit out of the healthy living centres.
In the event that the budgeted profit share in 2015/16 could not be realised, additional monies could potentially be released from the Development Pot residual balance to make up any shortfall; however, this would mean that these monies would not then be available for investment in the leisure estate. Given the level of resource GLL will be investing in this proposal there will be a risk of exit costs under the leisure management contract if the council decides not to progress the proposal for the healthy living centres without mutual consent. The proposed costs of the new service arrangements as set out in the report are planned to be funded through a combination of future residual Cultural Services revenue budgets and the Cooperative Investment Fund together with capital contributions including s106 funding and Performance Reward Grant as follows:

Projected Revenue Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1: Safe and Interesting Spaces</th>
<th>Projected Revenue Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 5 town centre libraries at Brixton, Durning, West Norwood, Streatham and Clapham.</td>
<td>£2.137m</td>
<td>£2.137m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 5 neighbourhood libraries at Waterloo, Minet, Tate South, Carnegie and Upper Norwood.</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home delivery and stock management systems.</td>
<td>£1m</td>
<td>£1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue costs for priority 1: Safe and Interesting Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>£3.237m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£3.237m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 2: The Great Outdoors</th>
<th>Projected Revenue Budget</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>£1.1m</td>
<td>£1.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Tree Maintenance</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks staffing</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue costs for priority 2: The Great Outdoors</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.1m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.1m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 3: Lets Get Active</th>
<th>Projected Revenue Budget</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure management contract fee</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Sports Team and Youth Games</td>
<td>£375,000</td>
<td>£375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, repairs, insurance and ancillary costs for the sports infrastructure.</td>
<td>£478,000</td>
<td>£478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue costs for priority 3: Lets Get Active</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1.253m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1.253m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 4: Be Inspired</th>
<th>Projected Revenue Budget</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts development</td>
<td>£65,000</td>
<td>£65,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1: Safe and Interesting Spaces</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue costs</td>
<td>£3.237m</td>
<td>£3.237m</td>
<td>Lambeth revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 2: The great outdoors</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue costs</td>
<td>£2.1m</td>
<td>£2.1m</td>
<td>Lambeth revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 3: Let's Get Active</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue costs</td>
<td>£1.253m</td>
<td>£1.253m</td>
<td>Lambeth revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 4: Be Inspired</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue costs</td>
<td>£65,000</td>
<td>£65,000</td>
<td>Lambeth revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 5: Showing Off</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue costs</td>
<td>£405,000</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>Lambeth revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>£7.060m</td>
<td>£6.845m</td>
<td>Total Costs £13.905m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTED FUNDING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Revenue budget including GLL Surplus Share 2015/16</td>
<td>£6.683m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative Investment Fund</td>
<td>£385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£7.068m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Capital Costs:**

12.8 The community asset management plan was adopted in 2012. Phase 1 of the plan had an initial target of £7m, which was achieved in 2013/2014 and enabled improvements to library buildings. There was also an additional target to contribute £4m to the council's capital pot, which has been achieved in 2015/16. This report reporfiles the balance of capital from phase 1 of the community asset management plan (£4.182m) and requests a supplementary allocation of £4.5m from the expected receipts from the next phase of the plan.

**Parks Investment**

12.9 A £20m parks capital investment programme was approved by Cabinet in January 2015 and this report instigates phase 1 of this investment to the tune of £3.8m. This comprises £2.03m of the council's planned £9m investment together with £905k s106 contributions and £950k external investment.

Angell Town & Brixton Domio Club
12.10 £1m has been earmarked by Lambeth First via the Performance Reward Grant for work on the Angell Town Estate and Brixton Domino Club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1: Safe and interesting spaces</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Additional Investment attracted via partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood library (Nettlefold construction).</td>
<td>£2m</td>
<td>£1m</td>
<td>Subject to final scheme and apportionment. £1m already approved by Cabinet 17.12.12. Balance to come from phase 2 community asset management plan.</td>
<td>£3m from private sector for development of commercial cinema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning library improvements.</td>
<td>£600,000</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>None. Wholly council funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit out of 4 neighbourhood libraries</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>None wholly council funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Norwood Joint Library building improvements in advance of lease.</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12.</td>
<td>Anticipate £100k match funding from Croydon Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oasis Centre contribution to construction and fit out.</td>
<td>£45,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>£3m development of the Oasis centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angell Town Enterprise Zone and Community Facilities</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
<td>Lambeth First (Performance Reward Grant)</td>
<td>£150,000 from corporate sponsorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Domino Club improvement plan</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>Lambeth First (Performance Reward Grant)</td>
<td>£150,000 from corporate sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total capital budget for priority 1: Safe and interesting spaces</td>
<td>£3.255m</td>
<td>£1.850m</td>
<td>Sub total additional investment secured by partners</td>
<td>£6.4m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 2: The Great Outdoors</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Additional Investment attracted via partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 of a £9m Parks capital investment programme from the council until 2018.</td>
<td>£1.03m</td>
<td>£1m</td>
<td>Earmarked on Lambeth Capital Pipeline; to be funded from capital receipts</td>
<td>External grants, Section106/CIL £1.855m. Phase 2 of the programme will be prepared during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1: Brockwell Hall redevelopment</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>£2.6m from Heritage Lottery Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food growing in parks fund</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>None. Wholly funded by Lambeth Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total capital budget for priority 2: The great outdoors</td>
<td>£1.13m</td>
<td>£1.1m</td>
<td>Sub total additional investment secured by partners</td>
<td>£4.455m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3: Lets Get Active</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Additional Investment attracted via partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refit of Tate South, Minet and Carnegie libraries into healthy living centres.</td>
<td>£2m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>£1m from Greenwich Leisure Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total capital budget for priority 3: Lets get active</td>
<td>£2m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sub total additional investment secured by partners</td>
<td>£1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4: Be Inspired</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Additional Investment attracted via partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old Vic Theatre</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>£25m by 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Theatre</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total capital budget for priority 4: Be inspired</td>
<td>£550,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sub total additional investment secured by partners</td>
<td>£25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 5: Showing Off</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Additional Investment attracted via partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Museum</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>£4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Windmill feasibility study</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reprofiled capital approved by Cabinet 17.12.12</td>
<td>Not known at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total capital budget for priority 5: Showing Off</td>
<td>£330,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sub total additional investment secured by partners</td>
<td>£4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6: The Big Picture</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Additional Investment attracted via partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of commercial cinema</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£3m private sector contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and café at the Nettlefold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub total</th>
<th>£0</th>
<th>£0</th>
<th>Sub total additional investment secured by partners</th>
<th>£3m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endowment</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Additional Investment attracted via partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial investment into the Lambeth Community Fund</td>
<td>£1.5m</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Community Asset Management Plan to enable release of resources from the capital reserve. Second instalment due of £1.5m in 2018-19 and pending delivery of next phase of the community asset management plan</td>
<td>£3.8m The London Community Foundation. £200k corporate donations. £3m other public sector partners by 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub total initial contribution to Lambeth Community Fund | £1.5m | N/A | Sub total additional investment secured by partners | £7m |
| Totals | £8.765m | £2.950m | Totals | £50.855m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total value of capital investment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional investment secured by partners</td>
<td>£50.855m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital investment from council</td>
<td>£11.715m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of capital investment</td>
<td>£62.570m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **Legal and Democracy**

13.1 The principles for lawful consultation are referred to in this report. Members are required to take consultation responses fully into account in deciding whether to agree to the matters referred to in this report. The responses to the consultation are summarised in the consultation report attached to this report. The ‘Gunning Principles’, which are set out at paragraph 3, specify that ‘where consultation is embarked upon it must be carried out fairly’. There is extensive case law on these points. Further guidance on meaningful consultation has been given in the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of R (on the application of Moseley v London Borough of Haringey) [2014] UKSC 56.

13.2 Where there is a duty to consult imposed by statute, then in addition to the common law duty set out at 3 above, there is an additional duty to ensure proper public participation in the local authority’s decision-making process. Meaningful participation in these circumstances required that those consulted be provided with an outline of any realistic
alternatives. In the absence of a specific statutory provision, reference to alternative options will be required where this is necessary in order for the consultees to express meaningful views on the proposals.

13.3 The recent decision in the case of R (Robson) v Salford City Council [2015] EWCA Civ 6 clarifies that the requirements for a lawful consultation vary according to the particular circumstances of the proposal under consideration but the general principals of fairness must be applied. The Council’s obligations under section 7 of the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 are referred to in section 5 Priority 1: Safe and Interesting Spaces of this report. The Council has obtained external legal advice from a QC on the specific requirement under Section 7 for provision that is ‘comprehensive’.

13.4 It is believed that the proposed restructured library service would amount to provision which accords with those obligations. Members should note that whilst the restructuring of the library service forms part of changes to a number of cultural and recreational services in Culture 2020, the duty under the 1964 Act is stand alone, and the Council must provide a library service which complies with the 1964 Act regardless of other cultural and recreational provision.

13.5 Due consideration has been given to the proposed changes at Tate South Lambeth and Durning leading to a further 4 week consultation commencing in November 2015. Section 19 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 contains wide powers enabling local authorities to provide within or outside their locality, such recreational facilities as they think fit. This section includes a useful and non-exhaustive list of permitted provision including buildings, equipment, supplies and assistance of any kind, premises for clubs and societies with athletic, social or recreational objects, staff, instructors and appropriate facilities in support of recreational facilities, whether for payment or otherwise.

13.6 Furthermore, local authorities may also award grants or loans towards any expenses incurred by voluntary organisations providing such recreational facilities, however such bodies must be not-for-profit entities. These powers are supplemented by Sections 144 and 145 Local Government Act 1972, empowering local authorities to provide such facilities as conference venues, exhibition fairs etc. with a view to encouraging visitors and the provision of entertainment respectively.

13.7 Any proposed changes or variations to existing contractual arrangements also need to comply with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and specific proposals as developed will need to be considered and will need to form the subject of a separate report. Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in taking the decision about whether to restructure the library service, the Council must have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination against people with protected characteristics;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and,
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
13.8 The equality impact assessment attached to this report gives information on the effect of the library proposals on people with various protected characteristics.

13.9 Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that a council can dispose of any land held by them in any manner they wish, subject to the limitation that the Council can not dispose of the land at less than the best consideration that can reasonably be obtained, without the consent of the Secretary of State.

13.10 The council may not dispose of any land consisting or forming part of an open space unless before disposing of the land they cause notice of their intention to do so, specifying the land in question, to be advertised in two consecutive weeks in a newspaper circulating in the area in which the land is situated, and consider any objections to the proposed disposal which may be made.

13.11 The Secretary of State has issued Circular 06/03: Local Government Act 1972 general disposal consent (England) 2003 disposal of land for less than the best consideration that can reasonably be obtained. The terms of the Consent mean that specific consent is not required for the disposal of any interest in land which the Council considers will help it to secure the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of its area, subject to the condition that the undervalue does not exceed £2,000,000.

13.12 When disposing of land at less than best consideration the Council is providing a subsidy to the owner and/or the occupier of the land and property, depending on the nature of the development. Where this occurs the Council must ensure that the nature and amount of subsidy complies with the state aid rules, particularly if there is no element of competition in the sale process. Failure to comply with the rules means that the aid may be unlawful, and may result in the benefit being recovered with interest from the recipient.

13.13 When deciding whether to adopt the recommendations of this report, members will be exercising a discretion within the constraints of the duties referred to above and should therefore have in mind the following principles of administrative law:-

- A decision must be within the Council's powers;
- All relevant information and consideration, including the Council's fiduciary duty to the Council Tax payer, must be taken into account; and,
- All irrelevant considerations, including unauthorised purposes, must be ignored.

13.14 In declaring a decision unlawful because it is unreasonable, the Courts would need to decide that the decision is so outrageous in its defiance of logic or accepted moral standards it is a decision that no sensible authority which had applied its mind to the decision could have arrived at it.
13.15 This proposed key decision was entered in the Forward Plan on 17 April 2015, having subsumed a previous edition of estate regeneration reports, and the necessary 28 clear days’ notice has been given. In addition, the Council’s Constitution requires the report to be published on the website for five clear days before the proposed decision is approved by the Cabinet Member. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the decision-maker before the decision is taken. A further period of five clear days - the call-in period – must then elapse before the decision is enacted. If the decision is called-in during this period, it cannot be enacted until the call-in has been considered and resolved.

14. Consultation and co-production
14.1 Consultation report is attached as an appendix 1 and extensively referenced throughout the report.

15. Risk management
15.1 A risk register was published at the start of the consultation and has been maintained throughout the consultation period. This has been updated throughout the development of Culture 2020.

16. Equalities impact assessment
16.1 Two equality impact assessments have been undertaken and are attached to this report. Given the statutory responsibilities placed on the council a separate equality impact assessment was undertaken on the library service.

17. Community safety
17.1 The 1998 Act, imposes a general duty on the Council: in the “exercise of its various functions to have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all it reasonably can to prevent crime, disorder and substance misuse in its area.”

17.2 The aim of Section 17 is therefore to provide an effective vehicle for mainstreaming crime and disorder considerations throughout the decision making of local authorities (and the other agencies involved in local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships). The duty is not absolute, but is one of a number of possible factors that the Council must “have regard to” when making its decisions.

17.3 The 2013 profile of crime & anti social behaviour data in Parks & Open Spaces identifies hotspots as Clapham Common, Kennington, Brockwell Park, Vauxhall Pleasure Gdns, For anti social behaviour it was Ruskin, Loughborough and to a lesser extent Archbishops and Tivoli. The night locking proposals therefore seem to cover the top hotspots in 2013 with the exception of Norwood Park, which will need to be monitored if the council decides to withdraw this service.
17.4 To ensure the council has due regard risk assessments of each park will be required to be undertaken before ceasing night locking and then monitoring will need to be carried out whether there is any increase in community safety concerns.

17.5 When designing schemes and improvements to the boroughs cultural infrastructure consideration will be given to design out crime principals in the redesign of all public spaces and there may be some beneficial consequences for crime and disorder in the borough given the extension of positive activities that may deter people away from criminal activity and provide beneficial outcomes for community safety.

18. **Organisational implications**

**Environmental**

18.1 The revised specification for the grounds maintenance contract for parks and open spaces will enable the council to maintain its statutory responsibility for these spaces, although there will be a notable reduction in some activity. This is reflected in the specification.

**Staffing and accommodation**

18.2 Whilst business cases need to be developed it is reasonable to assume that given the level of cuts in revenue this will lead to a reduction of approximately 25% of the current workforce.

**Procurement**

18.3 The options for the grounds maintenance contract for parks and open spaces are currently being assessed. The preferred option will follow the council’s procurement process. There are no further procurement issues as a result of this report.

**Health**

18.4 A health impact assessment has been undertaken on the consultation proposals and can be obtained at appendix 2.

**Timetable for implementation**

- Cabinet agree recommendations October 2015
- Lambeth Cultural Board established in early 2016
- New service starts to introduced by April 2016
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Part 1: Executive summary

Between Friday 30 January 2015 and Friday 24 April 2015, we consulted on the ‘Future of Cultural Services by 2020’ in Lambeth. The consultation covered the following service areas:

- Libraries and archives
- Parks and open spaces
- Sport and leisure
- Arts

Within the context of a 40% reduction to the cultural services budget we sought to understand the priorities of local people, as well as their feelings about income generation (for instance events in parks) and alternative management models (like community libraries). In addition to broad priorities we also sought views in relation to some very specific proposals. These proposals had been developed through coproduction and conversations which have taken place over the last two years.  

In addition to standard open consultation methods and meetings we also proactively sought the views of those less likely to respond to self-completion questionnaires. The consultation was broad and comprehensive to reflect the views of all of Lambeth’s citizens. It included:

- 1,648 self-completion questionnaires
- 207 written responses
- 513 representative on-street surveys
- 451 surveys completed by young people
- Seven public events attended by over 200 people
- 9 focus groups with particular equalities groups
- 13 other meetings

The scale of the response demonstrates the level of public interest and passion about Lambeth’s cultural services. In the main people were broadly positive about the vision and all the proposals set out as part of the consultation, with the exception of the libraries proposals which were more likely to be opposed than supported. In addition to the consultation methods described above there were:

- 1,806 signatories on petition to Save Lambeth Libraries
- 1,331 signatories on a petition to save Upper Norwood Library and
- around 1,750 postcards which originated from Friends of Lambeth Libraries and Friends of Durning Library.

The first part of the report presents the summary findings across the consultation. More detailed reports are included in Part 2 which sets out the specific findings from each element of the consultation.

1. Key findings

1.1 Overarching

---

1 For a detailed description of why particular proposals were put forward and others were discounted prior to consultation please see the Culture Options Appraisal [http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/lambeth-culture-2020-options-appraisal.pdf](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/lambeth-culture-2020-options-appraisal.pdf)

2 See Section 3 for further information about participants and Section 4 for demographic breakdowns. The reports by consultation method in Part 2 also have detailed information about participation
The proposals put forward in the consultation were set within the context of trying to achieve the council’s ambition that by 2020:

- No matter where you live in Lambeth you’ll be within 20 minutes average walking time from affordable activities which will improve your health and wellbeing.
- 85% of Lambeth’s population take part in regular cultural, sports and physical activities.
- All residents have access to a range of affordable, excellent facilities for cultural affordable, excellent facilities for cultural, sports and physical activities.

Of these, people were most supportive of having affordable activities within a 20 minute walk of their home (92% of on-street survey respondents and 87% of questionnaire respondents feel this is important).

When asked which of the six cultural services themes are most important to them, questionnaire and on-street survey respondents prioritise the same three themes: ‘safe and interesting spaces’ (libraries and community buildings), ‘the great outdoors’ (parks and open spaces) and ‘let’s get active’ (physical activity, sports and leisure centres). Of lower priority were ‘Be inspired’, ‘the bigger picture’ and ‘showing off’ (art, performing arts and theatre, cinema and heritage).

Almost half of the written responses concerned libraries, with the next highest focus being on parks followed by the proposals for relocating the archives. Overall, the written responses were predominantly expressing concerns (75%) about funding and staffing for libraries and parks, as well as the relocation of the borough archives.

The core findings from each of the six themes are summarised below:

### 1.2 Let’s get active (physical activity, sports and leisure centres)

Over half of self-completion questionnaire respondents (56%) support the overall approach of the Active Lambeth strategy, only 4% oppose it and there is general support for the activities identified. This also chimed with the qualitative elements of the consultation.

There is more than 50% support for all the proposals, except for the one referring specifically to Ferndale Community Leisure Centre (47%).

The most popular place for physical activity by some margin was in parks (62%), followed by open spaces (37%). The most frequently cited reason for not doing more exercise is a lack of free time (54%), followed by cost (37%) and family commitments (21%) though the extent to which this was true varied across demographics. Leisure centres and private gyms are used by just over a quarter of respondents each (28% and 26% respectively). Younger residents are more likely to use private gyms, while those aged 35-54 are more likely to exercise in parks.
1.3 Safe and interesting spaces (libraries and community buildings)

43% of on-street survey respondents had visited a library in the last six months and this is the third most popular cultural activity selected. 35-44 year olds are most likely to have visited a library (59%) and younger people are least likely to have visited a library (33% of 18-24 year olds and 34% of 25-34 year olds).

Just under a half of the young people’s survey respondents visit the library and a third would like to visit the library more frequently.

In general the consultation responses highlight a level of distrust around the consultation and a lack of understanding (or refusal to acknowledge) the financial framework for the consultation. Where there is support this is often accompanied by reluctance for any reduction in funding.

Four common concerns about the library proposals are:
- that selling buildings is a short-sighted response and once done could not be undone
- the north of the borough is being neglected
- accessible services for the disadvantaged will be removed and
- an overreliance on unaccountable volunteers and lack of professional staff.

Consultation respondents were keen that the council explore alternative options to selling buildings or closing services particularly in the north of the borough.

Just over two in five of the self-completion questionnaire respondents (42%) do not support the overall Lambeth Library offer set out in the proposals. Black African and Black Caribbean respondents are more likely to support the overall library offer (46%) and each of the other library proposals, whereas female respondents were more likely to oppose it.

From the self-completion questionnaire findings we can see the strongest opinions are regarding proposals to stop council funding or close library services. 56% of questionnaire respondents oppose the proposals for Carnegie, Durning and Upper Norwood libraries and two-thirds of those strongly oppose them. More than half of questionnaire respondents oppose the closures of Waterloo and Minet libraries (54% and 53% respectively).

Almost half of written submissions were about opposition to the library proposals and the two petitions (Save Lambeth Libraries and Save Upper Norwood Library) as well as the postcards submitted by friends of libraries all voiced opposition. If the council is to take a decision to close a library or stop or change a library service this would not be supported by consultation respondents.

1.4 The great outdoors (parks and open spaces)

From the self-completion questionnaire, there is more support than opposition to the proposals to hold up to 40 major commercial event days each year within Lambeth parks (42% support vs 29% oppose).
Among respondents to the on-street survey, parks are by far the most popular place for physical activity (61%) and cultural activity (83%). Attending an outdoor event was also the most likely to be selected as the activity people want to do more of (47%).

1.5 Be inspired, the bigger picture and showing off (art, performing arts and theatre, cinema and heritage)

All focus groups discuss better promotion of what there is to do in Lambeth and for older people it’s important this isn’t just online. Lack of awareness and affordability are the main barriers to participation for all groups, but this is particularly the case for some equality groups.

Arts organisations are keen to work together more – sharing information, resources and skills – and look to the council mainly for a facilitation and coordination role.
Part 2: How we consulted

1. Introduction

Between Friday 30 January 2015 and Friday 24 April 2015, we consulted on the ‘Future of Cultural Services by 2020’ in Lambeth. The consultation covered the following service areas:

- Libraries and archives
- Parks and open spaces
- Sport and leisure
- Arts

The proposals were a continuation of the conversations and consultations held over the last three years which have resulted in a more cooperative approach to service delivery. Importantly, the proposals sought to use the borough’s cultural assets to meet the council’s outcome that people are healthier for longer.

The consultation was framed within the context of an increasing population and a decreasing budget from central government (a reduction of around 40% by 2017/18). The financial budget for cultural services was not up for consultation but all the proposals concerning the council’s priorities and how it would use its resources was.

Part 1 of this report is an overview of the feedback from all consultation activities by theme. Part 2 is a collection of reports on the main activities.

1.1 Aims and objectives

We wanted residents and other service users to:

- have access to as much information as possible about the context of the proposals in order to help us take some difficult decisions;
- take part in a broad conversation about physical and cultural activity and how this can improve health and wellbeing;
- say what they thought about the proposals before any decisions were made so they could influence the future of cultural services;
- identify how they or the organisations they are involved with can get involved in supporting or delivering cultural services.

In particular, we wanted to know what people thought about the proposals, which we grouped across six themes:

2 Let’s get active: Active Lambeth – regular physical activity and sport, including the use of your local sport and leisure centres.
3 Safe and interesting spaces: Access to spaces including libraries and community buildings where you can learn, socialise and be enterprising
4 The great outdoors: Activities in your local park and the chance to have more influence how your local park is managed
5 Be inspired: Opportunities to participate in and enjoy theatre, performing arts and music.
6 The bigger picture: Cinemas in Lambeth’s five town centres and the chance to learn more about the art of cinema and film production
7 Showing off: Opportunities to enjoy art, or if you’re an artist, access to show off your work in archives, galleries and museums, whilst celebrating Lambeth’s cultural history
2. Consultation methods

We used a number of different methods to obtain comments and feedback on the proposals. We used both quantitative and qualitative methods. These included:

2.1 Self-completion questionnaires

The questionnaire was produced as part of a consultation booklet that could be returned to any Lambeth library, by Freepost address or completed online. Bulk copies of the booklets were available at all Lambeth libraries and leisure centres, the town hall and customer centres and park cafes. Copies were also sent to all GP surgeries and schools, as well as other address on request.

More extensive promotion and distribution of the online questionnaire was undertaken through digital media, the council’s regular communications channels, and via partners, stakeholders and residents. More information is provided later in this section (pp11 to 17).

There were five sections within the questionnaire and 19 questions in total. These were either questions that asked people to rate the proposals or open questions, so we could capture all views.

The questionnaire also included a section for equalities monitoring so we could make sure that we were hearing from all of Lambeth’s diverse communities.

2.2 On-street survey

More than 500, 10-minute on-street surveys were undertaken at six locations across the borough – Kennington cross, Gipsy Hill roundabout, Stockwell tube station, Coldharbour Lane/Loughborough Junction, Knight’s Hill in West Norwood and Streatham High Road near Greyhound Lane.

These areas were selected to correspond with areas where we knew residents were less likely to use cultural services and where we would be more likely to hear from demographic groups which are traditionally under-represented in self-completion questionnaires.

The Campaign Company was commissioned to do the fieldwork and analysis for the on-street survey. It was a different format to the self-completion questionnaire, given the 10-minute guide time for each interview, and through this activity we aimed to understand how important people felt the different themes were, the kind of physical and cultural activities they do currently, and what motivates them.

2.3 Young person’s survey

A shorter questionnaire was developed to capture young people’s views about the activities they do, what they like to do, what they have done recently and what motivates them to take part in cultural activities.

There were seven questions in total, including tick boxes, rating questions and open questions. The questionnaire was aimed at year 5 and above and distributed primarily through the schools. Every school in Lambeth was sent 30 copies of the questionnaire and we asked that at least one class was encouraged to complete it. More copies of the questionnaire were available on request.
Questionnaires were also sent to libraries and sports clubs, on request, and were available at the Youth In Action meeting on Monday 30 March 2015 and the young person’s focus group. Where questionnaires were completed outside of school and respondents were under 16 years of age, we required a signature from a parent or guardian. This was to comply with the guidelines set out in the Market Research Society Code of Conduct.

2.4 Seven public events

These events were held at locations across the borough that reflected geography, venue types and where proposals had greater relevance. We held them at a variety of times to suit as many people as possible.

The format for each event was the same throughout and covered un-structured discussion with council officers and the lead cabinet member, as well as workshop groups and feedback.

Streatham Library event

In order to facilitate an in-depth discussion on each theme, the different events were publicised with a specific workshop theme. However, time was given to discuss other proposals where attendees wished to do so. The list of events was:

- Streatham event – at Streatham Library, Mon 2 March (7-9pm) with a town centre Library and archives theme workshop
- Southbank event – at the Southbank Centre, Tues 3 March (7-9pm) with an arts theme workshop
- West Norwood event – at Portico Gallery, Sat 7 March with an arts and heritage theme workshop
- Waterloo event – at WAC, Tues 17 March (7-9pm) with a Community libraries theme
- Vassall Ward event – at Myatt’s Field North Community Centre, Wed 18 March (7-9pm) – community hub theme
- Brixton event – at Karibu Centre, Saturday 21 March (11am to 1pm) with a parks and events theme
- Clapham & Stockwell event – at Platanos College main hall, Weds 25 March (7-9pm) with a sports theme workshop
2.5 Nine focus groups

The focus groups were an opportunity to explore some of the issues around the consultation in greater depth. We particularly wanted to hear from groups who are traditionally under-represented in consultations and we reviewed the demographic data from the consultation after the mid-way point of the consultation to help determine the focus groups we would hold.

The nine focus groups were as follows:

- Older people – 17 older people recruited through the sheltered housing service
- Residents with mental health illnesses – 9 people from Mosaic Clubhouse
- Residents with physical disabilities – 7 people recruited with help from DASL (Disability Advice Service Lambeth)
- Blind or partially-sighted residents – 9 participants
- Young people – 23 young people recruited and facilitated by the Young Lambeth Cooperative
- Social housing tenants – 6 residents recruited through Lambeth Living
- Black Caribbean residents – 7 participants recruited via social media and a recruitment agency
- Black African residents – 7 participants recruited via social media and a recruitment agency
- English as a second language residents – 18 Portuguese residents recruited and facilitated by The Stockwell Partnership

Focus group participants were provided with an incentive of High Street vouchers to thank them for their time and compensate them for any travel. The focus group discussions lasted about 90 minutes and they all followed a similar structure, which allowed at least 35 minutes for discussion around the specific library and archive proposals. This was followed by two shorter, broader discussions around physical and cultural activity – focusing on personal use, motivations and barriers.

2.6 Other meetings

A number of additional meetings took place throughout the consultation and officers and councillors attended these to answer questions about the consultation. These events included:

- 30/1/2015 On the first day of consultation, Cllr Jane Edbrooke and council officers met individual with:
  - Minet Hub directors
  - Myatt’s Field Park Project
  - Friends of Carnegie Library
  - Friends of Lambeth Libraries, Chair
  - Carnegie Shadow Trust Board
- 5/2/2015 Carnegie Shadow Trust Board Committee meeting
- 9/2/2015 Friends of Durning Library full committee
- 11/2/2015 Waterloo Community Development Trust public meeting at Waterloo Library
- 11/2/2015 Friends of Durning Library Committee
- 16/2/2015 Upper Norwood Library Trust
- 18/2/2015 Lambeth Community Hubs
- 23/2/2015 Friends of Carnegie Library
- 27/2/2015 Minet Hub director’s meeting
2.7 Other written responses

People were also encouraged to submit their responses to the proposals direct via the email address culture2020@lambeth.gov.uk, the FREEPOST address, via the Love Lambeth blog, or to use the hashtag #culture2020 on social media (specifically Twitter and Facebook).

The Love Lambeth blog ([www.love.lambeth.gov.uk](http://www.love.lambeth.gov.uk)) carried 10 blog posts over the period of the consultation and people were encouraged to comment direct on these or to go direct to the consultation page and online questionnaire on the council's website.

The email address was monitored constantly, queries were responded to within 48 hours and written responses acknowledged and logged in the response spreadsheet for analysis (see Appendix 1).

3. How we communicated about the consultation

We wanted as many residents and users of the borough’s cultural services to have their say on the proposals as part of this consultation. We wanted respondents to reflect the diversity of the borough.

The consultation was set firmly within the context of budget cuts and how we consulted, including how we engage with people about the consultation, needed to be cost effective. The methods used for publicity and promotion consisted of:

- council owned communications channels and printed publicity
- online promotion
- through partners and intermediaries

3.1 Communicating directly with Lambeth residents

3.2 [Lambeth Council website](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/culture2020consultation): The consultation page – [www.lambeth.gov.uk/culture2020consultation](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/culture2020consultation) - was the hub for all information about the consultation and was promoted extensively through all the activity outlined below. This page received 11,128 views during the consultation period.

3.3 [Lambeth Talk](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/culture2020consultation): the borough magazine is distributed through every door in the borough and is regularly given as one of the top 3 ways residents like to receive information about what the council is doing. Lambeth Talk covered the Culture2020 consultation in the following ways:

- February edition – the consultation was highlighted in the Foreword by Cllr Lib Peck, Leader of Lambeth Council
- March edition – a 4-page centrefold feature gave information about the consultation, the key proposals, the events and other ways to get involved
April edition – a news story and a half page advert highlighted the end of consultation deadline.
3.4 **Love Lambeth blog:** A new section of the council’s blog was created for the Culture2020 consultation which outlined the context of the consultation, case studies and more. There were 10 blog posts throughout the consultation, including guest posts from Cllr Jane Edbrooke, which were used to promote the consultation via social media and encourage online engagement.

3.5 **Council enewsletters:** The consultation featured in a number of the council’s regular enewsletters, including:
- 11/2/2015 featured issue in TheBalance, distributed monthly to 43,000 recipients
- 19/2/2015 lead story in Love Lambeth, distributed monthly to more than 9,000 recipients
- 2/3/2015 story in Your Business enewsletter, distributed monthly to more than 9,000 recipients
- 10/4/2015 story in Your Business enewsletter, distributed monthly to more than 9,000 recipients
- 22/4/2015 deadline news story in Love Lambeth, distributed monthly to more than 9,000 recipients

3.6 **Postcards:** A5 postcards were produced to promote the online consultation and all the public events. These were displayed in libraries, leisure centres and other council buildings and copies were also distributed to schools, GPs, housing offices, park cafes and arts organisations. In the week leading up to each of the public events we also visited local shops and cafes to ask them to display copies. After the public events were over, a revised version was produced and re-distributed.
3.7 **A4 and A3 posters:** The first batch of posters produced was designed to publicise the public events and was distributed to libraries, leisure centres, other council buildings, schools, GP surgeries and parks. In the week leading up to each of the public events we also visited local shops and cafes to ask them to display copies. After the public events were over, revised posters were designed and distributed to libraries, leisure centres, other council buildings, schools, GP surgeries, parks cafes, arts organisations.

3.8 **On-street advertising:** Posters were displayed across the 43 JCD sites on the borough’s pavements between 3/3/2015 and 17/3/2015. These showed a selection of 3 posters that covered the themes of parks and open spaces, libraries and archives, and sports and leisure.
3.9 **Media:** A press release was distributed on the first day of the consultation, 30 January 2015. The consultation was covered by the South London Press, Timeout, The Bookseller, and Public Library News. It was also covered in local blogs such as Brixton Blog, Brixton Buzz, SE1 and Urban75.

3.10 **Social media:** This was an important way of having a conversation directly with local residents about the consultation and also asking partners and intermediaries to help spread the word. We used the hashtag - #Culture2020 – to monitor the conversation. Activity we undertook, included:

- 152 tweets from the @Lambeth_Council
- 10 Facebook posts to the Lambeth Council facebook page, including 3 promoted posts.

This tweet shows how people did take promotion of the consultation into their own hands.

“@Lambethgp @SaveLambthLibs ‘we need to get the word out about the plan of cuts that #culture2020 are proposing. People just do not know’” Tweet from @gulnar73
3.11 Engaging through partners and intermediaries

3.12 Councillors talk with residents using council services every day and we wanted them to help spread the word about the proposals and how people could respond. Councillors themselves were also likely to want to respond directly to the consultation.

The 59 Labour councillors were briefed by Cllr Jane Edbrooke, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, at a meeting on 26 January. All councillors were provided with a copy of the consultation booklet and postcards outlining the events taking place. Information was also circulated via the councillor enewsletter on Friday 30 January and Friday 20 February 2015.

3.13 Community organisations have networks and mailing lists reaching out to their members that we hoped would reach residents and service users we weren’t reaching and reinforce the importance of the consultation to those that we were.

Before the consultation began, the project team compiled a list of key stakeholders that we kept informed and asked to circulate materials more widely through at least 6 separate emails. We also used the council’s GIFTs database to around 900 organisations. There was evidence of the consultation being picked up in a number of ways, for example Norwood Action Group enewsletter, Norwood 24/7 and Myatt’s Field North newsletter.

We also used Twitter to direct message organisations within a specific area before each of the public events. Information was picked up by many of the key stakeholders and we saw details of the consultation contained in enewsletters, websites and re-tweeted widely.

Community organisations particularly affected by the proposals were also met with individually on the first day of consultation and additionally when requested (see paragraph 2.23 above).

Community organisations that illustrated some of the cultural activities available in Lambeth were also invited to do guest blogs that would help to promote the consultation. These included The St Matthews’ Project, the South London Theatre, the Streatham Vale Tearoom Library, the Streatham Common Cooperative and Silverfit.

3.14 Partner organisations were also asked to help promote the consultation by displaying materials. We wrote to all GP surgeries in the borough sending consultation documents and postcards advertising the public events. All leisure centres run by the council’s provider, Greenwich Leisure Ltd, were required to display booklets and postcards.

Young people are often under-represented in consultations and Lambeth schools were an ideal way to communicate with young people in the borough. We took consultation and promotional materials to the headteachers’ conference in March and wrote to every headteacher to ask them encourage at least one class in their school to complete the young person’s questionnaire. Senior schools were also sent the Lambeth Challenge, in case they wanted to discuss the issues in more depth and feed back to the cabinet member directly.

3.15 The Young Lambeth Coop, who co-ordinated a young person’s focus group, also used their social media networks to promote the consultation to young people. The Culture 2020 team also attended a Youth in Action event on 30 March 2015, taking 100 young person
questionnaires along for completion. The young person questionnaires were also distributed by the **Ready Steady Go** sports team and via the **Ferndale Community Sports Centre**.

3.16 **Lambeth Living** was able to circulate promotional material through the estate participation officers and to the Tenants’ Management Organisations. The sheltered housing section, which helped to recruit to the older person’s focus group, also distributed 300 questionnaires.

3.17 Every **Lambeth library** had a display including consultation booklets, posters, postcards, complete printed copies of all consultation materials, and return boxes for people to leave completed questionnaires. The library computers also included a pop-up display taking people to the consultation page.

3.18 Our **consultation partners** were also able to promote the consultation more widely to their networks. **Stockwell Partnership**, who co-ordinated a Portuguese speakers’ focus group, also used their advocates to help clients complete the questionnaire.

3.19 **Promotion to Lambeth staff**

Staff working within cultural services have important knowledge and experience about the services they help to deliver and the outcome of consultation could have an impact on their jobs. Three meetings with library staff were held just before the formal consultation period began on Wednesday 28 and Thursday 29 January 2015.

Library staff were issued with a frequently asked questions sheet so they could respond to questions that might be asked from members of the public. Every library had a display of consultation material and a box for collecting questionnaires.

All council employees are likely to use the services being consulted on and have contact with residents who need to know about the consultation. To promote the consultation to staff we did the following publicity:

- **The Bulletin:** The consultation was featured in the weekly email to all staff on 30/1/2015, 6/2/2015, 13/3/2015 and 17/4/2015
- **Intranet news story:** From 10/3/2015 until the end of the consultation there was an internet news story about the consultation
- **Staff Matters magazine:** An interview with Cllr Jane Edbrooke about the consultation was featured in the quarterly staff magazine on 17/4/2015
4. Consultation information and accessibility

The Culture 2020 consultation was a wide-ranging consultation covering parks, libraries, sports, arts and more. There was a lot of information for people to take in but we felt it was important to provide any all and any information that would help people to respond to the proposals.

4.1 Information

An overview booklet, which included the self-completion questionnaire, set the context and outlined the proposal, as well as pointing to relevant background information. This was available in paper format at libraries, leisure centres and distributed to GPs, schools, housing offices, park cafes and other venues as requested. It was also available in pdf format online.

All background information was available online on the Lambeth Council website at http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/consultations/cultural-services-by-2020. Information was broken down into:

- Key information – information directly relevant to the latest proposals being consulted on (total of 9 documents)
- Supporting information – information that supports the consultation itself and the proposals more generally (total of 11 documents)
- Extra background material – other information that might be useful (total of 7 documents)
Hard copy information packs, which included all Key and Supporting information were available at all Lambeth libraries, the town hall reception and the Olive Morris House Customer Service Centre.

During the consultation, where requests were made for additional information, this was also put online, for example the existing noise policy, the CIPFA report and the libraries budget.

It should be noted that there was some criticism of the amount of information made available and of the booklet itself.

4.2 Other formats
The consultation and questionnaire was offered online and as hard copy in the local libraries (as discussed above). The online questionnaire was also published as a text only document, suitable for screen reader software to access.

The booklet, web page and other publicity materials promoted a direct telephone number (020 7926 2623) and email (culture2020@lambeth.gov.uk) for any enquiries about the consultation and for people to call if they wanted to request alternative formats, e.g. community languages, audio or braille.

4.3 Community languages
To support requests from people where English is a second language we worked with The Big Word, the council’s contracted translations provider, and local community organisation, the Stockwell Partnership.

It was agreed that requests from speakers of Portuguese, Somali, Polish, Spanish, Italian and French speakers would be directed to the Stockwell Partnership who would be able to talk them through the proposals and the questionnaire either over the phone or face to face. Any requests from people speaking any of the other community languages were to be provided for using The Big Word.

Although two requests for translation services were discussed with library staff over the phone no groups came back to us to confirm that they wanted this service arranged.

To capture the views of this demographic more proactively, we asked Stockwell Partnership advocates to work with local clients with the aim of completing at least 50 questionnaires with community language speakers. The Stockwell Partnership was also contracted to recruit and facilitate a focus group with Portuguese speakers.

4.4 Public events
We used the Eventbrite software to publicise the events and request that people registered to attend, although it was clear that this was not obligatory. Having people sign up in this way allowed us to ask whether people had any specific requirements for attending the event and we also emailed attendees to ask this again a few days before each event.

Events were organised on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings and Saturday mornings to provide a range of alternatives for people with childcare, work or other commitments. They took place in venues across the borough and each venue was chosen
for its accessibility. Although the events highlighted specific workshop themes, we were clear that all proposals could be discussed at any of the events.

Note takers were provided at all the public events and the plenary sessions were recorded to ensure accuracy.

We had a portable induction loop at all public events for people who were hard of hearing, but no requests were made. We also contacted a provider of British Sign Language interpreters to make sure we could call on interpreters at short notice if required.

4.5 Focus groups
The focus groups were chosen to promote accessibility from a range of resident groups who may otherwise be under-represented in the consultation (see para 2.5 in this section). For the older person’s focus group we arranged transport for participants. Other focus groups where participants might have difficulties with access took place at venues participants would be familiar with, e.g. mental health issues focus group took place with Mosaic Clubhouse members at the Mosaic Clubhouse; blind and partially sighted focus group participants came to the Tate South Lambeth library where they have a regular meeting; and residents with physical disabilities came to the 336 Building.
Part 3: Participation

1.1 Questionnaire responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response method</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-completion questionnaire (online)</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-completion questionnaire (paper copy)</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total self-completion questionnaire responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1648</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire responses</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young person’s survey</td>
<td>451^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street survey</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Public events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public event</th>
<th>No. of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streatham event – at Streatham Library, Mon 2 March (7-9pm)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank event – at the Southbank Centre, Tues 3 March (7-9pm)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood event – at Portico Gallery, Sat 7 March (11am to 1pm)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo event – at WAC, Tues 17 March (7-9pm)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall Ward event – at Myatt’s Field North Community Centre, Wed 18 March (7-9pm)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton event – at Karibu Centre, Saturday 21 March (11am to 1pm)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham &amp; Stockwell event – at Platanos College main hall, Weds 25 March (7-9pm)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total people attending a public event</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Focus group participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>No. of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents with mental health illnesses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents with physical disabilities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind or partially-sighted residents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing tenants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean residents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African residents</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language residents</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total people attending a focus group</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^3 Although 472 completed questionnaire were returned, 21 of these did not provide adult consent or state they were over 16 years of age
1.4 Written responses

Responses via email or post 207

These included responses from the following organisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contacting Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The African Caribbean Cultural Centres Foundation</td>
<td>Articulate Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball England</td>
<td>Beaconsfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Cultural Archives</td>
<td>Brixton Rec Users Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brixton Society</td>
<td>Brockwell Lido Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common Management Committee</td>
<td>The Clapham Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Amos and Cllr Simpson, Princes Ward</td>
<td>Cllr Meldrum, Cabinet Member for Adult and Children’s Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Sustainability Commissioning Team</td>
<td>Friends of Carnegie Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Durning Library</td>
<td>Friends of Kennington Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Lambeth Libraries</td>
<td>Friends of Ruskin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Stockwell War Memorial and Gardens</td>
<td>Friends of Tate Library Brixton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Vauxhall Park</td>
<td>Friends of Windmill Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Bridge Trust</td>
<td>Greenwich Leisure Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guys and St Thomas’ Charity</td>
<td>The Herne Hill Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incredible Edible</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Archives</td>
<td>Lambeth Save our Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth UNISON</td>
<td>Lambeth Workers’ Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock ‘n’ Load events</td>
<td>LBL Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Community Foundation</td>
<td>Lucozade Power League Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myatt’s Fields Park</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vintage</td>
<td>The Oasis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Norwood Society</td>
<td>Paper Chain Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots and Shoots</td>
<td>Ruby Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5 Forum</td>
<td>Southbank Employers’ Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank Mosaics CIC</td>
<td>Streatham Common Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham PPC, Kim Caddy</td>
<td>Streatham South councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Wells councillors</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Norwood Library Trust</td>
<td>Vauxhall CIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vauxhall Society</td>
<td>Waterloo Action Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax Hands</td>
<td>Friends of West Norwood Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Digital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter - @Lambeth_Council</td>
<td>Tweets – 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reach – 162,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retweets - 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagements – 2,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Click throughs – 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Posts – 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.6 Other responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change.org petition to Save Lambeth Libraries</td>
<td>1,806 signatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcards originated from Friends of Lambeth Library and Friends of Durning Library</td>
<td>1,754 postcards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media comments</td>
<td>35 tweets with element of comment or report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition to save Upper Norwood Library</td>
<td>1,331 signatures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4: Consultation feedback

This section will review the main findings by theme, bringing together all the different consultation methodologies.

With almost 1,650 questionnaire responses and more than 200 written submissions, it is clear many people care passionately about Lambeth’s cultural services and many questionnaire respondents and event attendees are already deeply involved in activities that take place in these facilities.

By proactively seeking the views of those less likely to respond to consultations – through focus groups, the on-street survey and the young person’s questionnaire in schools - we sought to understand what cultural services matter, how people use facilities now and how the proposals could affect them.

In general the self-completion questionnaire and the written submissions highlight a level of distrust around the consultation and a lack of understanding (or refusal to acknowledge) the financial framework for the consultation. Where there is support this is often accompanied by a reluctance for any reduction in funding.

Four common concerns about the proposals are:
- that selling buildings is a short-sighted response and once done could not be undone
- the north of the borough is being neglected
- accessible services for the disadvantaged will be removed
- an over reliance on unaccountable volunteers and lack of professional staff.

‘The overall approach for people being able to take more responsibility for their well-being is a good one. But as an older person I don’t feel catered for.’ (questionnaire respondent)

1.0 Aspirations and overview

The proposals put forward in the Cultural Services by 2020 consultation were set within the context of trying to achieve the council’s ambition that by 2020:
- No matter where you live in Lambeth you’ll be within 20 minutes average walking time from affordable activities which will improve your health and wellbeing.
- 85% of Lambeth’s population take part in regular cultural, sports and physical activities.
- All residents have access to a range of affordable, excellent facilities for cultural affordable, excellent facilities for cultural, sports and physical activities.

1.1 Self-completion questionnaire responses

We asked people to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the three main aspirations outlined in the consultation booklet and above.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with what we are trying to achieve by 2020?

More than 50% of respondents agree with each of the aspirations.

The aspiration to have affordable activities within a 20 minutes’ walk of where people live resonates most strongly with respondents, with 87% either ‘strongly agreeing’ or ‘agreeing’ with the statement and only 4% either ‘disagreeing’ or ‘strongly disagreeing’.

The aspiration that 85% of Lambeth’s population are engaged in cultural, sports and physical activities as a routine part of their lives has the least support (46% either agree or strongly agree). Younger people are more likely to support the proposal, with disagreement and no opinion all increasing with age.

The consultation booklet identified six themes within cultural services and we asked people to indicate up to three themes that were important to them.

Safe and interesting spaces, including libraries and community buildings, are most likely to be selected as important to respondents (72%), followed by The great outdoors (61%) and Let’s get active (53%).

Opportunities to enjoy theatre, performing arts and music (30%), visual arts and culture (18%) are less popular, and cinema is least likely to be within respondents’ top three priorities (13%).
We’ve looked at cultural services across six main themes and we want to know which are most important to you. Please tick up to three from the list below.

- Safe and interesting spaces: 72%
- The great outdoors: 61%
- Let’s get active: 53%
- Be inspired: 30%
- Showing off: 18%
- The bigger picture: 13%

Additional comments
More than 40% of respondents provided additional comments and a quarter of these included comments on the consultation itself.

“I think the 2020 objectives are very good. However, I am concerned that by quoting the positive response to the questions in your survey will be used to justify your plans - which unfortunately are serious spending cuts, so in fact work in direct opposition to achieving those objectives.’

“The limitation to only 3 answers in question 2 is unfair and will result in an answer that will support the proposals in this consultation. I do not think any one of the 6 options should be posed against the other…”

1.2 On-street survey responses
Asked to select the most important of the themes outlined, the three that are most likely to be considered important are access to spaces where you can learn, socialise and be enterprising (90%) regular physical activity (89%), and activities in local parks and being able to influence how they are managed (89%).

Almost 90% of respondents consider their lifestyle healthy.

The on-street survey asked three questions about the aim for facilities to be within 20 minutes’ walk. These were designed to find out how important this was to people and whether this would encourage people to use facilities. We also wanted to see how people would choose to travel and whether walking to an activity would become part of a healthier lifestyle.
92% of respondents feel it is important to have a library, leisure centre or park within 20 minutes’ walk from their home. Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely to feel it is important (83%).

A similar number (93%) of those who think it important say they would be likely to go to a facility if it was within 20 minutes’ walk. Women are more likely to say they are very likely to go than men (68% v 54%). There was also some variation by age - the 45-54 year old age group was most likely to say they were very likely to go (77%) followed by those aged 35-44 (68%).

Assuming something was within a 20 minutes’ walk, the most popular form of transport considered by far was walking (83%) – making the act of doing a cultural activity of any kind also a form of physical activity.

A third of respondents to the on-street survey said they undertook physical activity at least five times a week, while a further 43% do so 2 to 4 times a week. Those not in a job or training seem most likely to exercise 5 times per week or more (43%).

1.3 Young people's survey

We asked young people how frequently they did physical and cultural activities. The vast majority of respondents like to take part in at least one cultural activity in their spare time. Only two respondents identified nothing that they like to do.

Overall, sport is the most popular activity, with four in five (81%) taking part in sport. However, there are significant differences between boys and girls (90% compared to 70%).

Going to the park and the cinema are the next most popular activities. Three in five young people in Lambeth like to be creative in their spare time and just under a half visit the library.

Q1: Which of these do you like to do in your spare time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the park</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the cinema</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be creative</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit the library</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a museum</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the theatre</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to gigs or events</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All (451)

* Less than 0.5%

Nine out of ten young people undertake an activity that they enjoy once a week or more. Only one in fifty say they get to do their favourite activity less than once a month (see below).
Taking part in cultural activities has a positive impact on the wellbeing of young people, with around nine in ten saying they have learnt new skills, and over four in five saying that they feel fitter and healthier, they have made new friends and they feel more confident about themselves.

Reflecting the top activity that young people currently take part in, sport is also the top activity that they would like to do more often, with around two-thirds (64%) wanting to do so. Visiting the cinema comes next (cited by 44%). Around two in five young people would like to be creative (38%) and to go to the park (37%) more often. A third (33%) would like to visit the library more frequently.

It appears that as young people move from primary school into secondary school their involvement in cultural activities lessens. Reflecting that there are a number of activities that 10 to 11 year olds are more likely to do than respondents overall, over three-quarters (77%) of respondents aged 10 to 11 are a member of a club or undertake an activity regularly,
which is higher than the figure for respondents overall (69%). Again reflecting that there are a number of activities that 12 to 15 year olds are less likely to do than respondents overall, respondents aged 12 to 15 are less likely to be a member of a club or undertake an activity regularly (55% compared to 69% overall).

The main barriers that stop young people doing activities they would like to do more often are lack of time (cited by 48%) and having other things to do (36%). Respondents aged 12 to 15 are more likely to say that not having enough time stops them doing more (61%).

Three in ten (29%) say that the cost of activities is a barrier. Boys are more likely to say this than girls (34% compared to 23%) and those aged 12 to 15 are less likely to cite this (19% compared to 23%).

Those aged 16 or over are more likely to cite no kit or equipment as stopping them from doing more (24% compared to 12%), but are less likely to cite having other things to do (22% compared to 36%).

In total there were 66 comments in which people set out what they like doing and a further 22 comments identifying more activities or things that were needed.

“Not enough things for us teenagers to do hardly any activities” Boy aged 15

“Can we have more things to do in our local area?” Girl aged 11

1.4 Written submissions

Almost half of the responses concerned libraries, with the next highest focus being on parks followed by the proposals for relocating the archives.

Overall, the written responses were predominantly expressing concerns (75%). The changes in funding and staffing for libraries and parks, as well as the relocation of the borough archives, were the main concerns of the respondents.
2. **Sports and physical activity: Let’s get active**

The consultation considered the proposals set out in Lambeth’s first draft Physical Activity and Sports Strategy, entitled *Active Lambeth*. This strategy was developed following the Brixton Rec Users’ Survey, March to May 2014 and a series of engagement activities with community sports partners, June to October 2014.

2.1 **Self-completion questionnaire responses**

*Active Lambeth strategy*

57% of respondents support the approach proposed in the Active Lambeth strategy for increasing participation in sport and physical activity, whilst only 4% oppose it.

*To what extent do you support or oppose the approach proposed in the Active Lambeth strategy for increasing participation in sport and physical activity?*

Respondents who are under 30, White non-British, Black Caribbean and Black African are more likely to support the proposals.

We also asked people whether they supported specific elements of the strategy. There are mixed levels of support for the different proposals outlined in question 5 – Gym equipment in parks and open spaces have the most support (69%) and Ferndale Community Sports Centre as a hub for grass roots sports clubs have the least support (47%).

Older people (75-84) responding to the questionnaire were less likely to support proposals for a 55+ healthy Lifestyles programme (55%).
To what extent do you support or oppose the following proposals?

Ferndale Community Sports Centre will be the hub providing a home to grass-roots sports clubs as the first step in their growth and capacity building.

Community-led organisations, such as Block Workout, will run a range of outdoor fitness classes across the borough.

A 55+ Healthy Lifestyles programme will be offered at Brixton, Streatham and Ferndale leisure centres targeting men at risk of long-term health conditions.

Gym equipment will be made available and used by anyone in larger parks and open spaces.

Significantly more respondents are likely to neither support nor oppose the proposals or ‘don’t know’ for Ferndale Community Sports Centre than any of the others. This suggests that, unless people are familiar with the sports centre or have links to community sports clubs they are less likely to have a view.

Respondents are more likely to strongly support gym equipment in parks than any of the other proposals.

Black African and Black Caribbean and other Black British respondents are more likely to support all four proposals.

The Sports Innovation Fund

The Lambeth Women’s and Girls programme and Active Walks programme both have high levels of support (both 70%). Women are more likely to support the Women’s and Girls programme (79%). Respondents over 75 are less likely to support this proposal.
To what extent do you support or oppose the following priorities for a Sport Innovation Fund?

The community sports club proposal has less support (53%) and higher numbers are likely to neither support nor oppose it (26%). This suggests that, unless people are involved in community sports clubs they are less likely to have a view.

Black African and Black Caribbean and other Black British respondents are again more likely to support all three of these proposals.

Additional comments
A quarter of the comments were about sports or leisure facilities, both in leisure centres and parks.

‘Lambeth should be encouraging all forms of exercise but I think they should have more input in our sports centres to ensure that all ages are catered for and that standards are kept as high as possible.’

‘The 55+ programme should be aimed at women as well as men. It should be linked to the Active Walks programme. The object should be to motivate people who have unhealthy lifestyles. I do not think that gym equipment in parks is a good use of money as it is generally used by those mainly young and already motivated. The Local Authority should be providing facilities for those who cannot afford private gyms etc. in order to bring greater equality of life chances at all ages.’
As seen in the extract above, there appears to be some confusion about why there was a gender split for some of the proposals.

2.2 On-street survey responses

The on-street survey asked ‘Where in the last month have you done sports or physical activity?’ The most popular place for physical activity by some margin is in parks (61%), followed by other public spaces (37%).

Leisure centres and private gyms are used by just over a quarter of respondents each (28% and 26% respectively).

Where in the last month have you done sports or physical activity?

![Graph showing where in the last month individuals did sports or physical activity.]

This varies by age, with younger residents more likely to use private gyms, while those aged 35-54 are more likely to exercise in parks. Use also varies by occupation with those in full-time work (32%) and education and training (31%) significantly more likely to have used a private gym.

Active Lambeth proposals include funding targeted prevention activity through cultural activities and services to tackle the impact of ill-health, as well as plans for new investment in sports buildings and facilities. The on-street survey asked respondents what the motivators and barriers were to physical activity to see how the proposals would meet healthier for longer outcomes.

When asked what motivates them to take part in physical activity, the top three most popular reasons are to get fitter/stronger (62%), feel happier (59%) and de-stress (52%).

There are significant differences in the answers given by male and female respondents. Female respondents are more likely to select the following motivators: lose weight (47% vs 28%); feel happier (65% vs 50%), have more energy (53% vs 34%) and de-stress (57% vs 43%).
Feeling happier is more likely to be a motivator among White British (62%) and White other (65%) respondents, with Black or Black British respondents the least likely to feel motivated by this (44%).

**Do any of the following prevent you from taking part in more exercise?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of free time</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (of facilities/equipment/membership)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family commitments</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I do enough exercise as it is</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities/opportunities to stay active in the area</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical / health limitations</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know where I can exercise in the area</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not very good at exercise/sports activities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel comfortable exercising in front of other people</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t live here</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced poor customer service</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends/family do not do much exercise</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TCC April 2015; Base: 465

The factors most likely to prevent people from taking part in more exercise are – lack of free time (54%), cost (37%) and family commitments (21%). All of these are more likely to be seen as barriers by women respondents.

15% of respondents selected I think I do enough exercise as it is and 13% selected lack of Facilities/opportunities to stay active in the area. Men were twice as likely as women to think they did enough exercise as it is.

Generally speaking, Cost (of facilities/equipment/membership) as a barrier seems to decrease with age. This put off 18-24 year olds more than any other age group by some margin and is this age group’s biggest barrier (52% v 36% next largest age group of 25-34 year olds). Those aged 35-44 are by far the most likely to be prevented by family commitments (36%), which may indicate the likelihood of having young dependents.

### 2.3 Young people’s survey

Sport is the most popular activity, with four in five respondents (81%) saying they like to take part in sport.
In all, around 50 different sporting activities were mentioned by respondents as being what they like to do. These include a mix of team and individual sports, as well as exercise and dance activities.

The most popular activity is football, which was cited by over a half of respondents who like to play sport (54%) and is also the most popular thing to do in parks. This was followed by swimming (24%) and basketball (23%), which are each mentioned by around a quarter of respondents.

“I like playing football near the Imperial War Museum on a Sunday.” Boy aged 9 or under

Sport is also the top activity that young people would like to do more often, with around two-thirds wanting to do so.

2.4 Public events

**Sport Innovation Fund and other money issues.**
There is a desire to look at the charges for community groups to use facilities and to see commercial and corporate use of facilities subsidise community use. There was some concern on the pressure of parks to generate more income and what this would mean for charges to use facilities there.

Some people don’t think the money coming in is very much and discussed the fact that the parks budget would also be required for maintaining and investing in park facilities. Some people agree with the need to be more business minded in the current funding climate whereas others feel that it shouldn’t be about making money. There are suggestions to look at commercial sponsorship and section106 money from development.
Preventative programmes and who to target to increase physical activity

There was a discussion about the benefits of referring people to sports clubs – how this could help promote wellbeing and encourage people to keep exercise as part of their daily life. It could also open up funding streams from the health sector.

Access to facilities is a popular theme and people discussed the lack of provision in the north of the borough, as well as restrictions in accessing pitches at peak times, which is a problem for people who work during the day.

Improved access for people with disabilities was discussed and there are suggestions to look at using community centres, GP surgeries and other spaces for physical activity if leisure centres are too far away, particularly for older people.

What else, apart from cost and convenience, might be preventing people from doing more physical activity?

One problem people identify is the condition of facilities. There was discussion around parks, which are a great ‘one stop shop’ for exercise but problems highlighted included dog mess, the poor condition of the BMX track, charging and relationships with Friends of groups and other users.

"Main barriers for BMX club is the facility – needs better maintenance. It’s not about attracting people – it’s about not having enough bikes and good facilities."

Another problem is around availability of pitches due to other block bookings and the fact that community sports groups need to operate at peak times too. Some people, however, did feel there needs to be more promotion of what’s available.

Where sports facilities are in parks there needs to be more coordination with Friends’ groups. In fact, more working together generally is needed and support for groups.

2.5 Focus groups

How frequently, if at all, do you take part in any physical activity and what do you like doing?

The key issue across most of the groups is that of affordability and in the case of those who are disabled getting to the leisure centres and support to use the facilities when there. For instance, older people say they need activities specifically for them and their physicality and someone with awareness of it leading the session.

What motivates you?

People say participation in leisure activities brings people together and contributes to wellbeing. Black African participants say that some promotion is needed to encourage use of the leisure centres. Young people give keeping fit, meeting friends, enjoying sport, socialising and building team skills as motivators.

What stops you?

Young people think that Lambeth facilities are not as good as those offered in other boroughs and many needed to travel outside the borough to do the activities they wanted to do. They see a need to advertise what was going on, for example roller discos, horse riding and badminton, even if this was out of the borough.
Social housing residents highlight costs can be prohibitive to those on low incomes as, unlike the unwaged, they don’t get discounts. There was also discussion about bringing activities to the community and supporting people to train as e.g. sports instructors to train their communities and in turn create jobs.

Portuguese speaking participants say they would go to free or affordable activities but most didn’t as they had physically demanding jobs or a lack of free time. They also want bilingual staff at leisure centres.

**Thinking about how the council can best spend its budget to encourage physical activity – what do you think should be our priority?**

More promotion of what was available is required and many pointed out that physical activity isn’t just about sports/gyms but can include gardening, shopping etc.

In the group for people with physical disabilities and carers of people with physical disabilities there was discussion about the need to look at the bigger picture and how promoting good health and well-being could save on other costly interventions. Because of this, it is suggested that health services should make a funding contribution.

Portuguese speaking residents feel that free gym equipment in parks and active walking groups were good initiatives but they would need better promoting.

**2.6 Written submissions**

Of the ten responses concerning sports, three were positive, five were neutral and only two were negative, showing that the sports responses were generally more receptive to the council’s aims,

> “England Netball are in support of the council’s objectives to increase the activity levels of Lambeth residents and are particularly interested in supporting the action against reducing the gap between male and female participation levels.” England Netball

There was one suggestion about the need to improve promotion, and Lambeth’s website in particular, to let people know about all the various activities available in the borough.

> “One of the major issues is getting information to local residents about the activities on offer. Small organisations struggle in publicising the work they do and the council should support these agencies by offering to advertise and promote through a website. The current website is clunky and offers residents very little information on what they can do and where, some investment in this area I see as very important. A significant investment in putting together a good website, which is regularly updated would represent a positive step forward. A marketing campaign linked to the website would also hold value, with promotional materials distributed to central sites across the borough: schools, GP surgeries, nurseries, libraries etc.” Moving Matters
3.0 Libraries, archives and community hubs: Safe and interesting spaces

The cooperative libraries programme started with the Cooperative Libraries and Community Hubs consultation in January – April 2012 and has so far included a Community Hubs capacity building programme and community-led consultations on options for Carnegie and Durning libraries.

The proposals put forward for a comprehensive and efficient library service for Lambeth would mean a mixed market of directly funded town centre libraries and not-for-profit enterprises running a series of community libraries, with the creation of new funding streams to support literacy and the love of reading.

3.1 Self-completion questionnaire responses

**The Lambeth library offer**

More respondents oppose the overall Lambeth library offer as outlined in the consultation than support it (42% vs 28%) and it is clear that there are strong feelings about this. A significant number of respondents neither support nor oppose it (15%).

**To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Lambeth library offer?**

Women respondents are more likely to oppose the proposed Lambeth library offer. Those aged 25-29 were less likely to oppose it.

Black Caribbean and Black African respondents were more likely to support this and each of the subsequent library proposals.

**Additional comments**

Almost half of respondents (771) provided comments when asked to ‘please tell us more’ and almost half of these (370) are opposing library closures.
There is scepticism regarding the community library proposals – including concerns that the removal of professional staff and loss of core funding will ultimately mean libraries closing. And there is also an emphasis on the importance of Lambeth libraries as community hubs.

‘Libraries are very important to people less well off (amongst many other things - information hub, social groups, education). They should be a priority for the council within communities - please look after people less well off than yourselves.’

Responses to the other library questions are outlined in the chart below.

To what extent do you support or oppose ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish a Lambeth Community Library Fund</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>32%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clapham, Brixton, Streatham, West Norwood and Tate South Lambeth will provide the borough’s statutory obligation.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. To what extent do you support or oppose the proposed Lambeth library offer?</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South Lambeth Library will become the town centre library for the north of the borough</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council funding for Carnegie, Durning and Upper Norwood libraries will stop by 2016.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop the library service currently provided by Lambeth Council at Waterloo Library,</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop the library service currently provided by Lambeth Council at Minet Library,</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strongly support
- Support
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Neither support nor oppose
- Don’t know/no opinion
- No reply

**Tate South Lambeth Library**

Opinion is fairly evenly divided between those who support (24%), oppose (31%) and neither support nor oppose (28%) the proposal for Tate South Lambeth Library to become the town centre library for the north of the borough until a review of town centre library provision is completed in 2020.

Over a third of the comments received (169 out of 443) felt that the Tate South Lambeth Library would not serve the needs of all the residents in North Lambeth and that people living in this area would not have the same level of access to libraries as elsewhere in the borough.

‘The Tate South Lambeth Library is not in the north of the borough so it is completely inappropriate for it to become the town centre library for the north of the borough – it is
not in the north and it is not in a town centre! Keep open both the Waterloo and Durning Libraries....’

**Town centre libraries**
There is evenly matched support and opposition for the town centre library proposals for five town centre libraries funded by the council (38% vs 35% respectively).

There are 503 comments to the open question and a fifth of these suggest that this proposal would mean areas of Lambeth would be left with an inadequate library provision.

‘I think the Borough is too large to be covered by just 5 libraries, particularly if you are aiming to cater for children to be able to use them without parental assistance’

There is also concern that only the town centre libraries would provide a professional library service and that they wouldn’t be able to cope with increased visitor numbers.

**The Lambeth Community Library Fund**
This is the most supported proposal with just under half of respondents (48%) in support of a Lambeth Community Library Fund to support charities, social enterprises and community groups to support literacy development and the love of reading. A quarter of respondents oppose it (25%).

Respondents aged 75-84 and who are permanently sick/disabled are more likely to oppose the proposal.

There are 488 additional comments to this question. Of these, 137 are supportive of the idea, although many qualify this support by insisting professional services remain and that this wouldn’t be the only funding available to these libraries in the future.

‘The Library Fund shows that Lambeth is leading the way thinking creatively in the face of major cuts from central government. More thinking like this please’

‘I support it as long as it isn’t the thin end of the wedge giving the council the chance to duck out of its obligations. I know money is ridiculously tight but libraries are crucial.’

**Carnegie, Durning and Upper Norwood libraries and the Lambeth Community Library Fund**
There are strong opinions about the proposals to stop council funding for library services currently provided at Carnegie, Durning and Upper Norwood libraries by 2016 and to encourage charities, social enterprises and community groups to bid into the Lambeth Library Community Fund.

58% per cent of respondents oppose this proposal and two-thirds of these strongly oppose it. Almost one-third of respondents provide comments to this question (522) and 171 of these are actively opposed to the closure and reduction of services at one or more library. Again, a number of respondents express reservations about non-council run services (178).

‘It’s ridiculous to expect a community group to provide a complex statutory service such as a library. The funds available to bid for will be nothing like enough to maintain an
adequate service - otherwise the council would just run the service and not propose closing it at all.’

**Waterloo Library**
Again, there are strong opinions about the proposal to stop the library service currently provided by Lambeth Council at Waterloo Library, close the library in 2015 and sell the building in 2016 to help establish the Lambeth Community Library Fund.

More than half of respondents (54%) oppose this proposal and 16% support it.

There are 433 additional comments, of which 131 are opposed to the closures or changes to current provision in Waterloo and a further 82 are against selling off council buildings.

‘I strongly oppose the closure of Waterloo Library. We live miles away from other Lambeth services. It’s unfair to pensioners who use this library. We are at the farthest point away from Lambeth council. In fact, the adjoining street to us is Hatfields which is in Southwark and all of their amenities are far closer to us,’

**Minet Library**
Similar numbers of respondents oppose the proposal to stop the library service currently provided at Minet Library (53%).

There were slightly less comments received than for the closure of Waterloo Library but they were similar in content. Of the 387 responses, 100 oppose the closure of the library and any changes in service at Minet, while an additional 65 comments were against selling Lambeth libraries.

‘Given the huge increase in the local population with the oval quarter development it is terrible and short sighted that the council are proposing to close this library.’

### 3.2 On-street survey responses
Almost all (92%) of respondents say they have done some cultural activity in Lambeth in the past six months and 43% of respondents had visited a library, which was the third most likely cultural activity selected.

35-44 year olds are most likely to have visited a library (59%) which may be a reflection of having young children. Younger people are least likely to have visited a library (33% of 18-24 year olds and 34% of 25-34 year olds).

People in part-time work are most likely to have visited a library (57%) and people in full-time work are least likely (34%).
Have you done any of the following in Lambeth in the last 6 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited a park</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone to the cinema</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the library</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been to an outdoor event</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been to an art exhibition</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watched a performance</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken part in a creative activity</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TCC April 2015; Base: 510

The on-street survey asked respondents what prevented them from doing cultural activities to see how the proposals would meet the need to support the provision of safe and inspiring space.

The three most likely barriers are the same as for physical activity – lack of free time (48%), cost (32%) and family commitments (20%). Lack of facilities/opportunities and don’t know where to go to take part deterred 12% each. Not knowing where to go is more likely to deter 18-24 year olds (18%).

Do any of these prevent you from doing any of the above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of free time</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of using facilities/taking part</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family commitments</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know where to go to take part</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities/opportunities</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t live here</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Links to facilities/opportunities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical / health limitations</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not interested in going to any</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced poor customer service</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends/family do not do any</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TCC April 2015; Base: 426

Those with a long standing illness, disability or infirmity are significantly more likely to feel prevented from doing cultural activity by cost (39%).
Respondents were also asked whether they would like to do any more of the cultural activities more often. The most popular responses are *go to an outdoor event* (47%), *go to the cinema* (41%) and *watch a performance* (40%). Just over a quarter of respondents want to *visit the library* more often (27%).

### 3.3 Young people’s survey

Just under a half of the young people who responded visit the library and a third would like to visit the library more frequently.

Almost half (47%) of young people who use the library do so to read, with around a third (35%) doing so to borrow books.

The library is also an important place for young people to study, learn, revise or do homework, with almost a quarter of users (23%) saying they use the library for this.

> “I just like the library facilities, it is really beneficial to me, it has given me space and privacy to revise in peace which I think is great.” Boy aged 16 or over

#### Q1: Visit the library – what do you do there?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow books / comics</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework / study / revise / learn</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the computer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend clubs / events / activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow DVDs / CDs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet friends / family</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All who visit the library (211)*

### 3.4 Public events

**What do you think about local organisations running community libraries with access to a Lambeth Community Library Fund?**

**Role of volunteers:** Many attendees reject the idea of community libraries and want to maintain a council-funded library service across the whole borough. People questioned the role of volunteers and how stable this would be, especially given the population churn.

People asked whether there is capacity in the community; how volunteers would be managed; and what would they get in return. They discussed examples of boroughs already trying this approach.
People valued librarians for their professional expertise and to ensure a continuity of service. An alternative model proposed was that of a library trust, which would see the library service across the whole borough run by the library staff.

**Funding:** The practicalities of funding a community library were discussed. Some people think a dependable revenue stream is required; some think the proposed endowment fund will not be enough and would ultimately lead to libraries closing.

**Transfers and sales:** Practical issues were raised around the asset transfer process and there are also warnings that once buildings were sold they would be gone for good. At the very least, the council should get market value for them.

Regarding the proposal to sell the Waterloo Library building there are some suggestions were a new community library could be located - Oasis Centre, Coin Street, Waterloo Action Centre, Shell Centre or Pimlico primary school.

There is a suggestion for a partial sale of the Minet Library building and to re-invest the money, for example to make it more accessible. Some people questioned why the new Myatt’s Field community centre (where the event was held) was built when the council is now thinking of closing Minet. But some other comments about the venue indicate how much people like the new building and suggest moving the library to this space.

**Community hubs:** A number of issues around Community Hubs are raised and include ideas for how hubs could be more effective.

There is a request for more information and advice from council officers and other professionals – for example about planning issues, funding opportunities and legal issues. Could this be pro bono work? There is also a call for specific hub champions within the council (councillor and officer) to unblock problems and broker community relationships.

*What do you think of focusing the council budget on town centre libraries to maintain opening hours and provide a comprehensive library service in accessible locations? What might be the role of town centre libraries in supporting a network of community libraries?*

At the Streatham event there was some discussion as to whether Streatham was a good example of a town centre library. Some people think it is not big enough but others said that it feels good for someone without sight, there are lots of different facilities, knowledgeable staff good IT and study space.

There appears to be agreement that libraries need to share knowledge and expertise and that it is better for town centre libraries to support other libraries than to close them. Some people suggest the council should also look to share resources with neighbouring boroughs.

*Where else should we be thinking of providing some library services, e.g. free book lending?*

A range of alternative locations for library services are mentioned – including schools, galleries, supermarkets and other public buildings.
Some people feel pop up libraries will not be good enough and comments were made that the Streatham Vale pop up library in the Railway pub is “not a proper library.”

**What other services might libraries supply?**

Income generating ideas suggested:
- Cafes
- room hire for meetings
- licenced room hire for events (such as flea markets, literary events and parties)
- an expanded IT offer (including software training and more specialist software for hire).

There are also suggestions to use libraries for other public services, for example as a venue for the school career services or to deliver health and well-being outcomes.

**Other issues raised**

A number of people have concerns about provision generally in the north of the borough and the need to look at the town centre library question now.

About funding more generally, there are suggestions to increase council tax to help fund libraries. Many people also want the council to look more closely at planning gain to make sure developers (particularly in the north of the borough) are doing what they should for community benefit. And there is a call to tap into the social responsibility of big business.

There are also calls for better engagement. These include better platforms for people getting involved (a bulletin board or more information in Lambeth Talk) and an assurance that the people who shout loudest won’t be the only ones getting noticed.

### 3.5 Focus groups

**Do you use Lambeth libraries?**

Overall, the common view is that libraries are no longer about books but places you can access information and use IT/Internet freely. They are also seen as social where people can meet other people but equally places people can find solace and peace and quiet to study in.

People attending the older person’s group see the future of libraries as information hubs of computers not shelves of books and think this is only right for those now growing up. Younger people see libraries as an important community resource, with all present recognising that young people need a place to study and that some young people may not have access to the internet elsewhere.

**What do you think about concentrating core council revenue funding on five town centre libraries where we can focus on a quality service and opening hours at least matching current ones?**

It is felt the council needs to have some commercial acumen around its library service to bring in an income, for example by hiring out spaces and holding events.

At the blind and partially sighted persons focus group it was noted that facilities for those with visual impairments could be better (for example talking scanners in all) and that libraries could do more in partnership with health services, which may also bring in extra funding.
Black Caribbean participants see a danger that reducing the number of directly funded libraries may lead to closures and poorer access for the elderly and disabled, as well as those with young families.

**What do you think about local organisations taking over the running of community library services – either within existing library buildings or elsewhere? Supported through access to a Community Library Fund?**

The idea of volunteering and libraries being run by community organisations is something worth exploring but, perhaps on a pilot basis at one library first.

Black African participants think libraries being run by local people will benefit the community as they can tailor a library to their own needs.

At the focus group for people with mental health issues concerns were raised around sustainability. It is noted that you can only sell libraries once, whereas a longer-term view is needed. If libraries are closed then participants suggest putting facilities, such as a library, health centre, gym, and son on, under one roof.

Participants with physical disabilities and carers of people with physical disabilities think community run libraries could be a good idea but it would need to be managed and supported by Lambeth Council.

**What is the role of volunteers? Would you be one?**

There is a lot of support for volunteering, which would give people skills, support paid staff and extend opening hours. Social housing residents think volunteering could even provide credits towards a degree, but that reliability could be an issue. Portuguese residents support the idea although none would volunteer themselves.

3.6 Written submissions

Comments about the library service made up the majority of written submissions (93). The opposition to the closure of the libraries is mainly based around the importance of libraries as a community asset. Closing libraries is seen as fundamentally reducing the quality of the cultural offer within Lambeth.

The library proposals were seen to impact the north of the borough disproportionately:

“The proposed provision of town centre libraries at Clapham, Brixton, Streatham and West Norwood, in effect, serves only the centre and south of the borough. The reference to an interim arrangement of town centre library service for Tate, South Lambeth Road gives rise to uncertainty, and its location is not well-placed to serve the whole of North Lambeth, particularly if both Waterloo and Durning libraries cease to exist. It could therefore be argued that the statutory obligations to proved a ‘comprehensive and efficient’ library service fail on a geographical test.” Resident, SE11

The proposal to move away from solely council run services is seen as undervaluing the quality of the services on offer.

“Community-led libraries’ are no substitute for a professional library service. They have an extremely poor track record, and have little chance of surviving at all in a borough like
The selling of council buildings is opposed by 11 of the submissions and is seen as an irreversible decision that could impact negatively in the future. There are also reservations about the Lambeth Community Library Fund (raised in 8 submissions) – whether the £10m could be raised and whether it would generate sufficient income.

**Alternative suggestions**

There were six alternative suggestions for the library service:

- 2 suggested a continuation of the council role within the libraries but reducing the scale of this to support community groups
- 1 promoted a private/council partnership (based on their own success with London Arts Base)
- 2 referenced library sites, the first recommending a new base for Durning and the other asking about the future use of the Waterloo site
- 1 proposed an alternative funding plan that would keep Minet library open.

On Twitter, there was some discussion about how confusing and complex the consultation was. This tweet reflected on the use of the word ‘hub’.

“Also - "hubs" is a deliberately confusing word - used by @lambeth_council to blur distinction between place and purpose #culture2020” Tweet from @MinimalismBlog

### 3.7 Petitions

There were 1,754 postcards received via the libraries and the FREEPOST address. These were produced by the Friends of Lambeth Libraries (and Friends of Durning Library produced and slightly amended version) and they asked the following questions with the following response rates. More information can be found in the Written Submissions report in part 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth needs all its 10 libraries</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All libraries must be properly run by professionals</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth could cut its budget in far less damaging ways (This question only asked in the Friends of Durning Library print outs)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Save Lambeth Libraries petition posted by Ruth Cashman on Change.org at [https://www.change.org/p/london-borough-of-lambeth-save-lambeth-libraries](https://www.change.org/p/london-borough-of-lambeth-save-lambeth-libraries) had received 1,806 signatures at the close of consultation.

A separate petition for Upper Norwood Library was also posted on Change.org - [https://www.change.org/p/lambeth-and-croydon-councils-properly-fund-our-library-as-a-statutory-town-centre-library-for-crystal-palace](https://www.change.org/p/lambeth-and-croydon-councils-properly-fund-our-library-as-a-statutory-town-centre-library-for-crystal-palace). It called for councils to ‘properly fund our library as a statutory town centre library for Crystal Palace. This had received 1,331 signatures at the close of consultation.
4.0 Parks, open spaces and events: The great outdoors

The proposals, which included a new Events Strategy and new ideas for locally managed parks, are a continuation of the council’s Cooperative Parks Programme.

Since the initial Cooperative Parks consultation took place July – October 2013, the council has worked with Friends of Parks groups and other organisations to test new models of local management and consulted on the Parks and Open Spaces Capital Investment Plan Consultation, September – October 2014.

4.1 Self-completion questionnaire responses

Draft Events Strategy

There is more support than opposition to the draft Events Strategy, which includes proposals to hold up to 40 major commercial event days each year (42% vs 29% respectively).

People under 45 are more likely to support the proposal and people aged 60-74 and 75-84 are more likely to oppose it.

To what extent do you support or oppose the draft Events Strategy, which includes proposals to hold up to 40 major commercial event days each year, along with changes to noise levels, across Lambeth’s public parks and open spaces? Two-thirds of the income to be reinvested to improve park facilities?

Almost 40% of respondents (645) provided additional comments on the draft Events’ Strategy. 192 of these were supportive and recognised the need for events, mainly due to the income, visitors and publicity that they bring to the area.

‘Brilliant proposal - the events are great for bringing people and interest to the area, as well as bringing significant income to help improve our parks.’

However, there were some qualifications from those who on balance support the proposals, which also reflect the concerns of those who don’t. These included noise levels,
environmental restrictions, consulting with local people and keeping some of the events affordable to residents.

*I support this providing that care is taken to protect the parks/open spaces against damage.‘*

One of the biggest concerns about the proposals was that increasing the number of events each year would detract from the public character of parks in Lambeth and that 40 major event days was too much.

‘40 major events is far too much. This means that people cannot use the park the way they want to.’

**Parks management**

**To what extent do you support or oppose?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposal of handing over a greater share of income from parks to local management groups (pioneers and partnership parks)?</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>24%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal to implement clustering arrangements between parks to create greater financial security for our smaller parks?</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more respondents support the proposal to hand over a greater share of income from parks to local management groups (35% vs 27%). And 80% of people who expressed an opinion support the proposal to implement clustering arrangements.

However, a significant number of people neither support nor oppose these proposals, don’t know or didn’t reply – 38% in the case of having a greater share of the income and 56% regarding clustering arrangements.

The clustering arrangements question also received fewer additional comments than most others, which may indicate that people weren’t very clear about the proposal. Of the 241 comments received, 84 gave qualified support, 64 criticised the consultation, 42 were concerned and another 42 were opposed.
‘This seems a sensible idea - if the aim is to share services so as to ensure the provision is not reduced or lost but simply provided more effectively and efficiently, that must be a good thing.’

There were 463 additional comments about groups receiving a greater share of the income. Of these, 165 give a qualified level of support to the proposals, although there is a recurring theme that the council would need to stay involved and step in if the local management groups are unable to keep up with the pressure.

‘This is ok as long as proper scrutiny, accountability and community consultation remains in place. Ultimately, the council must clearly be responsible and therefore overseeing the work of these groups.’

Those disagreeing with the proposals raised similar concerns about the need for professional staff and council involvement. The make-up of new groups was also a concern – would volunteering be sustainable, accountable or representative of local communities?

4.2 On-street survey responses

The great outdoors theme – or activities in your local park and the chance to have more influence how your local park is managed – is felt to be one of the three most important themes. However, respondents are less likely to think this very important (49%) than safe and interesting spaces (67%) or get active (63%). This may reflect the two part nature of the question and is the only one of the three that implies a level of getting involved in the running of the facility. By contrast, parks are clearly the most popular places for cultural and physical activities.

The most popular place for physical activity, by some margin, is in parks (62%), followed by other public spaces (37%). Those aged 35-44 (70%) and 45-54 (76%) are most likely to exercise in parks.

Where in the last month have you done sports or physical activity?

Similarly, when asked if they had done any of the following cultural activities in the last six months, the most popular answer is visited a park (83%), which is almost twice as popular as the second most popular option, going to the cinema (44%).
Over a quarter of respondents had been to an outdoor event (28%), which was also the most popular choice of activity that respondents would like to do more of (47%).

**Have you done any of the following in Lambeth in the last 6 months?**

- Go to an outdoor event: 47%
- Go to the cinema: 41%
- Watch a performance: 40%
- Go to an art exhibition: 38%
- Visit a park: 34%
- Visit the library: 27%
- Take part in creative activity: 20%
- Other: 2%
- None: 14%

Source: TCC April 2015; Base: 493

### 4.3 Young people’s survey

Going to the park is the second most popular thing to do. Football is the top activity that young respondents like to do when they go to the park (27%), followed by playing on children’s play equipment (25%).

The most popular reasons for wanting to visit the park more are to have fun or play (26%) to spend time with friends and for exercise or fitness (both 10%).

**Q1: Go to the park – what do you do there?**

- Play football: 27%
- Play on children’s play equipment: 25%
- Meet/play/relax with friends: 18%
- Cycle/scooter/rollerblade/skateboard: 11%
- Play/play games: 11%
- Spend time/play with family: 8%
- Run/jog/run around: 6%
- Relax/chill/meditate/read: 5%
- Use cafe/eat ice-cream: 5%
- Play tennis/table tennis: 5%
- Play basketball: 4%
- Exercise/get fit: 3%
- Walk: 2%
- Walk the dog: 2%
- Enjoy plants/wildlife/ducks: 2%
- Other: 3%

Base: All who like to go to the park (342)
4.4 Public events

Do you agree with 40 major commercial event days a year across all our parks, common land and open spaces?
There is agreement that the council needs to “run a tighter ship with events” and could get a greater income from the commercial entities running them.

Much of the discussion was around the impact events have on residents and the parks, before, during and after. This includes damage to the parks and disruption to residents through noise or lack of access to the public spaces they want to enjoy.

There was discussion whether 40 event days was just too many. Other comments made were that ticket prices for many events are too high for local residents and are mainly sold to people outside the borough. Many feel there should be discounts for those living in the borough.

Many whilst not against large scale commercial events would prefer to see more local and smaller scale ones and income generated from the larger commercial events used as a ‘Festival Fund’ to support smaller scale community events. A number also suggest the council should insist local providers are used to supply refreshments and put the fixtures up.

Do you agree that 2/3rd of all income from events should be put into parks to improve facilities and infrastructure?
This is generally supported but some people feel it is not enough to cover post event clear-up and repair. Many want to see event organisers responsible for this and want Lambeth to make sure they are charging appropriately.

There is also concern about an over-dependency on events for park funding – “What if the event holders decide to go elsewhere?”

Do you agree with the principle that capital investment in large parks should prioritise revenue generation to support small parks?
Many feel the council needs to be more imaginative in funding the parks, such as tapping into health services monies as it is felt parks impact on well-being and the value of this should be recognised by the NHS.

There is a distrust of large scale commercial interests coming into the parks and open spaces. There is concern that smaller spaces, too small to hold income generating events, would be sold off to developers or turned into allotments which only those with a plot would be able to access.

Do you think there is a future for locally managed parks?
In general, attendees feel park maintenance needs to be carried out by professionals and if Lambeth want volunteers to do it they need to provide them with horticultural training. They are keen to see work done by local contractors.

People agree strongly that local communities need to be more involved in decision making. Some are concerned that proposed savings could have an impact on health and safety e.g. maintenance of outdoor gym equipment.
There is a suggestion that better relationships with schools and other public services could bring in income from facility hire, which could be reinvested to further develop these facilities.

**How can parks support one another e.g. through clusters?**
People feel clustering will need coordination and management by the council but could lead to better or improved maintenance at reduced costs. Another suggestion is to develop services in parks locally like specialist horticultural teams which could then be sold on to other parks

**Would you be willing to be involved in running your park?**
It is felt that there is too much reliance on the goodwill of volunteers and that it isn’t sustainable. However, the council definitely needs to involve members of the various “Friends of” Parks groups in decision making.

If groups do run the parks then the council needs to support them to become incorporated legal entities so they are able to bid for funding credibly.

### 4.5 Focus groups

Parks was not a main topic for the focus groups but some issues were made in the context of the broader discussions on cultural and physical activities.

Black African participants don’t want to see parks close and specifically mentioned people using outdoor equipment and football pitches. They also see events in parks as prohibitively expensive and disruptive for the park.

Almost all young people in the focus group say they would volunteer in their local park if it would keep a park from closing. About 60% say they use their local park but also that parks would be used more if they were in better condition. They see parks as a good source of income generation and made suggestions for privatisation, sponsorship or sale.

Blind and partially sighted participants suggest buggies could be used to take older and disabled people around the parks and that monies from events should be invested in this and more park staff to police cyclists.

### 4.6 Written submissions

The theme of parks is raised in 45 written submissions. There is a sense that people see the reduction in funding leading to a reduction in the amount of public benefit.

Proposals to move away from solely council run services and give a greater role to volunteers and community organisation is seen as undervaluing the service and reducing its quality.

> “Lambeth’s Culture2020 proposals set out a future of community involvement in parks management with no precedence or examples of this level of community engagement to support the proposals as viable and realistic options.” Friends of Ruskin Park

Holding more events in parks is raised within 16 of the written submissions. The impact of events on the park environment and the public character of these areas is a concern, although could be mitigated if the community benefit is clear.
“While we don’t object in principle to more events in parks, if this is done so that local people feel they are also able to benefit from the events, it will make it much easier to overlook the inconvenience caused.” Individual resident

There is also response from event companies.

Clapham is a great place on which to stage music events. However, in all the years we have operated there, the Council licensing sound levels have been a major hindrance. Levels are currently lower than any other urban green field site that stages similar events to Sw4. This therefore means that we are always at a disadvantage when it comes to booking talent and selling tickets.” Lock N Load

Perhaps there is also concern that the cuts in funding to parks were being overlooked with the focus on the library proposals.

“#Culture2020 so many focused on libraries & not realising impact on parks. 50%=loss of facilities & services=only bare minimum done” Tweet from 1@park_spy
5.0 Arts and heritage

Three areas were highlighted within this consultation theme:

- Be inspired – opportunities to participate in and enjoy theatre, performing arts and music
- The bigger picture – cinemas in Lambeth’s five town centres and the chance to learn more about the art of cinema and film production
- Showing off – opportunities to enjoy art, of show off your work, whilst celebrating Lambeth’s cultural history.

Proposals were for the arts’ budget to remain at £65k per year and to collaborate more within an arts network to deliver the aspirations. The public event at The Southbank Centre attracted a number of the major cultural organisations and started to discuss what organisations needed, or could offer, to do this.

5.1 Self-completion questionnaire responses

Lambeth Archives

More people support than oppose the proposal for Brixton to become the destination for those seeking borough archives. This could include the borough archives being located in Brixton Library with strong operational links to the Black Cultural Archives (44% vs 18% respectively).

Just over one-fifth of respondents (364) provided additional comments to this question and just over one-third (125) of these gave qualified support to the proposals. Most of these supported the archives being placed in a more central or accessible location, but this was often coupled with a desire to see the Minet Library remain open.

‘I see the logic of this as long as the archives are adequately housed with appropriate professional support. And it should not be used as an excuse to close down and sell off the Minet Library.’

To what extent do you support or oppose the proposal for Brixton to become the destination for those seeking borough archives? This could include the borough archives being located in Brixton Library with strong operational links with the Black Cultural Archives.
There were 92 comments expressing concerns about the perceived lack of space at Brixton and 75 comments which linked opposing the archives move to opposing the closure of Minet Library.

‘I oppose this on principle as it would involve the closing of Minet Library. I query where the space for the archive will come from within Brixton Library unless some areas of the existing building are being taken out of everyday public usage?’

5.2 On-street survey responses

Each element of the arts offer – performing arts, cinema and visual art – appear to be similarly important. However, more respondents were likely to class ‘Opportunities to participate in and enjoy theatre, performing arts and music’ as very important (53%) and less likely to say they were not at all important (4%) than the other elements of the arts offer.

Of the 13% who took part in creative activity, the most popular thing to do was music and performing arts (38%).

Across the arts offer women were more likely than men to state they were important. Over 55s are less likely to consider cinemas in Lambeth’s town centres and the chance to learn more about cinema and film production to be important (64%) and more likely to consider it less important (35%). Those in education and training (88%) and part-time work (90%) are far more likely to say opportunities to enjoy art, if you’re an artist, access to show off your work are important.

5.3 Young people’s survey

Going to the cinema is the third most popular activity (71%) and the second most popular thing that young people want to do more often (44%).

Three in five respondents (61%) like to be creative in their spare time and more than a third of young people want to do this more often (38%). More girls than boys like to be creative (73% compared to 23%). Just over a quarter (27%) of those who would like the opportunity to be creative more often would like to be able to do something artistic including drawing, painting, sculpting or pottery.

Visiting the theatre, museums and going to gigs or events are activities that around a quarter to a third of young people do. More girls than boys like to go to the theatre (42% compared to 17%), go to museums (39% compared to 23%) and to go to gigs or events (31% compared to 21%).

White respondents are also more likely to like to visit a museum (44% compared to 31%) or go to the theatre (43% vs 28%).

5.4 Public events

What do you think of the proposal to move the Lambeth Archives to Brixton Library and encourage links with the BCA?
If the archives are moved people want a suitable new space and there was a suggestion to use the town hall rather than Brixton Library.

**What do you think of proposals for a Lambeth festival of culture – celebrating and promoting Lambeth’s cultural offer?**

There is an agreement that the council could do more to promote the arts offer in Lambeth and suggestions include an audit of what’s going on or what’s available or a Lambeth version of *Time Out*.

Regarding the festival, it was commented that this should be co-ordinated by the council not volunteers or money making enterprises and that the council should lead on getting funding. One post it comment noted: “Lack of funding and support is turning us from a festival into a fete.”

**Other themes**

**Collaboration:** A strong theme is the need for organisations to be more collaborative – sharing resources and skills – perhaps through an Arts Forum or an online Arts Web.

Post It comment – “We need someone, a hub, a database a forum/guru to ask for advice on sponsorship, marketing audience. Go to people.”

It was noted that there are strong links between organisations already in the north of the borough but these could be widened out further, with larger organisations supporting smaller ones. There could also be better links with the Southwark Arts Forum.

Sharing space, even between quite different organisations (such as libraries and galleries) is called for, and so is sharing expertise. Attendees look to the council to provide this facilitation role, as well as advice on funding opportunities and planning.

**Funding:** As well as sharing knowledge and advice on sponsorship, there are a number of other suggestions about funding. These include talking to businesses and the Business Improvement Districts around corporate social responsibility, looking at planning gain, crowd funding and EU funding opportunities.

**Cinema:** There is a suggestion that the council needs to insist on historical/learning repertoire of cinemas e.g. provide editing suites for students and promote the history of cinema.

There was a question about how the Norwood cinema development will benefit local people; and another question regarding what happens to any income from filming in the borough.

### 5.5 Focus groups

**How frequently, if at all, do you do cultural activities in Lambeth and what do you like doing?**

Portuguese speaking residents are largely unaware of any museums or cultural activities in Lambeth and several say they would rather go to the West End to find things to do.

Lambeth’s cultural activities resonate little with younger residents. The majority of the young person group could not identify with activities other than the Lambeth Country Show, Brixton
Splash and the occasional event at the Southbank. A group cheered when Primark was mentioned and it was apparent that they would like a large indoor shopping centre to spend time in with friends at little or low cost.

Participants in the mental health focus group say more community art space is needed, for example displays, artists’ talks and music events in libraries. They also suggest a social enterprise giving guided tours of Lambeth.

**What motivates you?**

All groups discuss better promotion of what there is to do in Lambeth. For older people it’s important this isn’t just online. Black Caribbean participants think having cinemas in libraries is a good idea to encourage families to go. Using different spaces is a common theme and other suggestions include having more events in the town hall (Black African participants) and bringing arts to council estates (social housing tenants group).

**What stops you?**

Affordability is identified as the main barrier to participation in cultural activity, with many saying the events were too costly for them and that as Lambeth residents they should have some discount.

People with physical disabilities and carers of people with physical disabilities note that the big events, like the Lambeth Country Show aren’t as accessible to the disabled as they could be. Age is a barrier for young people, who ask for more youth clubs and dance clubs to be set up for the under 18s.

**Other**

Black Caribbean participants don’t want funding for the BCA to stop entirely and suggest that a nominal sum continue to be given – maybe coming from the leisure centre income?

### 5.6 Written submissions

There are 4 written submissions that discuss the arts and heritage theme and 31 commenting on the Lambeth Archives.

The archives comments do not necessarily oppose a move from the Minet Library, however there is opposition to the idea of a temporary home and a recurrent concern of whether there is enough space in Brixton to store them properly.

> "If their present home, the Minet Library, is to be sold next year, what is to happen the Archives? The suggestion that they might go to Brixton Library is untenable, since there is no room there. No proper consideration has been given to their relocation. Special conditions apply to the storage of archives and these cannot be provided at the drop of a hat." Individual

The importance of the arts is emphasised in the response from Brixton Live, a partnership of local arts organisations, and there are suggestions for what role the council can play.

> "It is important that the new plans take into account that there needs to be advocacy within the Authority to ensure that the local arts organisations are recognized as being able to deliver tangible benefits for residents on cross cutting agendas in adult learning, social care, schools, health & wellbeing etc…" Brixton Live
Part 5: Demographic data

1.1 Gender

More women than men completed the self-completion questionnaire (58% vs 38%) and women were more likely to attend the public events (61% vs 39%).

The genders were evenly split among the young people completing the young person’s questionnaire.

What is your gender identity? (Comparison with 2011 census data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-completion questionnaire</th>
<th>on-street survey</th>
<th>Young people’s survey</th>
<th>Public events</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men are under-represented in the self-completion question and, although we didn’t have a specific focus groups for men, we attempted to recruit more men than women so we could explore any gender specific issues that emerged with men in more depth. Of the 48 monitoring forms completed for the focus groups, 28 participants were men.

1.2 Age

People under 30 were under represented and people aged 30-74 were over represented in the self-completion questionnaire respondents when compared against the demographic profile of Lambeth.

More than half, 255, of the young person respondents are aged 11 or under and 68 (15%) are aged 16 or over.

People coming to the public events were more likely to be 45 and above, with the most frequent age group being 65-74.

The young person’s questionnaire, the young person’s focus group and the attendance at the Youth in Action event all sought to make sure the voice of young people would be heard during the consultation. 22 people attended the young person’s focus group.

An older person’s focus group was also held with 17 attendees.
1.3 **Ethnicity**

White British people are over represented among the respondents to the self-completion questionnaire. All other ethnic groups, except White non-British are under-represented compared with the ethnic profile for Lambeth. Almost 9% of respondents preferred not to or didn’t answer this question.

Conversely, among respondents to the young person’s questionnaire White people are under-represented, Black or Black British and Mixed race residents are over represented.

Almost two-thirds (63%) of public event attendees who completed an equalities monitoring form are White British.

Two focus groups sought to understand in more depth the views of residents from both Black African and Black Caribbean communities – 7 people attended each of the focus groups.
How would you describe your ethnicity? (Comparison with 2011 census data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-completion questionnaire</th>
<th>On-street survey</th>
<th>Young person questionnaire</th>
<th>Public events</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other (incl Irish)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(White)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British - Caribbean</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British - African</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black or Black British</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Black or Black British)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Disability

The on-street survey has a comparable response rate for people with physical or learning disabilities or health problems with the 2011 census data for Lambeth. Although numbers for this groups are small, it is potentially over-represented among public events attendees and slightly under-represented among respondents to the self-completion questionnaire.

Are your day to day activities limited due to a physical or learning disability or health problem? (Comparison with 2011 Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-completion questionnaire</th>
<th>on-street survey</th>
<th>Young person questionnaire</th>
<th>Public events</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say or no response</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three focus groups were held to understand in more detail the views of people with mental health issues (9 attendees), physical disabilities and their carers (7 attendees) and those who are blind or partially sighted (9 attendees).
1.5 Sexual orientation
Compared with Lambeth resident survey data, gay or lesbian people are over represented among respondents to the self-completion questionnaire.

**Which of these best describes your sexual orientation? (Comparison with 2014 Lambeth Residents’ Survey)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-completion questionnaire</th>
<th>Public events</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am heterosexual/straight</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am gay or lesbian (homosexual)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am bisexual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Economic activity
Compared with Lambeth wide census date, those in full-time employment, full-time education, permanently sick or disabled and unemployed are under represented among those completing the main questionnaire. Those who identify as self-employed, wholly retired from work or doing something else are over represented.

The largest number of public event attendees completing an equalities monitoring form are in full time employment (25) followed by those who are retired (19) and those who are full time self-employed (13).

A focus group was held with people living in social housing to discuss in greater detail the views of those on low incomes (6 attendees).

**Which of these best describes what you’re doing at present? (Comparison with 2011 Census)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-completion questionnaire</th>
<th>on-street survey</th>
<th>Public events</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee in full-time job (30+ hours per week)</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee in part-time job (under 30 hours per week)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed full-time</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed part-time</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a government supported training programme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently sick/disabled</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly retired from work</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after the home</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something else</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and available for work</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7 **Faith**
Of those completing the question of faith as part of the self-completion questionnaire, the largest faith group is Christian (32%), followed by No religion (25%) and Atheist (20%). Muslims are under represented among respondents compared with the Lambeth census data.

The largest number of public event attendees completing an equalities monitoring form identify as having no religion (26), followed by Christian (24) and Atheist (15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of these best describes your religion? (Comparison with 2011 Census)</th>
<th>Self-completion questionnaire</th>
<th>Public events</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say / Don't know</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 **Important note on sub group analysis**
For the self-completion questionnaire and the young person questionnaire it should be noted that the group of respondents cannot be seen to be representative of the Lambeth population as a whole. This means it is not possible to make reliable inferences about residents as a whole, unlike, say, the Residents Survey.

Put another way, any significant findings may well be caused by the structure of the group of respondents, rather than necessarily reflect any wider community opinions. We can say with confidence that ‘Black African respondents to the consultation are more likely to say’ but not ‘Black African residents / respondents are more likely to say’ or ‘the Black African community….’. For this reason, any sub-group findings should not be given undue weight.
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**London Borough of Lambeth**

**Full Equality Impact Assessment Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please enter responses below in the right hand columns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1.0 Introduction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1.1 Business activity aims and intentions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In brief explain the aims of your proposal/project/service, why is it needed? Who is it aimed at? What is the intended outcome? What are the links to the cooperative council vision, corporate outcomes and priorities?

By 2020 the Council will have 40% less funding for cultural services, including libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts. This reduction in funding means that some activities will need to be decommissioned to ensure services operate within the budget available to the council for cultural services including the statutory library service.

The budget for cultural service which includes libraries will have reduced from £10.4m in 2014 to £6.5m by 2018. These figures do not include any further reductions, which are likely to be announced as part of the government’s autumn statement on public spending. Maintaining the status quo with the level of funding available is not an option.

The Culture 2020 report sets out proposals for the future model of library service delivery across the borough following the recent consultation and a period of review and reflection.
The proposals seek to deliver a service which is ‘comprehensive and efficient’ which is required under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, while also achieving savings of xxx, as a contribution to the overall reduction in the Cultural Services budget.

Between 30 January and 24 April 2015 the council consulted on proposals for the future of culture services which it funds including libraries. The results of the consultation process have provided a range of valuable information and this feedback has guided the development of the revised library offer.

This Equality Impact Assessment sets outs out the impact for the remodelled library service and the mitigations.

**The current service**

Lambeth Council runs 10 libraries spread across the borough. These libraries are:

- Brixton Library: located in the centre of Brixton, next to the Ritzy Cinema. Also contains the Reference Library for the borough.
- Carnegie Library: located within a residential area between Denmark Hill and Loughborough Junction.
- Clapham Library: located on Clapham High Street (new building opened in 2012)
- Durning Library: located in Kennington, close to Kennington Tube station.
- Minet Library: located within a residential area on Knatchbull Road, close to Myatt's Fields Park. Also contains the borough’s Archives.
- Tate South Lambeth Library: located on South Lambeth Road, between Vauxhall and Stockwell tube stations
- Streatham Tate Library: located on Streatham High Road (refurbished library opened in March 2014)
- Waterloo Library: near Waterloo Station, located in Lower Marsh, right next to the market, in a building shared with the a job shop.
- West Norwood: temporarily located on Knights Hill, in the Old Library which is now a youth centre, while the development of the new library site next to Norwood cemetery is in progress.
- Upper Norwood Joint Library: part of the shopping parade on Westow Hill, near Gypsy Hill and Crystal Palace stations.
**Lambeth Library Service:** Libraries provide free and universal access to books, information, the internet, informal learning and support for families and individuals through reading and a wide range of activities and events for all age groups.

**Services in every library include:**
- Books, DVDS, audio books, e-books and e-magazines for loan, including stock in community languages
- A range of daily newspapers and magazines
- Free use of computers with internet access,
- Free Wi-Fi access
- Photocopying, scanning and printing facilities
- An information and enquiry service including free access to book and online reference resources and regular advice sessions.
- Reading Groups for adults and children supported by professional staff
- Support for the visually impaired and those with low literacy levels or dyslexia using advanced reading technology
- Special educational need material and activities
- An extensive programme of events for all ages including the Summer Reading Challenge, Black History Month and the Readers and Writers Festival and regular author talks
- A range of activities covering health, business, careers, IT and coding, arts and craft.
- Parent and toddler sessions supporting school readiness eg rhyme time, wriggle and rhyme, baby bounce.
- Study space, study guides and homework clubs
- Meetings rooms and/or library space for hire

Libraries also provide
- Home visit service – delivering books to residents who are unable to access their local library due to age or a disability
- Deposit collections to over 40 sites across the borough i.e. collections of books are left for a three month period in sheltered housing complexes, day centres etc. for residents or those attending the day centre.
- A library for HMP Brixton, which is funded by an agency of the Ministry of Justice.
### Library visit figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>312,278</td>
<td>326,936</td>
<td>271,387</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>32,559</td>
<td>37,416</td>
<td>53,044</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>346,377</td>
<td>432,004</td>
<td>422,854</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>83,625</td>
<td>82,695</td>
<td>73,699</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minet</td>
<td>49,408</td>
<td>48,325</td>
<td>53,685</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South</td>
<td>86,578</td>
<td>94,186</td>
<td>96,948</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>198,073</td>
<td>76,332</td>
<td>257,957</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>37,281</td>
<td>36,947</td>
<td>42,252</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>36,463</td>
<td>32,758</td>
<td>37,672</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Norwood Joint Library</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>61,798</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,182,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,229,397</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,371,998</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33% of all Lambeth households use Lambeth libraries

### Library issues:

|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------|

---

1 Residents survey 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>142,242</td>
<td>147,972</td>
<td>111,026</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>40,523</td>
<td>48,542</td>
<td>54,107</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>104,161</td>
<td>123,912</td>
<td>104,137</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Library Service</td>
<td>39,795</td>
<td>31,536</td>
<td>31,443</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>48,549</td>
<td>49,169</td>
<td>45,406</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minet</td>
<td>32,422</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>28,094</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lambeth</td>
<td>49,262</td>
<td>45,687</td>
<td>49,240</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Support Services/Head Office</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>146,253</td>
<td>82,426</td>
<td>158,404</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>20,373</td>
<td>23,181</td>
<td>21,482</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>31,606</td>
<td>41,421</td>
<td>38,541</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Norwood</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>80,880</td>
<td>68,358</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>657,183</td>
<td>707,003</td>
<td>710,481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CIPFA 2013-14\(^2\) report indicates that Lambeth has the lowest level of book stock per 1000 population and the lowest level of book issues compared to other boroughs in their comparison group. Their analysis suggests that the number of active borrowers per 1,000 population is a key indication of how well the library service engages with the public. However, engagement will be influenced by a range of factors and Lambeth is in the lowest quartile for provision of stock and public computers, level of staff and service points (libraries) in relation to its population size.

\(^2\) CIPFA 2013-14
### Library membership figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% split for 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>16966</td>
<td>17124</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>2885</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>12037</td>
<td>11819</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>3863</td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minet</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South</td>
<td>4068</td>
<td>4576</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>8698</td>
<td>12852</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>4182</td>
<td>3931</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNJL</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>8,172</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56636</td>
<td>71,029</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Peoples Network Computers (PNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Adult PCN with internet</th>
<th>Children’s PNC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9% of the population in Lambeth accessed the internet at a Lambeth Library.  

Access to computers: Lambeth has the lowest number of library computers and computer hours available per population\(^4\) compared with other inner London boroughs.

**The Proposal: Culture 2020**

In addition to the government’s austerity programme and reductions in public sector funding, some of the challenges facing Lambeth over the next few years include:

- A growing population: between 2015 and 2024, the population is projected to rise by 10%. There are however variations within this projection for specific residents and health issues. Women and older people remain those considered to be most at risk of social isolation, low level mental health issues and obesity.

- Increased health and wellbeing demands: by 2024 there will be 42.6% more people aged 55-64

- A disproportionate impact/risk of poor health on specific residents

**Culture 2020** sets out proposals for the delivery of an integrated, holistic approach to preventing poor health, which utilises the borough’s culture, physical and sports assets to secure people are healthier for longer.

- No matter where you live in Lambeth you should be within 20 minutes average walking time from somewhere you can enjoy affordable activities, which will improve your health

---

\(^3\) Residents Survey 2015  
\(^4\) CIPFA 2013-14
and wellbeing.
- 85% of Lambeth’s population are engaged in cultural, sports and physical activities as a routine part of their lives.
- All residents have choice and affordable access to excellent facilities where they can engage in cultural, sports and physical activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe and interesting spaces: Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are obvious tensions between the funding available, the cost of the existing service, feedback from consultation and meeting statutory obligations. Maintaining the current service in this environment is not an option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The service will be re-modeled around town centre and neighbourhood libraries and include greater flexibilities to meet changing needs, continue to build opportunities for residents to volunteer in the service to increase opening hours where the demand exists, as well as:

- Using library buildings differently to generate more income and prevent closure where possible.
- Concentrating statutory obligations, not exclusively, but increasingly through town centre libraries where 77%[^5] of users currently access the service.
- Diversifying and broaden access to services at library buildings to increase usage and to deliver the outcome people are healthier for longer.
- Increasing access hours to the remodeled service.
- Creating sustainable funding sources for literacy support projects, which are community-led.
- The borough’s statutory library service will be delivered from 5 town centre libraries: Clapham, Streatham, Brixton, Durning or Tate South and West Norwood.
- There are no proposed changes to the total book stock, which currently stands at 231,677 books.

[^5]: 2014-15 library usage figures for Brixton, Streatham, Clapham and Durning libraries
**Town Centre Library**

There will be 5 Town Centre libraries at Streatham, Clapham, Brixton, West Norwood and Durning or Tate South libraries which will deliver the borough’s universal library service.

77% of users currently access the service through these sites and by providing additional capacity at Durning library or Tate South, this figure is likely to increase to 80% by 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Current opening hours</th>
<th>New opening hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>30.5 to be increased</td>
<td>55 (When Nettlefold reopens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shortly to 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning or Tate South</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(temporary North Lambeth Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the proposals set out within the Cabinet report, there are no changes proposed to Brixton, Streatham, Clapham and West Norwood (when Nettlefold reopens) which are open 7 days per week. The opening hours for Durning or Tate South library will be increased in line with the other four town centre libraries and the building will be refurbished in 2016/17 to improve the layout and access to the building.

All the town centre libraries are in locations which are easily accessible by public transport.

**Brixton Tate Library**: located in the heart of Brixton, the library provides books, DVDs and audio books for loan, free use of Wi-Fi, newspapers and periodicals, computers, scanning, printing, email, word-processing and study space. It houses the main reference and information service for the borough on the first floor.

**Clapham Library**: has the highest number of visitors and is, located on Clapham High Street. It opened on its current site in July 2012. The library provides books, DVDs and audio books for loan, free use of Wi-Fi, newspapers and periodicals, computers, scanning, printing, email,
word-processing and study space. It has fully equipped meeting rooms and large performance space for hire.

**Streatham Tate Library:** The building was refurbished in 2013 and re-opened in its current format in March 2014. The refurbishment was part funded by the Mayors Outer London Fund. The library provides books, DVDs and audio books for loan, free use of Wi-Fi, newspapers and periodicals, computers, scanning, printing, email, word-processing and study space, as well as the refurbished Mark Bennett Streatham Centre.

**West Norwood:** The temporary library provision in West Norwood, operating from the Old Library building, will close during 2017-18 and will be relocated back into the redeveloped Nettlefold Centre. Following the relocation of the library to the Nettlefold Centre the opening hours will be increased to 55 hours per week.

**North Lambeth:** Tate South Lambeth library was originally proposed as a location for the library hub servicing for the north of the borough. Following further reflection on the consultation feedback and a review of the financial impact of not having the endowment operational from 2016, this proposal is no longer being pursued. This constitutes a change to what was proposed in the Culture 2020 consultation and we recommend a 4 weeks consultation period from 2nd November 2015 until midday 27th November 2015 on this specific issue.

**Neighbourhood Library Service**

22.5%\(^6\) of library users currently access the service via Waterloo, Tate South Lambeth, Carnegie, Upper Norwood and Minet Libraries. This report recommends significant changes to the service delivered in these neighbourhoods. This will include the decommissioning of the existing service and the creation of a neighbourhood library model. This will consist of:

- Free access to the internet.
- Study space.
- Book stock will be managed by library service to reflect local need, culture and language.
- A self-service machine providing residents with access to borrowing a reduced selection of books, as well as the ability to return them.
- There will be no permanent Lambeth library staff on site for the libraries’ opening hours. Site

---

\(^6\) 2014-15 library usage figures for Tate South Lambeth, Carnegie, Minet and Upper Norwood Joint Library
security will be provided by the agency managing the whole site.

- Each neighbourhood library is within a reasonable distance of a town centre library either on foot, public transport, or private car.

As a result of recommendations in the Culture 2020 report, library users currently accessing the service at Waterloo, Tate South Lambeth, Carnegie, Upper Norwood and Minet Libraries will experience:

- A reduction in physical space for the library service at these sites.
- A reduction in the range of library services on offer at these sites.
- No professional library interface at these sites.
- A detrimental impact on the distance they may need to travel, if they wish to access a broader range of library services. It is also recognised that elderly, disabled residents or those with small children may find the extra distance and cost problematic.

**Waterloo**

The closure of the Waterloo library service was proposed during the Culture 2020 consultation. The report confirms this proposal, which will be implemented no later than April 2016. At this point the service will close and the site will be declared surplus to requirements for the provision of a library service.

In mitigation the council will partner with Oasis Charitable Trust to provide a library offer at the Oasis Centre, 1 Kennington Road, London, SE1 7QP from May 2016. This site is 0.77 miles from Durning library and 1.6 miles from Tate South – one of which will be the nearest Town Centre library.

The services on offer at this neighbourhood library will include:

- Book loaning and returns.
- A Community coffee shop (open 7 days per week).
- A home for the Waterloo Food-bank.
- Free public IT access (Wi-Fi and physical access points).

---

7 Distances calculated using Transport for London Journey Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 2 (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - The Oasis debt advice service.  
- IT access (Wi-Fi and physical access points).  
- A Credit Union.  
- A space for general community activities.  

**Gipsy Hill (Upper Norwood Joint Library)**

Upper Norwood Joint Library is within 1.6 miles from West Norwood library.

The service is jointly funded by Lambeth and Croydon council’s and is located at 41 Westow Hill, London, SE19 1TJ. The building is also jointly owned by both local authorities.

The Upper Norwood Joint Library Trust, a community-led charity, has been seeking transfer of the building and service to them for several years. Lambeth has supported this approach since the adoption of the Cooperative Libraries policy. Following consideration of the Trust’s business plan this report puts in place the timeline to deliver this transfer by no later than June 2016.

In the meantime this report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and is replaced by a neighbourhood library service.

**Vassall: (Minet Library)**

Minet library is 1.1 mile from the Brixton library.

The council originally proposed disposal of the Minet library site, 52 Knatchbull Road, London SE5 9QY, with the resulting capital receipt being used to part fund the establishment of a library endowment fund.

Following reflection of the consultation feedback the report recommends that disposal of the site is no longer sought and that the redevelopment option be pursued by 2020.

The report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and that the site be transformed into a healthy living centre providing a gym, neighbourhood library service and maintenance of the borough archive. An options appraisal will be undertaken for the long term location for the archive.
Herne Hill (Carnegie Library)

Carnegie library is 1.1 mile from Brixton library.

A community-led steering group has been seeking to establish a local charitable Trust, which would take on the management of Carnegie library building, 118 Herne Hill Road, London, SE24 0AG. The ambition of the steering group is to develop the facility into a broader community hub providing a wider range of services, cultural activities, a base for social enterprise, as well as a library service. These plans are unlikely to be fully realised until 2020 at the earliest given the complexities of setting up the trust and securing grants from external agencies like the Heritage Lottery Fund.

There remains the potential of an alternative proposal for this library coming emerging from the Friends of Carnegie Library. At the point of writing this report no further details are available on the financial sustainability of this proposal other than an outlined proposal.

This report recommends the current library service is decommissioned by April 2016 and the site be transformed into a healthy living centre providing a gym, neighbourhood library service, community hire, rental and maintenance of the library stock management system.

Oval (Tate South Lambeth Library) – proposal

Tate South Lambeth library, 180 South Lambeth Road, Vauxhall, London SW8 1QP is 1.3 miles from Clapham library and 1.4 miles from Brixton library. Oval ward has good public transport links.

Following further reflection on the consultation feedback and a review of the financial impact of not having the endowment operational from 2016, this proposal is no longer being pursued. This constitutes a change to what was proposed in the Culture 2020 consultation and we recommend a 4 weeks consultation period from 2nd November 2015 until midday 27th November 2015 on this specific issue.
Neighbourhood library opening hours

When reopened as healthy living centres access to the neighbourhood library service will be coterminous with the opening hours in each healthy living centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Current library opening hours</th>
<th>Opening hours under new model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Hill (Upper Norwood Joint Library)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall (Minet)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill (Carnegie)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval (Tate South Lambeth) proposal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>283.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There will be no change to the number of Public Network Computers (PNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Adult PCN with internet</th>
<th>Children’s PNC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill (Carnegie)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall (Minet)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval (Tate South) proposal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Hill (Upper Norwood Joint Library)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of Public Networks Computers available at the Oasis site has not yet been confirmed.

2.0 Analysing your equalities evidence

2.1 Evidence
Any proposed business activity, new policy or strategy, service change, or procurement must be informed by carrying out an assessment of the likely impact that it may have. In this section please include both data and analysis which shows that you understand how this decision is likely to affect residents that fall under the protected characteristics enshrined in law and the local characteristics which we consider to be important in Lambeth (language, health and socio-economic factors). Please check the council’s equality and monitoring policy and your division’s self-assessment. Each division in 2011/12 reviewed its equality data and completed a self-assessment about what equality data is relevant and available?

IF YOUR PROPOSAL ALSO IMPACTS ON LAMBETH COUNCIL STAFF YOU NEED TO COMPLETE A STAFFING EIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected characteristics and local equality characteristics</th>
<th>Impact analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For each characteristic please indicate the type of impact (i.e. positive, negative, positive and negative, none, or unknown), and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please explain how you justify your claims around impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please include any data and evidence that you have collected including from surveys, performance data or complaints to support your proposed changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please indicate sources of data and the date it relates to/was produced (e.g. ‘Residents Survey, wave 10, April 12’ or ‘Lambeth Business Survey 2012’ etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comments: The library service is a universal service, which is free, and open to all. As a result it is difficult to give a full and accurate picture of everyone who uses the service. People can use the library facilities without registering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Positive and Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Around 40% of Lambeth’s population is white with a UK background(^8). White people make up 59% if the population, with round 40% of Lambeth residents being White British.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15% are from other white backgrounds: around 47,000. About two thirds of these are from Europe. 8% from Central and South America, 4% from North America and the Caribbean and 8% from Australasia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^8\) Lambeth State of the Borough Report 2014
• Black people make up a quarter of the population (25%). The largest non-white ethnic group is black African (11.5%) followed by black Caribbean (9.8%).
• Lambeth has a small Asian population compared to many places in London. Only 7.8% of Lambeth residents are from an Asian background (including Chinese).

Library usage by ethnic group[^9]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access to the internet:** Information from the 2015 residents’ survey indicates that nine out of 10 Lambeth residents have access to the internet. Despite the high proportion of residents able to access the internet, Black Caribbean residents are more likely to not have access to the internet. The 2014 residents’ survey identified that 20% of residents from Black Caribbean communities do not have access to the internet.

**Impact**

• 40% of the borough’s contact with residents will be online by 2017[^10]. Implementation of Universal Credit will mean many residents will have no choice but to access the internet to manage claims. We recognise that there may be an impact on residents with none or limited ICT skills who access neighbourhood libraries that are not staffed by the library service.

• The proposed changes may initially have a detrimental effect on community cohesion in the neighbourhoods where there is a reduced library offer as the library space is seen as safe community space where people can gather.

[^9]: Lambeth Library Service
[^10]: Draft Lambeth Digital Inclusion Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The neighbourhood libraries will continue to offer access to IT. There will be no change in the number of Public Network Computers (PNC) available for public use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As part of the Council’s plan to support residents to access services online, a Lambeth digital inclusion policy has been developed (which forms part of the customer access strategy). The policy aims to ensure that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘All residents have the access they need to the internet and the digital skills to support this’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ‘No residents are left behind during the digitalisation of Lambeth services.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The digital inclusion draft action plan which will be implemented by 2017 includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Digi-buddy training in key basic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Digi-buddies at key locations targeted digital outreach, IT equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Targeted work with residents in Olive Morris House, at job centres and housing offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The overall impact on community cohesion is likely to be neutral in terms of community cohesion once the healthy living centres are fully operational and the local community see the centres as safe spaces where they can still gather. The minimum opening hours for the centres will be 70 hours per week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive/Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are slightly more women than men resident in Lambeth. Around 155,400 females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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compared to 154,700 males (State of the Borough Report 2014).

The feedback from the Culture Services by 2020 consultation has identified that female respondents are more likely to oppose the proposals set out for the Lambeth library offer.

Library usage by gender\textsuperscript{11}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact

- We recognise that traditionally, women tend to use the library service more than men. For this reason, any changes to the service are likely to affect women more than men.

- Libraries are often seen as safe spaces for women and the proposed neighbourhood library model may have a disproportionate impact on this group.

Mitigation

- The neighbourhood libraries will continue to provide safe, neutral spaces for study and access to IT and will be open for an increased number of hours.

- Security for the buildings and the facilities will be provided by the organisation managing the whole site.

Gender re-assignment

Unknown

It is estimated that there are 20 transgender people per 100,000\textsuperscript{12} in the UK, which suggests that

\textsuperscript{11} Information provided by Lambeth Library Service

\textsuperscript{12} Information provided by Lambeth Library Service
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Positive/Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to the State of the Borough report (2014) about 37,000 people in Lambeth report that their day-to-day activities are limited by long-term illness or a disability. About 17,000 limited a lot and 20,000 limited a little.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are 29,000 people of working age in Lambeth who are disabled (census 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About 60% of people with a limiting health condition are aged over 50. About 12% of residents aged 55-64 have a limiting condition, as do 27% of 64-74s, 46% of 75-84s and 64% of over 85s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from the residents survey (2014) found that 12-16% of adults classified themselves as having a long-term disability or health condition; 2-3% of young people aged 11-19 years classified themselves in this way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figures on the number of library users that are registered as disabled are not collected. Lambeth libraries carried out a survey of 2446 adult library users in 2013. Of the 2018 library users that answered this question, overall 20% said they had a disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the survey information, the breakdown by library is as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brixton 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Streatham 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• West Norwood 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clapham 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Durning 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Carnegie 18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Minet 14%
- South Lambeth 19%
- Waterloo 11%
- Upper Norwood Joint Library – no information available

Nine out of 10 Lambeth residents have access to the internet\(^{13}\). Disabled people continue to be more likely to have no access to the internet (42%) (Residents’ survey 2014).

From the culture 2020 consultation, 92 per cent of respondents felt that it is important to have a library, leisure centre or park within twenty minutes’ walk from their home, and 93 per cent said that they would be likely to go there if such a place existed. Agreement with these sentiments is not as strong among residents with a long term illness, disability or infirmity.

**Impact**

- It is not anticipated that the neighbourhood library model will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of disability when compared to the population of Lambeth as a whole.

- Familiarity, with locations and staff are important factors for some groups of people with disabilities who rely on staff for additional support. We recognise that there will be an impact on these groups of people who access neighbourhood libraries that are not staffed by the library service.

- People who have a visual impairment - blind or partially sighted and who are familiar with the library layout may be adversely affected following changes to the layout of the building resulting from the move to a neighbourhood library model.

- One of the concerns for this equality strand will be the impact on access to ICT and specialist equipment for people who are blind or partially sighted at the neighbourhood library locations which will no longer be staffed on a permanent basis. Tate South Lambeth for example runs a regular weekly session for residents with a visual impairment.

---

\(^{13}\) Residents Survey 2014
• There will be a detrimental impact on residents with a physical disability who will have further to walk/travel to a town centre library.

• People with disabilities may be more likely to feel more vulnerable accessing services within the unstaffed neighbourhood libraries.

• Library users with physical or learning difficulties may be more likely to experience difficulties with using the self-service technology in the neighbourhood libraries.

• People with sensory impairments – hearing or sight may not have the same access to the range of audio and large print books at neighbourhood libraries.

Mitigation

• In terms of mobility related disabilities, those accessing a neighbourhood library would not have to travel any further than they currently do. There will be no additional cost implications. The neighbourhood libraries are within 1.6 miles of the nearest Town Centre library.

• Security for the neighbourhood libraries, buildings and other facilities will be provided by the organisation managing the whole site.

• 4 of the 5 neighbourhood libraries will be delivered from buildings which previously housed the library service. All the sites are accessible. The Oasis site at Waterloo will be DDA compliant.

• The universal library service will be delivered from 5 town centre sites: Brixton, Clapham, West Norwood, Streatham and Durning or Tate South which are all accessible. Work will be undertaken at Durning Library during 2016/17 to improve access to the site if this is the site selected following the consultation period from 2nd November 2015 until midday 27th November 2015 on this specific issue.

• Space and specialist IT equipment will continue to be made available for the sensory
impairment group that meets weekly at Tate South once the site is reopened as the Tate South healthy living centre.

- The Library services will continue to provide a home delivery visiting service for residents with disabilities or long term health conditions which prevents them from travelling to a library to access these services.

- Book stock in the neighbourhood libraries will be planned and managed by Lambeth library service to reflect local need including audio books and large print books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive and negative</td>
<td>As with many London boroughs Lambeth has a young age profile. This is due to the high numbers of working age residents rather than high number of children or teenagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children and young people:</strong></td>
<td>About a fifth – 21% - of Lambeth’s population is aged 20 or under, around 66,000 people. Compared to other London boroughs, there is a low percentage of people ages 15 to 19 (4.6%)(^\text{14})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young working age:</strong></td>
<td>Over half of the population, 51%, is aged between 20 and 44, around 157,000 people. About two-thirds of young working age people are over 30. Lambeth is in the top ten London boroughs for people aged 20 to 24 (8.8%), and the top five for people aged 25 to 29 (14.2%) and 30 to 44 (28.8%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older working age:</strong></td>
<td>Less than a fifth of the population, 18%, is aged between 45 and 64, around 57,000 people. Nearly four fifths of older working age people are under 60. Only 3% are aged 60 to 64, which is in the bottom five boroughs in London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older people:</strong></td>
<td>Less than a tenth, 7.6%, of the population is aged 65 or over, 23,000 people. About half of older people are aged 65-74. Lambeth is in the bottom five boroughs in London in all older age categories: 65 to 74 (4.2%), 75 to 84 (2.5%), 85 to 89 (0.6%) and 90 and over (0.3%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) Lambeth: State of the Borough Report 2014
The borough’s population is projected to grow by just over 1% per year for the next five years, and by 1% or just under in the five years after that. The borough will continue to have a majority of young working age people (20-44). There is projected to be decrease in people aged 15-29, and an increase in the proportion of people aged 55-64.

Around 21% of residents aged 55 to 64, and 47% over the age of 65 do not have access to the internet. (residents’ survey 2014)

**Current library membership figures by age group** (based on figures at July 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4 yrs.</th>
<th>5-11yr</th>
<th>12-15yr</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>Over 18</th>
<th>Over 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>12656</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>8365</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minet</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lambeth</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNJL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4941</td>
<td></td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact:**

- Children and young people make extensive use of libraries particularly after school. One of the key issues potentially affecting this equality strand is the impact on education attainment, access to neutral, safe space for study and access to IT.

- There may be some concerns that because of the increased use of public transport and greater walking distances to town centre libraries in order to access a wide choice of books, that young people may be at greater risk of being involved in road traffic accidents and or gang related incidents.
There may be some concerns that because of the increased use of public transport and greater walking distances to town centre libraries in order to access a wide choice of books, older people may be at greater risk of being involved in road traffic accidents particularly during the winter months.

There may be an impact particularly for young children around the lack of access to activities such as story time at the unstaffed neighbourhood libraries.

**Mitigation**

- The neighbourhood library service, which will offer a small selection of books, will be delivered from buildings which have previously housed the library service. The buildings will continue to provide safe, neutral spaces for study and access to IT. Security for the buildings will be provided by the organisation managing the building.

- There will be no change in the number of computer terminals available for public use at the (Minet) Vassall, (Carnegie) Herne Hill, (Upper Norwood Joint Library) Gipsy Hill and (Tate South) Oval neighbourhood library sites.

- The Healthy Living Centres which house the neighbourhood libraries will be open for an increased number of hours for residents to access study space and IT.

- The neighbourhood library sites are a maximum of 1.6 miles from the nearest town centre library. There is no change in the distance between the Town centre and neighbourhood libraries. Library users will not have to travel any further to access a library service. All the libraries sites are accessible by public transport.

- The library service will continue to provide a home visiting service for older people who have problems accessing the service from neighbourhood or town centre libraries.

- The library service will continue to run the deposits and collection scheme across the borough for sheltered housing complexes, day centres etc. for residents or those attending the day centre etc. to use at their leisure.
• A reduced children’s book offer will be available from the neighbourhood library.

• The library service will continue to provide and distribute the DCMS funded Bookstart Baby Packs for 0 to 12 month olds and Treasure Packs for 3 years olds.

• Space will continue to be made available for the provision of parent and toddler sessions in the neighbourhood libraries.

• The council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grant programme, which will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes, including parent and toddler groups.

• The Council will continue to run parent and toddler sessions such as story time, wriggle and rhyme and rhyme time etc. from the five town centre libraries.

• Activities for all age groups will continue to take place across the town centre libraries including reading groups, the summer reading challenge, story time sessions and homework support.

• The Lambeth Early Years Partnership (LEAP), which includes Lambeth Council, the Clinical Commissioning Group, Kings Health Partners, Public Health, Voluntary and Community sector organisations and the National Children’s Bureau is a 10 year, multi million pound Lottery funded initiative operating in four areas within Lambeth; Stockwell, Vassall, Coldharbour and Tulse Hill. The programme provides a range of programmes to support parents from pregnancy until their child is four years old through integrated care across health, children’s services and social care.
Recent health estimates suggest that Lambeth has one of the largest populations of men who have sex with men (MSM) in the UK. 6.3-5% of respondents to the Lambeth Residents’ Survey 2014 identified themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heterosexual / straight</th>
<th>Gay / lesbian</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>no. of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact:**
The Residents Survey 2014 suggests that there is no difference in the use or satisfaction of library services by sexuality. The library service offers a varied programme of activities and events focussed on equalities.

It is not anticipated that the neighbourhood library model will have a disproportionate impact on the grounds of sexual orientation.

Book stock in the neighbourhood libraries will be planned and managed by Lambeth library service to reflect local need and sexual orientation.

**Religion and belief**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Over 60% of Lambeth residents have a religion and 28% have no religion. Christians (53%) and Muslims (7%) are the largest group of residents by religion. Over a quarter of residents have no religion. These are overwhelmingly white British (60%); white other (15%), and 9% of mixed.

---
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## Library usage by religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>No religion</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact:**

- It is recognised that for a number of faith groups libraries are regarded as safe places for women and children and that the proposed neighbourhood library model may have a disproportionate impact on these groups.

- There may be an impact on religious groups that rent space for their activities in the proposed neighbourhood libraries.

**Mitigation**

- The buildings housing the neighbourhood library service will continue to provide safe, neutral spaces for study and access to IT. Security for the buildings will be provided by the organisation managing the building.

- Book stock in the neighbourhood libraries will be planned and managed by Lambeth library service to reflect local need and culture.

- We may not be able to mitigate against the impact of the loss of rental space available for hire by faith organisations within library buildings.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregnancy and maternity</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are around 4-5,000 births in Lambeth every year. Between 2-3% of respondents to Lambeth’s Residents’ Survey are currently pregnant or on maternity leave, suggesting that at any one time, there are between 6,000 and 9,000 Lambeth residents pregnant or on maternity leave (State of the Borough Report 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact:** Performance management systems do not currently collect data for this equality strand.

Although there is no monitoring of diversity of registered library users in this area of diversity, it is recognised that pregnant women may find access to the town centre libraries more difficult in the later stages of pregnancy. Access is likely to be more difficult if they have other young children, are lone parents or experience economic or social deprivation.

**Mitigating actions:**

- The neighbourhood library, which will provide a small selection of books including a children’s book offer.

- The Lambeth Early Years Partnership (LEAP), which includes Lambeth Council, the Clinical Commissioning Group, Kings Health Partners, Public Health, Voluntary and Community sector organisations and the National Children’s Bureau is a 10 year, multi million pound Lottery Funded initiative operating in four areas within Lambeth; Stockwell, Vassall, Coldharbour and Tulse Hill. LEAP provides a range of programmes from Children’ Centres to support parents from pregnancy until their child is four years old through integrated care across health, children’s services and social care

- The Council will continue to run parent and toddler sessions such as story time, wriggle and rhyme and rhyme time from the five town centre libraries.

- The council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grant programme, which will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes, including parent and toddler groups.
Marriage and civil partnership

**Unknown**

**Impact:** Performance management systems do not currently collect data for this equality strand.

The collection of data in respect of a person’s marital status is not deemed to be relevant to the provision of these services.

It is not anticipated that the neighbourhood library model will have a disproportionate impact on the grounds of marriage and civil partnership.

---

Socio-economic factors (this is not a statutory protected characteristic)

**Positive and Negative**

Like many London boroughs, Lambeth has areas of affluence and areas of poverty, often side by side. There is a persistent pool of economically inactive people with little mobility and this group tends to experience high levels of social exclusion and poor education, employment and health outcomes.¹⁹

The latest deprivation data is the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). IMD 2010 places Lambeth as the 8th most deprived borough in London and 14th most deprived in England, a relative worsening of position since 2008 when Lambeth was ranked 19th most deprived.

Those living in the most deprived areas are spread throughout the borough but are particularly concentrated in Coldharbour ward. The most affluent areas include the Thames-side part of Bishops ward and the Dulwich border area of Thurlow Park.

The eight areas of Lambeth which are among the 10% most deprived in the country include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell</td>
<td>Area near Cowley Road including Myatt’s Field North Estate is classified as severely deprived in income and wider barriers to service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>Area east of Lyham Road, south to Dumbarton Road, which includes Brixton Prison and Blenheim Gardens Estate. It is classified as severely severely deprived.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁹ Lambeth: State of the Borough Report 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area east of Brixton Road between Loughborough Road and Villa Road, which includes the Angell Town Estate,</td>
<td>is classified as severely deprived in income, employment and wider barriers to services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area at the junction of Shakespeare Road and Coldharbour Lane</td>
<td>is classified as severely deprived in income affecting older people, wider barriers to services and crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moorlands Estate</td>
<td>is classified as severely deprived in income employment and wider barriers to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area at the junction of Tulse Hill and Christchurch Road including much of the St Martin’s Estate</td>
<td>is classified as severely deprived in income and wider barriers to services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>Area just north of Streatham Station, including Stanthorpe Road and Gleneldon Road, as far north as Sunnyhill Road is classified as severely deprived in health and disability, wider barriers to services, crime and indoor living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>Area at the junction of Crown Lane and Knights Hill, including Holderness and Portobello Estates is classified as severely deprived in income and wider barriers to services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.

- Access to free school meals is a local indicator of economic disadvantage. The largest concentration of children accessing free school meals are in Coldharbour and Tulse Hill wards, with hotspots in Vassall, Streatham Wells, Thornton and Thurlow Park wards. ²⁰

**Impact**

- The proposed model of 5 town centre libraries and 5 neighbourhood libraries could considerably reduce the number of access points to free internet access, advice and support from library staff including the areas of high deprivation in the borough.

²⁰ Lambeth Public Health Report 2014
may impact on residents with no or limited ICT skills that rely on library staff for support. There may be a disproportionate impact on people on low incomes and those with low digital literacy skills who need support with online job applications and benefit applications.

- There may be a cost implication for some residents who need to travel further to access a wider range of books/activities that are not available from the neighbourhood libraries.

- We recognise that there may be an impact on residents particularly those on low incomes who see their local library as a safe, warm place that they can access at no cost.

Mitigation

- Access to free Wi-Fi and computers will be available in the neighbourhood libraries.

- As part of the Council’s plan to support residents to access services online, the council has developed a Lambeth digital inclusion policy (which forms part of the customer access strategy). The policy which is scheduled to be implemented by 2017 aims to ensure that:

  - All residents have the access they need to the internet and the digital skills to support this.
  - ‘No residents are left behind during the digitalisation of Lambeth services.’

  Digi-buddies will:
  - Provide training in key basic skills
  - Be located at key locations and undertake targeted digital outreach
  - Undertake targeted work with residents in Olive Morris House, at job centres and housing offices

- Whilst young people may have to travel further to access a wider selection of books, affordability will not necessarily be an issue as bus travel is free for young people while in full time education.
If access to a town centre library is required then disabled and elderly residents who are more mobile will be able to use their Freedom Bus pass, to access a library town centre. Overall there is no significant change in the distance a disabled or elderly person is required to travel to access the service through either a town centre, or neighbourhood library service. The maximum distance from a neighbourhood library to the nearest Town Centre library is 1.6m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Library</th>
<th>Town Centre library</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Journey time based on moderate walking speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oval (Tate South)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.4 miles</td>
<td>34 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 miles</td>
<td>32 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill (Carnegie)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.1 mile</td>
<td>27 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall (Minet)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.0 mile</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis site Waterloo</td>
<td>Durning Library or Tate South</td>
<td>0.7 miles (Durning) &amp; 1.6 miles (Tate South)</td>
<td>17 minutes or 38 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Hill (Upper Norwood Joint Library)</td>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>1.6 miles</td>
<td>38 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The neighbourhood libraries (healthy living centres) will provide access to safe spaces for residents of all ages.
## protected characteristic

Approximately 140 different languages are spoken by families in the borough, with the most common languages after English being Portuguese (7% of pupils), Spanish (5%), Somali (4.5%), French (3.7%), Yoruba (3.6%), Akan/Twi-Fante (2.8%), Polish and Arabic (both 2.4%) and Bengali (1.5%).

There are 3,587 people who live in Lambeth who were born in the UK but whose main language is not English, 1.2% of all usual residents aged 3 and over. Of these 86% can speak English well or very well (735 and 2,347 respectively). 348 cannot speak English well (9.7%) and 157 cannot speak English (4.4%).

**Impact:** Performance management systems do not currently collect data for this equality strand.

**Mitigation:** Book stock in the neighbourhood libraries will be planned and managed by Lambeth library service to reflect local need, culture and community languages.

## Health

*(this is not a statutory protected characteristic)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Over 85% of people in Lambeth say that they are in good or very good health. 49% in very good health. There are around 14,000 people who are in bad health or very bad health, just under 5% of the population.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Around 25,000 households have someone with a long-term health condition or disability. About 6% of Lambeth residents have their day-to-day activities limited a lot by a long-term health problem or disability and another 6% are limited a little.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Lambeth Public Health Report outlines the following:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Healthy life expectancy for men in Lambeth is 2.7 years lower than in England, and 1.5 years lower for women.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>While more people are engaged in economic activity than in 2008, the people with long-term conditions represent over a quarter of those not working, which is 10% higher than at the start of the recession.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In 2011, mental ill health was the largest single source of disability in the UK, accounting</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


for 22.8 per cent of the ‘burden of disease’

- At any one time, 16.2% of the adult population (age 16 & over) may have a common mental disorder (CMD), such as depression, anxiety, panic disorder, phobias, obsessive compulsive disorders and eating disorders\(^\text{23}\). This is about 51,000 people in Lambeth (based on the GP registered population).

- Physical inactivity has a significant burden on healthcare costs and the economy. Inactivity costs the UK economy approx. £20 billion every year. UK Active (Turning the tide of inactivity) estimates that just a 1% reduction in the rates of inactivity each year for 5 years would save the UK around £1.2 billion.

- Research by the British Heart Foundation Promotion Group estimated the cost of inactivity in 2009 in Lambeth alone as being £4.8m (Sport England Local Area profile). This cost is likely to be much higher if other disease areas such as mental health and obesity, which were not included in this estimate.

- Cardio vascular disease accounted for 25% of the total number of deaths in Lambeth in 2010, with heart disease being the commonest cause. There is a higher than average incidences of mental ill health - 25,500 adults are known to have depression, 4,500 adults have a severe mental health illness and over 3,000 children have received mental health services.

- Hypertension is a major risk factor for heart disease and strokes – it is more common, more severe and has an earlier onset in black Africans than in white British people. Exercise and weight management have an important role to play in preventing hypertension. The Commissioning proposals explore the possibility of different leisure pricing to cross subside interventions in vulnerable children and adults or those with disabilities.

- The Health Survey of England (2012) reveals that, only 56% of adults meet the guidelines for the recommended levels of physical activity and 28.5 of adults fail to achieve 30 minutes of activity over seven days. Only 21% of boys and 16% of girls aged 5-15 are achieving 60 minutes of physical activity per day.

---

\(^{23}\) Public Health Report 2014
- 25% of 10-11 years olds are obese. 10.8% of children in Reception year and 24.2% of Year 6 children are recorded as obese, with the highest rates amongst the ethnic groups Black and Black British, Asian or Asian British, Any Other Ethnic Group and Mixed. It is estimated that 50% of children in Lambeth are inactive (a risk factor for obesity).\(^\text{24}\)

- There has been increasing recognition of the role the environment can play in enhancing health. Less active lifestyles have led to an increase in preventable diseases, which are placing increasing pressures on the National Health Service. Simply being outside in a green space can promote mental wellbeing, relieve stress, overcome isolation, improve social cohesion, and alleviate physical problems so that fewer working days are lost to ill health (CABE, 2009).


- Physical activity is higher in men at all ages (compared to women)
- Physical activity declines with increasing age for both men and women. The proportion of participants classed as inactive rises from 8% of men and 22% of women aged 16-34 to 74% respectively in those aged 85 and over.
- Physical activity is lower in low income households
- Certain ethnic groups have lower levels of physical activity
- Boys are more active than girls
- Only 7% of disabled adults participate in at least 30 minutes of moderate intensity sport three times per week, compared to 35% of all adults.

- “Literacy is a stronger predictor of individual’s health status than income, employment status, education level and racial or ethnic group.” (Weiss, cited in WHO, 2013). Evidence demonstrates a clear link between low literacy and poor health.

- It is estimated that 5.4% of adults aged 16-64 in Lambeth have entry level or below literacy. The Credible Intervals for this estimate are 4.1 and 6.1% at the 95 per cent level. This means

\(^{24}\) NHS Lambeth Annual Public Sector Equality Compliance Report – January 2013
that while the estimate is 5.4%, there is a 95% likelihood that the actual value is somewhere between 4.1 and 6.1%.25

- Wards that are above the Lambeth average are: Vassall, Tulse Hill, Prince’s, Stockwell, Coldharbour, Bishops, Gipsy Hill and Larkhall.

Impact

- Familiarity, with locations and staff are important factors for some groups of vulnerable people, i.e. those with disabilities or mental health problems who rely on staff for additional support. We recognise that there will be an impact on these residents who access neighbourhood libraries that are not staffed by the library service.

- There may be an impact on residents with low levels of literacy who rely on library staff for support in completing forms or accessing information.

- It is not anticipated that the move to a neighbourhood library model will have a detrimental impact on the health of the residents in the wards affected. In fact the establishment of the healthy living centres alongside the neighbourhood library should have positive impact on the health of the local community.

Mitigation

- It is not possible to mitigate the impact of the unstaffed neighbourhood libraries on groups of vulnerable people who rely on staff in their local library for support. The council will continue to provide a universal library service from five core sites: Brixton, Clapham, West Norwood, Durning or Tate South and Streatham. The maximum distance from a neighbourhood library to a Town Centre library is 1.6 miles.

25 Department for Business and Skills: Skills for life survey: 2009 all skills level estimate (published Dec 2012)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Library</th>
<th>Town Centre Library</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Journey time based on moderate walking speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oval (Tate South)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.4 miles</td>
<td>34 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 miles</td>
<td>32 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill (Carnegie)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.1 mile</td>
<td>27 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall (Minet)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.0 mile</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis site Waterloo</td>
<td>Durning Library or Tate South</td>
<td>0.7 miles (Durning) &amp; 1.6 miles Tate South</td>
<td>17 minutes or 38 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Hill (Upper Norwood Joint Library)</td>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>1.6 miles</td>
<td>38 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grants programme that will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes from May 2016.

- Adult Education provide a range of in colleges and community venues across Lambeth that are free or very low cost

- The Library service will continue to provide a home delivery visiting service for residents with a disability or a long term limiting health conditions which prevents them from travelling to a library to access these services.

- The library service will continue to run deposit collections at sites across the borough: collections of books are left for a three month period in sheltered housing complexes, day centres etc. for residents or those attending the day centre to use at their leisure

- The healthy living centres will provide a range of accessible and affordable activities for the
2.2 Gaps in evidence base
What gaps in information have you identified from your analysis? In your response please identify areas where more information is required and how you intend to fill in the gaps. If you are unable to fill in the gaps please state this clearly with justification.

3.0 Consultation, Involvement and Coproduction
3.1 Coproduction, involvement and consultation
Who are your key stakeholders and how have you consulted, coproduced or involved them? What difference did this make?

Key stakeholders include:
- Lambeth residents
- Current library users and potential future users
- Library staff
- Elected members
- Volunteer-led Friends of Lambeth Libraries
- Community and voluntary organisations
- Partner organisations

Public consultation on the proposals set out within Cultural services by 2012 took place between 30 January and 24 April 2015.

We used a number of different methods to obtain comments and feedback on the proposals. We used both quantitative and qualitative methods. These included:

Self-completion questionnaires
The questionnaire was produced as part of a consultation booklet that could be returned to any Lambeth library, by Freepost address, and online. Bulk copies of the booklets were available at all...
Lambeth libraries and leisure centres, the town hall and customer centres, park cafes. Copies were also sent to all GP surgeries and schools, as well as other address on request.

More extensive promotion and distribution of the online questionnaire was undertaken through digital media, the council’s regular communications channels, and via partners, stakeholders and residents.

**On-street survey**
More than 500, 10-minute on-street surveys were undertaken at six locations across the borough – Kennington cross, Gipsy Hill roundabout, Stockwell tube station, Coldharbour Lane/Loughborough Junction, Knight’s Hill in West Norwood and Streatham High Road nr Greyhound Lane.

These areas were selected to correspond with areas where we knew residents were less likely to use cultural services and where we would be more likely to hear from demographic groups which are traditionally under-represented in self-completion questionnaires.

The Campaign Company was commissioned to do the fieldwork and analysis for the on-street survey. It was a different format to the self-completion questionnaire, given the 10-minute guide time for each interview, and through this activity we aimed to understand how important people felt the different themes were, the kind of physical and cultural activities they do currently, and what motivates them.

**Young person’s survey**
A shorter questionnaire was developed to capture young people’s views about the activities they do, what they like to do, what they have done recently and what motivates them to take part in cultural activities.

There were seven questions in total, including tick boxes, rating questions and open questions. The questionnaire was aimed at year 5 and above and distributed primarily through the schools. Every school in Lambeth was sent 30 copies of the questionnaire and we asked that at least one class was encouraged to complete it. More copies of the questionnaire were available on request.
Questionnaires were also sent to libraries and sports clubs, on request, and were available at the Youth In Action meeting on Monday 30 March 2015 and the young person’s focus group. Where questionnaires were completed outside of school and respondents were under 16 years of age, we required a signature from a parent or guardian. This was to comply with the guidelines set out in the Market Research Society Code of Conduct.

Seven public events
These events were held at locations across the borough that reflected geography, venue types and where proposals had greater relevance. We held them at a variety of times to suit as many people as possible.

The format for each event was the same throughout and covered un-structured discussion with council officers and the lead cabinet member, as well as workshop groups and feedback.

Nine focus groups
The focus groups were an opportunity to explore some of the issues around the consultation in greater depth. We particularly wanted to hear from groups who are traditionally underrepresented in consultations and we reviewed the demographic data from the consultation after the mid-way point of the consultation to help determine the focus groups we would hold.

The nine focus groups were as follows:
- Older people – 17 older people recruited through the sheltered housing service
- Residents with mental health illnesses – 9 people from Mosaic Clubhouse
- Residents with physical disabilities – 7 people recruited with help from DASL (Disability Advice Service Lambeth)
- Blind or partially-sighted residents – 9 participants
- Young people – 23 young people recruited and facilitated by the Young Lambeth Cooperative
- Social housing tenants – 6 residents recruited through Lambeth Living
- Black Caribbean residents – 7 participants recruited via social media and a recruitment agency
- Black African residents – 7 participants recruited via social media and a recruitment agency
- English as a second language residents – 18 Portuguese residents recruited and facilitated by Stockwell Partnership
Other meetings
A number of additional meetings took place throughout the consultation and officers and councillors attended these to answer questions about the consultation. These events included:

- 30/1/2015 On the first day of consultation, Cllr Jane Edbrooke and council officers met individual with:
  - Minet Hub directors
  - Myatt’s Field Park Project
  - Friends of Carnegie Library
  - Friends of Lambeth Libraries, Chair
  - Carnegie Shadow Trust Board
- 5/2/2015 Carnegie Shadow Trust Board Committee meeting
- 9/2/2015 Friends of Durning Library full committee
- 11/2/2015 Waterloo Community Development Trust public meeting at Waterloo Library
- 11/2/2015 Friends of Durning Library Committee
- 16/2/2015 Upper Norwood Library Trust
- 18/2/2015 Lambeth Community Hubs
- 23/2/2015 Friends of Carnegie Library
- 27/2/2015 Minet Hub director’s meeting
- 11/3/2015 Friends of Tate South Lambeth Library Committee
- 11/3/2015 Longfield Hall Trust meeting
- 12/3/2015 Carnegie Shadow Trust reps meeting
- 29/3/2015 Youth in Action event

The consultation was publicised using a number of different methods:

Lambeth Council website
Lambeth Talk: the borough magazine is distributed through every door in the borough

- February edition – the consultation was highlighted in the Foreword by Cllr Lib Peck, Leader
- of Lambeth Council
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- March edition: a 4-page centrefold feature gave information about the consultation, the key proposals, the events and other ways to get involved
- April edition: a news story and a half page advert highlighted the end of consultation deadline

Love Lambeth Blog
Council e-newsletters
A3 and A4 posters: The first batch of posters produced was designed to publicise the public events and was distributed to libraries, leisure centres, other council buildings, schools, GP surgeries and parks. In the week leading up to each of the public events we also visited local shops and cafes to ask them to display copies. After the public events were over, revised posters were designed and distributed to libraries, leisure centres, other council buildings, schools, GP surgeries, parks cafes, arts organisations.

On street advertising: Posters were displayed across the 43 JCD sites on the borough’s pavements between 3/3/2015 and 17/3/2015

Postcards: A5 postcards were produced to promote the online consultation and all the public events. These were displayed in libraries, leisure centres and other council buildings and copies were also distributed to schools, GPs, housing offices, park cafes and arts organisations.

There was a strong response to the questionnaire with almost 1,650 questionnaire responses and more than 200 written submissions

Approximately 203 people attended the public meetings.

The diversity of the communities most represented within the consultation responses does not reflect the diversity of the active borrower population nor of the boroughs residents.

The results of the consultation process have provided a range of valuable additional information and this feedback has guided the development of the revised library offer.

### 3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation
and involvement
What gaps in consultation and involvement and coproduction have you identified (set out any gaps as they relate to specific equality groups)? Please describe where more consultation, involvement and/or coproduction is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification.

4.0 Conclusions, justification and action

4.1 Conclusions and justification
What are the main conclusions of this EIA? What, if any, disproportionate negative or positive equality impacts did you identify at 2.1? On what grounds do you justify them and how will they be mitigated?

The library service is a universal service, which is accessible to all members of the community.

Given the level of reductions in public sector funding, keeping things as they are is not an option and alternative options are required for the delivery of the service. The proposals overall are intended to have as positive an impact as possible given the context of reduced resources. However, as set out in this EIA the proposals will have a negative disproportionate impact on some groups.

A number of actions have been developed to help reduce the impact, or mitigate against where possible. However, there are some cases where the negative impact cannot be mitigated, these include:

- Library users with physical or learning difficulties may be more likely to experience difficulties with using the self-service technology in the neighbourhood libraries.
4.2 Equality Action plan

*Please list the equality issue/s identified through the evidence and the mitigating action to be taken. Please also detail the date when the action will be taken and the name and job title of the responsible officer.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Issue</th>
<th>Mitigating actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Race           | The neighbourhood libraries will continue to offer access to IT. There will be no change in the number of Public Network Computers (PNC) available for public use. As part of the Council’s plan to support residents to access services on line, a Lambeth digital inclusion policy has been developed (which forms part of the customer access strategy). The policy aims to ensure that: ‘All residents have the access they need to the internet and the digital skills to support this’ ‘No residents are left behind during the digitalisation of Lambeth services.’ The digital inclusion draft action plan which will be implemented by 2017 includes:  
  - Digi-buddy training in key basic skills  
  - Digi-buddies at key locations targeted digital outreach, IT equipment.  
  - Targeted work with residents in Olive Morris House, at job centres and housing offices The overall impact on community cohesion is likely to be neutral in terms of community cohesion once the healthy living centres are fully operational and the local community see the centres as safe spaces where they can still gather. The minimum opening hours for the centres will be 70 hours per week.          |
| Gender         | The neighbourhood libraries will continue to provide safe, neutral spaces for study and access to IT and will be open for an increased number of hours. Security for the buildings and the facilities will be provided by the organisation managing the |
| **Disability** | In terms of mobility related disabilities, those accessing a neighbourhood library would not have to travel any further that they currently do. There will be no additional cost implications. The neighbourhood libraries are within 1.6 miles of the nearest Town Centre library.  

Security for the neighbourhood libraries, buildings and other facilities will be provided by the organisation managing the whole site.  

4 of the 5 neighbourhood libraries will be delivered from buildings which previously housed the library service. All the sites are accessible. The Oasis site at Waterloo will be DDA compliant.  

The universal library service will be delivered from 5 town centre sites: Brixton, Clapham, West Norwood, Streatham and Durning or Tate South, which are all accessible. Work will be undertaken at Durning Library during 2016/17 to improve access to the site if this is the site selected following the consultation period from 2nd November 2015 until midday 27th November 2015 on this specific issue.  

Space and specialist IT equipment will continue to be made available for the sensory impairment group that meets weekly at Tate South once the site is reopened as the Tate South healthy living centre.  

The Library services will continue to provide a home delivery visiting service for residents with disabilities or long term health conditions which prevents them from travelling to a library to access these services.  

Book stock in the neighbourhood libraries will be planned and managed by Lambeth library service to reflect local need including audio books and large print books. |
| **Age** | • The neighbourhood library service, which will offer a small selection of books, will be delivered from buildings which have previously housed the library service. The buildings will continue to provide safe, neutral spaces for study and access to IT. Security for the buildings |
will be provided by the organisation managing the building.

- There will be no change in the number of computer terminals available for public use at the (Minet) Vassall, (Carnegie) Herne Hill, (Upper Norwood Joint Library) Gipsy Hill and (Tate South) Oval neighbourhood library sites.

- The Healthy Living Centres which house the neighbourhood libraries will be open for an increased number of hours for residents to access study space and IT.

- The neighbourhood library sites are a maximum of 1.6 miles from the nearest town centre library. There is no change in the distance between the Town centre and neighbourhood libraries. Library users will not have to travel any further to access a library service. All the libraries sites are accessible by public transport.

- The library service will continue to provide a home visiting service for older people who have problems accessing the service from neighbourhood or town centre libraries.

- The library service will continue to run the deposits and collection scheme across the borough for sheltered housing complexes, day centres etc. for residents or those attending the day centre etc. to use at their leisure.

- A reduced children’s book offer will be available from the neighbourhood library.

- The library service will continue to provide and distribute the DCMS funded Bookstart Baby Packs for 0 to 12 month olds and Treasure Packs for 3 years olds.

- Space will continue to be made available for the provision of parent and toddler sessions in the neighbourhood libraries.

The council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grant programme, which will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes, including parent and toddler groups.
The Council will continue to run parent and toddler sessions such as story time, wriggle and rhyme and rhyme time etc. from the five town centre libraries.

Activities for all age groups will continue to take place across the town centre libraries including reading groups, the summer reading challenge, story time sessions and homework support.

The Lambeth Early Years Partnership (LEAP), which includes Lambeth Council, the Clinical Commissioning Group, Kings Health Partners, Public Health, Voluntary and Community sector organisations and the National Children’s Bureau is a 10 year, multi million pound Lottery Funded initiative operating in four areas within Lambeth; Stockwell, Vassall, Coldharbour and Tulse Hill. The programme provides a range of programmes to support parents from pregnancy until their child is four years old through integrated care across health, children’s services and social care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion and Belief</th>
<th>The buildings housing the neighbourhood library service will continue to provide safe, neutral spaces for study and access to IT. Security for the buildings will be provided by the organisation managing the building.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book stock in the neighbourhood libraries will be planned and managed by Lambeth library service to reflect local need and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We may not be able to mitigate against the impact of the loss of rental space available for hire by faith organisations within library buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregnancy and Maternity</th>
<th>The neighbourhood library, which will provide a small selection of books including a children’s book offer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Lambeth Early Years Partnership (LEAP), which includes Lambeth Council, the Clinical Commissioning Group, Kings Health Partners, Public Health, Voluntary and Community sector organisations and the National Children’s Bureau is a 10 year, multi million pound Lottery Funded initiative operating in four areas within Lambeth; Stockwell, Vassall, Coldharbour and Tulse Hill. LEAP provides a range of programmes from Children’ Centres to support parents from pregnancy until their child is four years old through integrated care across health, children’s services and social care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council will continue to run parent and toddler sessions such as story time, wriggle and rhyme and rhyme time from the five town centre libraries.

The council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grant programme, which will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes, including parent and toddler groups.

### Socio economic factors

Access to free Wi-Fi and computers will be available in the neighbourhood libraries.

As part of the Council’s plan to support residents to access services on line, the council has developed a Lambeth digital inclusion policy (which forms part of the customer access strategy). The policy which is scheduled to be implemented by 2017 aims to ensure that:

- All residents have the access they need to the internet and the digital skills to support this.
- ‘No residents are left behind during the digitalisation of Lambeth services.’

Digi-buddies will:

- Provide training in key basic skills
- Be located at key locations and undertake targeted digital outreach
- Undertake targeted work with residents in Olive Morris House, at job centres and housing offices

Whilst young people may have to travel further to access a wider selection of books, affordability will not necessarily be an issue as bus travel is free for young people while in full time education.

If access to a town centre library is required then disabled and elderly residents who are more mobile will be able to use their Freedom Bus pass, to access a library town centre. Overall there is no significant change in the distance a disabled or elderly person is required to travel to access the service through either a town centre, or neighbourhood library service. The maximum distance from a neighbourhood library to the nearest Town Centre library is 1.6m.
### Neighbourhood Library Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Library</th>
<th>Town Centre Library</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Journey time based on moderate walking speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oval (Tate South)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.4 miles</td>
<td>34 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clapham Library</td>
<td>1.3 miles</td>
<td>32 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Hill (Carnegie)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.1 mile</td>
<td>27 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassall (Minet)</td>
<td>Brixton Library</td>
<td>1.0 mile</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis site Waterloo</td>
<td>Durning Library or Tate South</td>
<td>0.7 miles (Durning) &amp; 1.6 miles Tate South</td>
<td>17 minutes or 38 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Hill (Upper Norwood Joint Library)</td>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>1.6 miles</td>
<td>38 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The neighbourhood libraries (healthy living centres) will provide access to safe spaces for residents of all ages.

### Health

It is not possible to mitigate the impact of the unstaffed neighbourhood libraries on groups of vulnerable people who rely on staff in their local library for support. The council will continue to provide a universal library service from five core sites: Brixton, Clapham, West Norwood, Durning or Tate South and Streatham. The maximum distance from a neighbourhood library to a Town Centre library is 1.6 miles.
The council will partner with the London Community Foundation to create a grants programme that will enable local charities to bid for funds to provide literacy support programmes from May 2016.

Adult Education provide a range of in colleges and community venues across Lambeth that are free or very low cost

The Library service will continue to provide a home delivery visiting service for residents with a disability or a long term limiting health conditions which prevents them from travelling to a library to access these services.

The library service will continue to run deposit collections at sites across the borough: collections of books are left for a three month period in sheltered housing complexes, day centres etc. for residents or those attending the day centre to use at their leisure

The healthy living centres will provide a range of accessible and affordable activities for the local community. Elderly and disabled residents will be able to access activities at reduced prices via a discount card.

5.0 Publishing your results

The results of your EIA must be published. Once the business activity has been implemented the EIA must be periodically reviewed to ensure your decision/change had the anticipated impact and the actions set out at 4.2 are still appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIA publishing date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIA review date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment sign off (name/job title):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All completed and signed-off EIAs must be submitted to equalities@lambeth.gov.uk for publication on Lambeth’s website. Where possible, please anonymise your EIAs prior to submission (i.e. please remove any references to an officers’ name, email and phone number).
### Equality Impact Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please enter responses below in the right hand columns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date to EIA panel</strong></td>
<td>Monday October 5 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Project, business area, policy/strategy</strong></td>
<td>Culture 2020-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author</strong></td>
<td>Donna Wiggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title, division and department</strong></td>
<td>Lead Commissioner, Healthier for Longer Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact email and telephone</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwiggins@lambeth.gov.uk">dwiggins@lambeth.gov.uk</a> Ext 62681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Adrian Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### London Borough of Lambeth Full Equality Impact Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please enter responses below in the right hand columns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 Business activity aims and intentions

*In brief explain the aims of your proposal/project/service, why is it needed? Who is it aimed at? What is the intended outcome? What are the links to the cooperative council vision, corporate outcomes and priorities?*

- The Culture 2020 report to Cabinet in October 2015 sets out the council’s first comprehensive cultural plan for the borough. It explains how the council intends to provide and facilitate Libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts more generally over the next four years.

- The council is seeking to mobilise its cultural resources, buildings, land, partnerships and use its enabling and influencing capacity to encourage a growth in cultural enterprises that will prioritise residents most at risk of ill-health and social isolation by ensuring:
  - All Lambeth residents living within 20 minutes average walking distance of a cultural facility,
  - 85% of residents are engaged in a cultural activity as a part of routine life, and:
  - All residents have access to a range of affordable facilities for cultural, sports and physical activities.
The council is losing £90m of its overall controllable budget. As a consequence the revenue budget for cultural services, which funds services like Libraries, parks and open spaces, sports and the arts, will be reduced from £10.4m in 2014 to £6.5m by 2018. This means doing things radically differently to achieve the priority People are Healthier for Longer.

The budget of £6.573m while, still a considerable amount of funding will be £5.4m less than the £12m we had to spend in 2013-14. See appendix one which sets out the current level of provision in more detail.

The Proposal: Culture 2020

Lambeth Cultural Trust

Emerging from the consultation feedback was a proposal from Greenwich Leisure Limited for the creation of a joint and not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust, which would be tasked with driving the Culture 2020 framework forwards. The council accepts that such a Trust could potentially bring together a cross sector of agencies with the investment capacity to help address the needs identified within this report, which the council could not do alone. This model would enable funds generated through the provision of leisure facilities to be recycled within the trust to support further improvement in the services provided and supported by the trust, this would have the potential for embracing similar values to the public service. A Trust with charitable status could potentially take advantage of tax exemptions and efficiencies. There were no other proposals for a cultural trust submitted during the consultation.

If feasible in the future this model could significantly reduce the risk of closing buildings, and provide additional mitigation to offset the impact of revenue reductions.

Following further discussions with Greenwich Leisure Limited, they are offering a stepping stone approach towards the creation of an independent and not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust. The Greenwich Leisure Limited business is structured as a social enterprise with charitable registration. Greenwich Leisure Limited are contracted to provide the management of the borough’s 6 leisure centres until 2022.
Initial membership of the Lambeth Cultural Board will be drawn from Lambeth Council and Greenwich Leisure Limited. Additional membership will also be sought from The London Community Foundation, Lambeth health providers, Lambeth College and the Southbank Quarter. The purpose of the Trust will be:

a) The development of integrated pricing and concession plans to increase the participation of Lambeth residents in cultural activities, especially those at highest risk of ill health, limited disposal income, physical disability and those above the state retirement age.

b) Securing new investment into Lambeth’s sports, physical activity and cultural infrastructure.

c) Supporting creative enterprises and routes into employment, training and volunteering opportunities for local residents.

The Culture 2020 report recommends the establishment of the Lambeth Cultural Board, initially under the governance of Greenwich Leisure Limited. By 2018 an options appraisal and business modelling will be undertaken to assess the benefits and risks associated with establishing a wholly independent and not for profit Lambeth Cultural Trust.

The board and subsequently the Trust will be leased three buildings until 2022 to convert into Healthy Living Centres, which will also host a neighbourhood library service. This will trial an integrated wellbeing offer which is cost neutral.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see the separate Equalities Impact Assessment

**The Great Outdoors**

This priority is about the boroughs parks and open spaces and providing residents, if they so wish, with the opportunity to have a bigger say in the upkeep and maintenance of their local park and open space. The borough has over 64 parks and open spaces, which are home to play areas, community food growing projects, sports facilities.

The Culture 2020 approach is based on the following:

- Investing in parks and open spaces
- Diversifying usage where possible
- Maximising income
• Working within agreed revenue budgets
• Streamlining the cost of engagement
• Brockwell Hall as a designated project
• Borough owned skate parks

To achieve this will require things to be done differently. It will require some things to stop and where possible the nurturing of community-led approaches to horticulture, gardening and food growing projects in our parks and open spaces. We need to increase people’s participation in keeping active and this includes using our parks more to promote physical, as well as mental health. There are no proposals to dispose of any of the council’s parks and open spaces, as a consequence of the Culture 2020 report.

Investing in Parks and Open Spaces

The first line of both protection and mitigation against the cuts in revenue funding is to invest and grow alternative sources of income, as well as ensuring old and costly facilities and equipment is replaced where possible, so that on-going maintenance costs can be safely reduced. In January 2015, the council approved the boroughs first integrated 5 Year Parks Investment Plan. The Culture 2020 report approves the initial phase of investment, which is valued at approximately £3m.

Diversifying usage where possible

Whilst not all parks and open spaces provide the right environment for the development of food growing projects and allotment type infrastructure, some of our smaller parks and open spaces do. During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop allotments in up to 5 parks and open spaces. We will consult and work with ward councillors and the Friends of Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces in identifying up to 5 locations for the proposed pilots and establish a one off fund (£50,000) to support the development of these proposals and monitor the impact before considering any expansion of this proposal.

Working within agreed revenue budgets

Following further reflection of the consultation feedback, priorities for Culture 2020 and the available budget the Culture 2020 report recommends a revised specification for the maintenance of the borough’s parks and open spaces. The revised specification will prioritise...
revenue around: Increased maintenance during the summer months and larger parks and opens spaces.

The revised specification will focus on:

- Meeting the council’s statutory obligations for litter collection and waste management, to provide clean and safe parks.
- Provide mown grass areas for informal recreation, sports and events and areas where the grass is left uncut and which support nature conservation.
- Meeting European safety standards for children’s plays areas and paddling pools
- Maintaining sports facilities, which support the Culture 2020 priorities and generate income which can be reinvested in services.
- Maintaining the Heritage Lottery investments at Brockwell Park, Myatts Fields Parks and Kennington Park.

### Paddling Pools

On average it costs up to £40,000 per year to keep a single paddling pool operational once utilities and maintenance have been taken into account. One option could have been to close all paddling pools in parks and open spaces. The paddling pools with the heaviest usage are located at Brockwell Park, Myatt’s Field Park, Norwood Park and Clapham Common. The Culture 2020 plan will prioritise these facilities whilst decommissioning paddling pools located at Streatham Common, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens. These will be returned to open land during 2016-17.

The council will welcome any proposal from interested parties to either maintain these facilities in their current use, as well as suitable alternatives that are cost neutral to the council. If no further proposals are forthcoming the council consider converting these facilities to cost neutral facilities, which may include skateboarding, children’s play areas, or returning to grassed open spaces, etc.

### Seasonal Bedding

The council’s seasonal bedding and ornamental planting programme will be replaced with a mixture of perennial planting and conversion back to grassed open space at Archbishops Park, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Myatts Fields, Ruskin Park and Vauxhall Park. The Council will
establish a small grants fund in partnership with the London Community Fund that will seek to fund Friends of Groups, local schools and organisations to undertake planting projects in local parks and open spaces.

### Public Toilets

The approach to public toilets in parks is a mixture of investment, integration with other parks facilities, alternative provision, rationalisation and closure. This will avoid the impact of public toilets facing permanent closure across all parks. Public toilet’s reach peak usage during the summer months between May and September each year. It is the larger parks, which witness the heaviest usage. The plan is therefore to focus on them as priority:

- Brockwell Park: Stable, Temple and children’s play area.
- Clapham Common: Windmill Drive and children’s play area.
- Myatts Fields Park: Park toilets.
- Kennington Park: Children’s play area
- Streatham Common.

Alternative plans will be drawn up for Archbishops Park, Norwood, Ruskin and Agnes Riley Gardens. This will include a requirement for operators leasing sports and café facilities to provide access to public toilets. The council will explore the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where there no commercial facilities available to leased, as well as exploring closer synergy with the network of community toilets provided by local businesses. If none of these options provide a solution then no toilet facilities will be available within the park.

Between October 2015 and February 2016 the council will carry out any assessment at Archbishops Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens to determine a local plan based on the process outlined above. If faced with the prospect of closure a public notice will be placed in the park affected for a period of 6 weeks.

Brockwell Park, Ufford Street, St Johns Churchyard, Archbishops Park, Tivoli Park, Ruskin Park, Loughborough Park, Kennington Park and Myatts Fields Park will continue to have their gates locked overnight. Night locking will be phased out in the remaining parks by April 2016. The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council
will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services.

**Clustering: Partnership Parks**

Residents keen to influence how their local park is managed are asking for more transparency around events, how capital is allocated, the pace of project delivery and more input into monitoring the quality of our maintenance contacts. The Culture 2020 consultation proposed clustering around the concept of partnership parks using the existing five neighbourhood areas Lambeth is split into.

This structure also mirrors the parks capital investment plan, which in turn forms the basis of the partnership park model on a North Lambeth, Brixton, Clapham, Streatham and Norwood model. Under this model the Council will appoint one lead councillor for each of the areas. The lead councillors will have the following remit:

- Provide the link back to Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods.
- Monitor delivery of capital investment in the designated cluster and make recommendations on the prioritisation of the parks capital programme.
- Review and comment on the events forward plan.
- Review park management plans and master plan.
- Raise issues around maintenance of parks
- Provide a contract monitoring role.

Partnership Parks will provide places where residents, Friends of Parks groups, ward councillors, key officers, events and project officers and contractors can hear feedback and take this on board. These meetings will take place no less than twice a year. This model will also ensure that the significant proportions of open spaces that do have an active friends group are not forgotten. This revised approach will enable resources to be pushed to the point of delivery and help safeguard services in our green spaces.

**Brockwell Hall as a Designated Project**
Over the past decade Brockwell Park has been subject to a major redevelopment programme, which has witnessed significant improvements to its grounds, water play area and refurbishment of the lido.

The culture 2020 report recommends that £100,000 of capital is approved to support the preparation of a stage 1 Heritage Lottery application. The total value of a successful stage 2 application is expected to be in the region of £4m capital in 2018-19, which will require match funding of approximately £1.4m capital. It is too early to determine the revenue implications of the projects. Any options must be revenue neutral to the council.

Skateboard Parks

The council currently hosts 3 skate parks in Norwood Park, Kennington Park and Clapham Common, as well as a further facility at Stockwell. The council recognises the rich sub culture the skating community brings to a neighbourhood, as well as the direct health and wellbeing benefits for those participating in skating.

Following representation from the Friends of Stockwell Skate Park during the Culture 2020 consultation the council is adopting a plan that will positively embrace the important contribution skate parks bring to the boroughs culture, heritage, health and wellbeing.

This plan will protect and maintain these 4 sites within the grounds maintenance contract for current and future generations. The council will undertake technical appraisals of these sites to evaluate their state of repair. Skateboard groups active at these facilities will be offered the opportunity to inform the specification for these surveys prior to them being undertaken. Any resulting requirements for capital investment will be considered as part of the capital pipeline for the council to consider.

Let’s Get Active

Let’s get active is about regular physical activity and sport, including the use of local sport and leisure centres.
The Culture 2020 report recommends the agreement of the Active Lambeth Plan, which also includes indoor and outdoor sports facilities strategies which will oversee:

- Improved access to and participation in sport and physical activity for Lambeth residents.
- Development of a strong club/group network and wider partnerships to provide access to good quality and accessible sport and physical activity.
- Improvement in the management of all sports facilities in Lambeth.
- The prioritisation of investment in those sports facilities that have potential to generate revenue and to best meet demand.

The five priority areas within the Active Lambeth Plan have been identified as:

- Children and young people (18’s and under)
- Older adults (over 65)
- Women and Girls
- Disabled peoples
- Black and Minority Ethnic groups


The revised leisure management contract with Greenwich Leisure will be provided at no additional cost to the council and no change in the overall specification for leisure centres. There will be a requirement for an increased emphasis on income generation, whilst securing savings in contractual fees. Initial negotiations have been held and a framework has been agreed with Greenwich Leisure Limited, which is subject to final agreement. This includes:

- Surplus generated being recycled to tackle the impact and prevent ill health.
- A dedicated fund for the up-keep and modernisation of leisure facilities.
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- The provision of 3 healthy living centres.
- A Sports Innovation Fund.
- An intervention programme targeting 100 Lambeth’s residents who are considered to be most at risk from involvement in violent gangs, long term and high cost care and older residents considered at risk of social exclusion.
- The provision of discount cards for those residents who are elderly, disabled, or on job seeker benefits.
- Payment of the London Living Wage for those employed under the contract.

During 2016-17 the revised leisure management contract will make provision for the creation of 3 healthy living centres, which will provide access to a community lounge where residents can access the neighbourhood library spoke service, fee paying access to gymnasium equipment, physical activities provided by self employed trainers targeting priority Culture 2020 groups and where space permits room rentals for community groups, clubs and cultural enterprises. Healthy Living Centres will be located at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minet Healthy Living Centre</td>
<td>Vassall Ward</td>
<td>52 Knatchbull Road, London SE5 9QY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate South Lambeth Healthy Living Centre</td>
<td>Oval Ward</td>
<td>180 South Lambeth Road, Vauxhall, London SW8 1QP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Healthy Living Centre</td>
<td>Herne Hill Ward</td>
<td>118 Herne Hill Road, London, SE24 0AG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These buildings will be leased to Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) inline with the existing leasing agreement for the borough’s leisure management contract for sports centres from April 2016.

**Be Inspired**

The majority of the activities/services delivered under this category are delivered via partner organisations. The council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

Be inspired is about creating more opportunities to participate in and enjoy theatre, performing
arts and music. The borough’s flagship Southbank quarter, which is home to the likes of the Southbank Centre, Old Vic, National Theatre, Young Vic, Rambert Dance Company, etc. is integral to securing our cultural prosperity.

The Southbank Cultural Quarter not only provides a national and international stage for the borough, but also generates substantial benefits to Lambeth’s local economy. During the Culture 2020 consultation we heard from our partners on the Southbank around how the council could support the continued cultural growth of the area. This did not always come down to money, but a requirement of the council to:

- Improve how policies on planning, the environment and licensing are better coordinated locally.
- Make access to its buildings and open spaces more flexible for artists to test out new performance, rehearse, or provide a home for fledging creative enterprise.

Our ambition is to secure Lambeth as a major culture player and recognised for developing performance arts and creative enterprises, as well as a destination for audiences. We will achieve this by:

- Working with our Southbank quarter colleagues to consolidate and help grow their role locally and in turn strengthen their position on the national and international stage.
- Invest one off council capital to secure external investment in our cultural infrastructure.
- Where appropriate utilise development agreements through the likes of the Community Infrastructure Levy to improve the borough’s cultural facilities.
- Create more spaces where cultural enterprises, performers, artists and audiences can grow in our library buildings, leisure centres, parks and open spaces, etc.

We will establish a task and finish group with the Southbank Partnership, which will explore how the council can develop its local policies to further enable and support the continued growth of the Southbank.

Old Vic: The Council is proposing to provide a one off capital grant of £300,000 to support the Old Vic’s capital campaign for the restoration of their grade II listed building. This programme aims to ensure the building is fit for purpose as a 21st Century theatre. The overall project is valued at
£30m and will guarantee the future of the theatre.

Once reopened the refurbished building and its facilities will be made more accessible to local residents and provide access to free Wi-Fi and study space within the Culture 2020 priority of safe and interesting spaces. Separate to the capital project the Old Vic will also provide during the construction a tailor made 2 year Stage Business Schools Programme targeting young people in the borough, as well as mentoring small culture enterprises.

**Showing Off**

Showing off is about providing more opportunities to enjoy art, or if you’re an artist, access to show off your work in archives, galleries and museums, whilst celebrating Lambeth’s cultural history.

**Garden Museum:** are about to undertake a £6.6m capital programme to restore, upgrade and extend their museum based in St Mary’s Church, which is Lambeth’s second most ancient structure. The works being proposed will safeguard this landmark and enable the Museum to continue as an independent self-sustaining venture. The Culture 2020 report recommends a one off capital grant of £300,000 towards the overall capital costs for the project.

Once complete the new facilities will open up new spaces, doubling the amount of room for their collection. It will create a new publically accessible learning and study spaces, enable the organisation to ensure its sustainability, grow and deliver a more effective cultural offer to the community, including the provision of safe and inspiring spaces for Lambeth residents.

**Borough Archives:** The report recommends that an options appraisal on the future location of the borough archives is be undertaken and completed no later than September 2016. All options to be considered must:

- Be affordable both in terms of the capital and revenue required of the council to maintain both service and facilities.
- Improve accessibility.
- Utilise new technologies.
• Maximise income generation.
• Provide a destination where people can access the service, discover and learn about local identity and heritage.
• Meet the necessary standards for archive storage.

The options that will be considered, whilst not exhaustive, will include:

1. Brixton more generally.
2. A split site arrangement with front of house to the service maintaining high use stock and bulk archive stock situated elsewhere. This option might include maintaining storage at Minet library as part of the redevelopment of the site.
3. Any other option that has the capacity to fulfil the above criteria

Heritage Strategy: the council aims to develop and publish by April 2016 Lambeth’s first Heritage Strategy that will create an overview of priorities and projects, which protect and enhance the borough’s heritage.

The Bigger Picture

The council does not fund any activity or services under this category. All activities are delivered via the private sector. The Bigger Picture is about working with partners to secure a cinema in Lambeth’s five town centres and the chance to learn more about the art of cinema and film making. The council is very much a facilitator in regards to this priority rather than a revenue investor.

2.0 Analysing your equalities evidence

2.1 Evidence

Any proposed business activity, new policy or strategy, service change, or procurement must be informed by carrying out an assessment of the likely impact that it may have. In this section please include both data and analysis which shows that you understand how this decision is likely to affect residents that fall under the protected characteristics enshrined in law and the local characteristics which we consider to be important in Lambeth (language, health and socio-economic factors).
Protected characteristics and local equality characteristics | Impact analysis
--- | ---
For each characteristic please indicate the type of impact (i.e. positive, negative, positive and negative, none, or unknown), and:

| Race | General Comments: Parks (and some arts programmes) are universal services, which are free, and open to all, as a result it is difficult to give a full and accurate picture of everyone who uses parks and sports and leisure and arts programme. People can use the library, sports and leisure facilities without registering.

Positive and Negative

Lambeth Cultural Trust

Impact: It is not anticipated that the proposals for the establishment of a Lambeth Cultural Trust will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of race. A separate equalities impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries): Please see the separate Equalities Impact Assessment

The Great Outdoors:

From the 2014 Residents:
- White British residents are more likely to say parks and open spaces are important, reflecting that they are more likely to use them.
- White other residents are more likely to value parks and open spaces as important.
- Asian residents are less likely to use parks and open spaces

During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop community managed food growing projects in up to 5 parks and open spaces. The expressions of interest will be assessed by a panel chaired by the lead councillor for each neighbourhood. The criteria for the assessment has not yet been developed but will include a requirement for all
projects to demonstrate inclusivity.

**Impact:**

- Ceasing night locking will create public access to unlit parks, which may result in an increase in hate crime.

- Reductions in regular maintenance have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of Parks and can create the perception of unsafe spaces particularly if allowed to become overgrown or unrepaid. This perception may discourage the use of open spaces by communities who are more vulnerable or experience fear of crime.

**Mitigation**

- The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.

- We will work with the Police to assess crime hotspots and ensure that vegetation in areas of concern is cut back on a regular basis. In open spaces, planted areas including shrubs beds will be heavily reduced on a three year pruning cycle to maintain sightlines and visibility. The council will carry out regular inspections of infrastructure pathways etc. to measure compliance with relevant safety standards for facilities and infrastructure including; children’s facilities, footpaths and public lighting.

**Let’s Get Active: Positive**

From the 2014 residents survey:

- Black African residents are more likely to have used services for children and young people and are less likely to use leisure and sports facilities.
From the 2014 Residents survey White British residents are more likely to use leisure and sports facilities.

Asian residents are less likely to use leisure and sports facilities.

The Sport England Active People Survey (2012/3) indicated that there are significant differences in the participation levels of people undertaking physical activity on a regular basis between White British and other ethnic groups. 46% for white British compared to 36% for BME communities. This reflects a similar trend across London.

We do not collect information on the race of residents accessing sports and leisure facilities. Information on the number of BME residents that are registered for the Real Plus Card (pay and play membership) is collected. In 2014/15 there were just over 93,000 members.

Impact: The proposals for Let’s Get Active are unlikely to have a negative impact on the basis of race. In fact this should have a positive impact particularly on Black and Minority Ethnic groups (primarily African and Caribbean communities).

People from black and minority ethnic backgrounds are up to five times more likely to develop diabetes than the general population. Improved physical activity levels in this area locally will support better management of such as coronary heart disease, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and diabetes.

Targeted interventions which will be based on need will be used as a means of improving active participation whilst contributing to a better sense of wellbeing for BAME groups and individuals. BME communities, primarily African and Black and Caribbean communities have been identified as one of the 5 priority groups within the Active Lambeth Plan.

Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help
promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the race of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals for the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of gender. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see the separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

**The Great Outdoors**

Findings from the 2014 residents’ survey show that women are more likely to have used parks and open spaces. Men are less likely to use parks and open spaces. This however is difficult to track as we do not collect information on the gender of residents accessing parks and open spaces.
During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop community managed food growing projects in up to 5 parks and open spaces. The expressions of interest will be assessed by a panel chaired by the lead councillor for each neighbourhood. The criteria for the assessment has not yet been developed but will include a requirement for all projects to demonstrate inclusivity.

**Impact:**

- Ceasing night locking will create public access to unlit parks, which may result in an increase in crime.
- Reductions in regular maintenance have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of Parks and can create the perception of unsafe spaces particularly if allowed to become overgrown or unrepaired. This perception may discourage the use of open spaces by communities who are more vulnerable or experience fear of crime.

**Mitigation**

- The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.
- We will work with the Police to assess crime hotspots and ensure that vegetation in areas of concern is cut back on a regular basis. In open spaces, planted areas including shrubs beds will be heavily reduced on a three year pruning cycle to maintain sightlines and visibility. The council will carry out regular inspections of infrastructure pathways etc. to measure compliance with relevant safety standards for facilities and infrastructure including; children’s facilities, footpaths and public lighting.
Let’s Get Active: Positive

Physical activity can promote mental and physical wellbeing and studies show that it can reduce the risk of chronic diseases in later life.

The Government's policy document ‘Moving Up, Living More (2014)’ highlights:

- Physical activity is higher in men of all ages (compared to women)
- Boys are more active than girls
- Girls are more likely than boys to reduce their activity levels as they move from childhood to adolescence.

In Lambeth, male sports participation rates are significantly higher than those for females:

Males: 53%, females 27.9% (Sport England – Active People Survey 2013). Male rates are above national and London rates and females are lower.

National: Males: 40.9%, females: 30.7%.
London: males: 43.1%, females 31.5%

From the 2014 residents survey we know that women are less likely to use sports and leisure facilities.

Data is not collected on the gender of residents accessing sports and leisure facilities. We will review this as part of the discussions around the revised leisure contract. We do however collect information on the number of women signed up for Real Plus card membership (this is a pay and play membership) at leisure centres. The total number in 2014/15 was just over 68,000.

Impact: The proposals for Let’s Get Active should in fact have a positive impact on women as this group has been identified as one of the five priority groups within the Active Lambeth Plan (see page 9 for the other priority groups), following the needs assessment undertaken in 2014.

- In order to improve the levels of participation on sport for women and girls, we have developed a 3 year partnership project, partly funded by Sport England will focus on 5,238, 14 to 25 year old females, to increase participation and develop sustainable pathways for
physical activity and sport, and including those currently inactive, in areas of low participation and high deprivation, and those at risk of preventable health conditions. The project is called: ‘Lambeth Girls Can’

- Female participation in physical activity and sport is known to decrease with age. Tackling the post – 16 drop off in participation through a better understanding and the removal of barriers such as confidence and lack of time, will serve as a key outcome of the project.

- The Council intends to use this project as the first in a programme of commissioned activity to 2020, as we implement our Active Lambeth approach to address community need, and scale up activity which increases sustained once per week participation in physical activity and sport.

- Working with external partners we will develop our participation and outcomes monitoring tool and academic evaluation of the project will be undertaken with London South Bank University.

**Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.**

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the gender of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or
music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of gender.

### Gender re-assignment

Unknown

It is estimated that there are 20 transgender people per 100,0001 in the UK, which suggests that roughly 50-60 people in Lambeth are transgender.

**Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of gender reassignment. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interest Spaces:** See separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

**The Great Outdoors**

Data however is not collected on this equality strand.

**Impact:**

- Ceasing night locking will create public access to unlit parks, which may result in an increase in hate crime.

- Reductions in regular maintenance have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of Parks and can create the perception of unsafe spaces particularly if allowed to become overgrown or unrepaved. This perception may discourage the use of open spaces by

---

1 State of the Borough Report 2014 (source info: Gender Variance in the UK: Prevalence, Incidence, Growth and Geographic Distribution, Gender Identity Research and Education Society, 2009)
communities who are more vulnerable or experience fear of crime.

**Mitigation**

- The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.

- We will work with the Police to assess crime hotspots and ensure that vegetation in areas of concern is cut back on a regular basis. In open spaces, planted areas including shrubs beds will be heavily reduced on a three year pruning cycle to maintain sightlines and visibility. The council will carry out regular inspections of infrastructure pathways etc. to measure compliance with relevant safety standards for facilities and infrastructure including; children’s facilities, footpaths and public lighting.

**Let’s Get Active**

Data is not collected on the gender re-assignment of residents accessing Sports and Leisure activities.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of this equality strand.

**Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.**

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.
For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on this equality strand for residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of this equality strand.

**Disability**

Positive/Negative

According to the State of the Borough report (2014) about 37,000 people in Lambeth report that their day-to-day activities are limited by long-term illness or a disability. About 17,000 limited a lot and 20,000 limited a little.

There are 29,000 people of working age in Lambeth who are disabled (census 2011).

About 60% of people with a limiting health condition are aged over 50. About 12% of residents aged 55-64 have a limiting condition, as do 27% of 64-74s, 46% of 75-84s and 64% of over 85s.

Data from the residents survey (2014) found that 12-16% of adults classified themselves as having a long-term disability or health condition; 2-3% of young people aged 11-19 years classified themselves in this way.

**The Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of disability. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment.
The Great Outdoors: Unknown

Data is not collected on the disability of residents accessing parks and open spaces.

Findings from the 2014 Lambeth resident’s survey show that disabled residents are less likely to use parks and open spaces and reflecting this they are less likely to value parks and open spaces as important.

During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop community managed food growing projects in up to 5 parks and open spaces. The expressions of interest will be assessed by a panel chaired by the lead councillor for each neighbourhood. The criteria for the assessment has not yet been developed but will include a requirement for all projects to demonstrate inclusivity.

Impact:

- The closure of parks public toilets is likely to impact on disabled people as the lack of facilities may stop them walking/exercising as much or visiting a park, which in turn will impact on social isolation. For those residents that do not have access to a garden or communal area using the park may be these only opportunity they have to access open space.

- Lack of accessible public toilets not only restricts a disabled person’s independence and lifestyle, but can have negative consequences for her/his health. Some people may stop drinking water if they know they need to be out in public to prevent the need to use public toilets.²

Mitigation

- Before making any final decision to close the public toilets at Archbishop’s Park, Norwood
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Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens, alternative plans will be developed. Sports and café operators leasing facilities from the council will be required to provide toilet facilities as part of the condition of their lease. The council will explore the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where no commercial facilities exist that could be leased. We will also explore greater synergy with the community toilet scheme. If none of these options provide a viable solution the toilet facilities within these parks will be withdraw after a 6 week notification period.

- If the decision is taken to close the toilet facilities work will be undertaken to sign post the availability of public toilets in council owned buildings and the community toilet scheme.

Let’s Get Active: Positive

Impact: It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of disability. In fact the impact should be positive.

Disabilities have been highlighted as one of the target areas within the Active Lambeth Plan. As set out within the Active Lambeth Plan, we will work with Interactive (disability equality in sport), whose mission is to ‘Lead change, challenge attitudes and connect the sectors to create opportunities so that disabled Londoners can choose to be active for life’ and disability partners in Lambeth to plan, map and monitor more activities and sporting opportunities for people with disabilities through development and adoption of Inclusive and Active 2.

To help increase participation in physical activity and sport we will review and promote awareness of the discounted leisure offers available locally, and bring activity closer to those who need it most. Concessionary rates are available for residents receiving a range of benefits include disabled tax credit.

There are approx. 4900 disabled users signed up for the Real Plus card membership (pay and play membership).

Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of

---

3 Inclusive and Active 2 is the new five year, London wide strategy with a vision of active disabled Londoners
work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the disability of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of disability.

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive and negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As with many London boroughs Lambeth has a young age profile. This is due to the high numbers of working age residents rather than high number of children or teenagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About a fifth – 21% - of Lambeth’s population is aged 20 or under, around 66,000 people. Compared to other London boroughs, there is a low percentage of people ages 15 to 19 (4.6%)^4 Lambeth is in the top ten London boroughs for people aged 20 to 24 (8.8%), and the top five for people aged 25 to 29 (14.2%) and 30 to 44 (28.8%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a fifth of the population, 18%, is aged between 45 and 64, around 57,000 people. Nearly four fifths of older working age people are under 60. Only 3% are aged 60 to 64, which is in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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bottom five boroughs in London.

Less than a tenth, 7.6%, of the population is aged 65 or over, 23,000 people. About half of older people are aged 65-74.

The borough’s population is projected to grow by just over 1% per year for the next five years, and by 1% or just under in the five years after that. The borough will continue to have a majority of young working age people (20-44). There is projected to be decrease in people aged 15-29, and an increase in the proportion of people aged 55-64.

**Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of age. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

**The Great Outdoors: Positive**

Data is not collected on the age of residents accessing parks and opens.

From national research undertaken two thirds of 9-11 year olds however are dissatisfied with their quality of local outdoor play facilities. For 15-16 year olds this figure rises to 81%.

From a sample of 2077 under 16’s undertaken nationally by GreenSpace, 56% visit parks and green spaces at least once a week and 37% visit most or everyday during the summer months. For 16 to the 19 year olds, 44% report at least weekly summer visits and 28% daily or most days.

From a sample of 10,852, 30-39 year olds, 35% report that they visit parks for outings with their children/family, and 39% report that they go to the park to visit the playground.

---


7 GreenSpace (2010) GreenSTAT visitor survey system
As we get older, many people increasingly rely on local public services to continue to live active and fulfilled lives. Parks are age proof and bring opportunities for physical activity, volunteering and social interaction all of which provide a sense of achievement and purpose\(^8\).

From work undertaken nationally we know that, 50% of older people are regular visitors to parks and green spaces\(^9\). Parks make no distinction about age. Access to open space has been found to enhance social ties and provide opportunities for social cohesion. They are free and are accessible to all residents regardless of their economic circumstances.

From the 2014 residents survey young people (age 18 – 24) are less likely to use parks and open spaces.

Older residents (65+) are also less likely to use both parks and open spaces.

The proposals for the Great Outdoors do not propose the closure of any parks or open spaces with Lambeth and they will continue to be accessible for people of all ages.

During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop community managed food growing projects in up to 5 parks and open spaces. The expressions of interest will be assessed by a panel chaired by the lead councillor for each neighbourhood. The criteria for the assessment has not yet been developed but will include a requirement for all projects to demonstrate inclusivity.

**Impact:**

- The closure of the paddling pools at Streatham Common, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens is likely to impact on young children in the surrounding area.

- Older age is often associated with the need to use the toilet more often and can be a major impediment to leading an active and independent life. The potential closure of the public

---

\(^8\) Charted Society of Designers: Understanding the Contribution Parks and Green Spaces can make to Improving People’s Lives 2011.

toilets in Archbishop’s Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens is likely to impact on residents on older residents. For those residents that do not have access to a garden or communal area using the park may be these only opportunity they have to access open space.

- Reductions in regular maintenance have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of Parks and can create the perception of unsafe spaces particularly if allowed to become overgrown or unrepaved. This perception may discourage the use of open spaces by communities who are more vulnerable or experience fear of crime.

- Ceasing night locking will create public access to unlit parks, which may result in an increase in crime.

**Mitigating actions**

- The council will welcome any proposal from interested parties to either maintain these facilities in their current use, as well as suitable alternatives that are cost neutral to the council. If no further proposals are forthcoming the council consider converting these facilities to cost neutral facilities, which may include skateboarding, children’s play areas, or returning to grassed open spaces, etc.

- The nearest local public swimming pools are located at Streatham Ice and Leisure Centre, Brixton Recreation Centre and Clapham Leisure Centre.

- Before making any final decision to close the public toilets at Archbishop’s Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens, alternative plans will be developed. Sports and café operators leasing facilities from the council will be required to provide toilet facilities as part of the condition of their lease. The council will explore the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where no commercial facilities exist that could be leased. We will also explore greater use of the community toilet scheme. If none of these options provide a viable solution, the toilet facilities within these parks will be withdrawn after a 6 week notification period.

- If the decision is taken to close the toilet facilities work will be undertaken to sign post the availability of public toilets in council owned buildings and the community toilet scheme.
- We will work with the Police to assess crime hotspots and ensure that vegetation in areas of concern is cut back on a regular basis. In open spaces, planted areas including shrubs beds will be heavily reduced on a three year pruning cycle to maintain sightlines and visibility. The council will carry out regular inspections of infrastructure pathways etc. to measure compliance with relevant safety standards for facilities and infrastructure including; children’s facilities, footpaths and public lighting.

- The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.

**Let’s Get Active: Positive**

The pattern for sports participation at national and London levels is for participation levels to decrease with age. Sample sizes for some age groups in Lambeth are not sufficient to be able to provide robust data. However, the data that is available from Sport England, Active People Survey 7 shows that the 35-44 age group in Lambeth bucks the trend of decreasing participation with age in that it is higher than the 26-34 years age group:

Age 26-34: 51.1% (Lambeth) – national: 44.2%
Age 35-44: 56.4% (Lambeth) – national: 49.9%

From the 2014 residents survey older residents (65+) are less likely to use and leisure and sports facilities.

Just over 19,500 residents over 60+ are registered as Real Plus Card members (pay and play membership).

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of age. One of the priority areas identified within the Active Lambeth Plan is residents over the age
of 65 as we know that the level of sports participation decreases with age.

**Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.**

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the age of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of age.

---

**Sexual orientation**

Recent health estimates suggest that Lambeth has one of the largest populations of men who have sex with men (MSM) in the UK\(^{10}\). 6. 3-5% of respondents to the Lambeth Residents’ Survey 2014 identified themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual.

---

\(^{10}\) State of the Borough Report 2014 (Men who have sex with men: estimating the size of at-risk populations in London primary care trusts, Health Protection Agency (HPA), 2010)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lambeth Cultural Trust</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of sexual orientation. A separate equalities impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe and Interesting spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment

**The Great Outdoors: unknown**

Data is not collected on the sexual orientation of residents using parks and open spaces.

**Impact:**

- Ceasing night locking will create public access to unlit parks, which may result in an increase in hate crime.

- Reductions in regular maintenance have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of Parks and can create the perception of unsafe spaces particularly if allowed to become overgrown or unrepaired. This perception may discourage the use of open spaces by communities who are more vulnerable or experience fear of crime.

**Mitigation**

- The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.

- We will work with the Police to assess crime hotspots and ensure that vegetation in areas of concern is cut back on a regular basis. In open spaces, planted areas including shrubs beds will be heavily reduced on a three year pruning cycle to maintain sightlines and visibility. The
Appendix 2(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council will carry out regular inspections of infrastructure pathways etc. to measure compliance with relevant safety standards for facilities and infrastructure including; children’s facilities, footpaths and public lighting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Let’s Get Active: unknown**

Data is not collected on the sexual orientation of residents using our sports and leisure facilities. **Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of sexual orientation.

**Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.**

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the sexual orientation of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data. **Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of this equality strand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion and belief</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 60% of Lambeth residents have a religion and 28% have no religion. Christians (53%) and Muslims (7%) are the largest group of residents by religion. Over a quarter of residents have no religion. These are overwhelmingly white British (60%); white other (15%), and 9% of mixed ethnic groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** it is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of religion or belief. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

**The Great Outdoors**

We do not collect data on the religion or belief of residents accessing parks and open spaces.

During 2016/17 the council will call for expressions of interests from interested parties to develop community managed food growing projects in up to 5 parks and open spaces. The expressions of interest will be assessed by a panel chaired by the lead councillor for each neighbourhood. The criteria for the assessment has not yet been developed but will include a requirement for all projects to demonstrate inclusivity.

**Impact:**

- The phasing out of night locking of parks by April 2016 may result in an increase in the...
Mitigation

- The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.

Let’s Get Active

Data is not collected on the religion or beliefs of residents accessing sports and leisure facilities. Women only sessions required for religious reasons are available on request at leisure centres.

Impact: it is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of religion or belief.

Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.
### Appendix 2(b)

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture. The Council does not collect data on the religion or belief of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

**Impact**: It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of religion or belief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pregnancy and maternity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unknown</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are around 4-5,000 births in Lambeth every year. Between 2-3% of respondents to Lambeth’s Residents’ Survey are currently pregnant or on maternity leave, suggesting that at any one time, there are between 6,000 and 9,000 Lambeth residents pregnant or on maternity leave (State of the Borough Report 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries)**: Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment

**The Great Outdoors**:

Data is not collected in respect of pregnancy or maternity for the provision of this service.

**Impact**

- The closure of the paddling pools at Streatham Common, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens may impact on pregnant women with other young children who will not have access to these facilities locally and will need to travel to one of the larger parks where the paddling pools will remain open.

- The potential closure of the public toilets in Archbishop’s Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens may impact on this equality group.

**Mitigation**
• The council will welcome any proposal from interested parties to either maintain these facilities in their current use, as well as suitable alternatives that are cost neutral to the council. If no further proposals are forthcoming the council consider converting these facilities to cost neutral facilities, which may include skateboarding, children’s play areas, or returning to grassed open spaces, etc.

• The nearest local public swimming pools are located at Streatham Ice and Leisure Centre, Brixton Recreation Centre and Clapham Leisure Centre

• Before making any final decision to close the public toilets at Archbishop’s Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens, alternative plans will be developed. Sports and café operators leasing facilities from the council will be required to provide toilet facilities as part of the condition of their lease. The council will explore the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where no commercial facilities exist that could be leased. We will also explore greater use of the community toilet scheme. If none of these options provide a viable solution the toilet facilities within these parks will be withdraw after a 6 week notification period.

• If the decision is taken to close the toilet facilities work will be undertaken to sign post the availability of public toilets in council owned buildings and the network of community toilets scheme.

**Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.**

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other
| Marriage and civil partnership | activities/services are delivered by external organisations. The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture. The Council does not collect data on this equality strand for residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of pregnancy or maternity.

**Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust will have a disproportionate impact on this equality strand. A separate equalities impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment

**The Great Outdoors:** unknown

Data is not collected for this equality strand. The collection of data in respect of a person’s marital status is not deemed to be relevant to the provision of these services.

**Let’s Get Active:** unknown

Data is not collected for this equality strand. The collection of data in respect of a person’s marital status is not deemed to be relevant to the provision of these services.
Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for 'Be Inspired' is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the marital status of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

Impact: It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing Off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of marriage or civil partnership.

Socio-economic factors (this is not a statutory protected characteristic)

Positive and Negative

Like many London boroughs, Lambeth has areas of affluence and areas of poverty, often side by side. There is a persistent pool of economically inactive people with little mobility and this group tends to experience high levels of social exclusion and poor education, employment and health outcomes.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Lambeth: State of the Borough Report 2014
The latest deprivation data is the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). IMD 2010 places Lambeth as the 8th most deprived borough in London and 14th most deprived in England, a relative worsening of position since 2008 when Lambeth was ranked 19th most deprived.

Those living in the most deprived areas are spread throughout the borough but are particularly concentrated in Coldharbour ward. The most affluent areas include the Thames-side part of Bishops ward and the Dulwich border area of Thurlow Park.

Access to free school meals is a local indicator of economic disadvantage. The largest concentration of children accessing free school meals are in Coldharbour and Tulse Hill wards, with hotspots in Vassall, Streatham Wells, Thornton and Thurlow Park wards.\(^\text{13}\)

### The Lambeth Cultural Trust

The purpose of the trust will be:

- The development of integrated pricing and concession plans to increase the participation of Lambeth residents in cultural activities, especially those at highest risk of ill health, limited disposal income, physical disability and those above the state retirement age.

- Securing new investment into Lambeth’s sports, physical activity and cultural infrastructure.

- To support creative enterprises and routes into employment, training and volunteering opportunities for local residents.

**Impact:** This is not anticipated that the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust will have a disproportionate impact on this equality strand. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

\(^\text{13}\) Lambeth Public Health Report 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Great Outdoors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents are able to access Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces free of charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During times of economic hardship the range of freely available activities and opportunities provided by parks and the diverse range of other informal and community managed green spaces becomes particularly important for less well off individuals and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> It is not anticipated that the proposals within Culture 2020 will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of socio-economic factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Let’s Get Active: Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of deprivation 16 out of our 21 residential wards are classed within the lowest 20% in the country. An indication of this position can be found in particularly low levels of participation from individuals and groups on low incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the 2014 resident’s survey, residents in employment are more likely to say they might get involved in leisure and sports activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of socio-economic factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The proposals set out within the Active Lambeth plan will lead to more vulnerable people gaining access to free or discounted access to sports and leisure facilities across the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Active Lambeth plan will increase efforts to address issues of cost and location which both serve as major barriers to participation for people on low incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A REAL Plus Family leisure membership offers affordable family membership for two named adults and up to three named children. With a REAL Plus Family membership all the named members in a family can receive up to 45% discount off standard leisure centre prices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Charted Society of Designers: Understanding the Contribution Parks and Green Spaces can make to Improving People’s Lives 2011
• To help increase participation we will review and promote awareness of the discounted leisure offers available locally, and bring activity closer to those who need it most. Concessionary rates are available for residents receiving a range of benefits include council tax benefit and income support.

• The sports innovation fund will provide small grants and access to facilities at reduced rates for Lambeth based sports club that are helping to tackle the healthier for longer priorities will have a positive equalities impact.

• The revised leisure management contract will include the requirement for payment of the London Living Wage for those employed under the contract.

Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on socio economic factor relating to residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Impact: It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of socio economic factors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Approximately 140 different languages are spoken by families in the borough(^\text{15}), with the most common languages after English being Portuguese (7% of pupils), Spanish (5%), Somali (4.5%), French (3.7%), Yoruba (3.6%), Akan/Twi-Fante (2.8%), Polish and Arabic (both 2.4%) and Bengali (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are 3,587 people who live in Lambeth who were born in the UK but whose main language is not English, 1.2% of all usual residents aged 3 and over. Of these 86% can speak English well or very well (735 and 2,347 respectively). 348 cannot speak English well (9.7%) and 157 cannot speak English (4.4%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Lambeth Cultural Trust**

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of language. A separate equalities Impact assessment however will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries):** Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

**The Great Outdoors**

The collection of data in respect of language is not deemed to be relevant to the provision of this service.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of language.

---

\(^{15}\) Lambeth: State of the Borough Report 2014
Let’s Get Active

The collection of data in respect of language is not deemed to be relevant to the provision of this service.

Impact: It is not anticipated that the proposals will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of language.

Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

For example the council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the language of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas. A condition of the funding agreement for the capital grant from the council will be a requirement for the Old Vic, the Garden Museum and the South London Theatre to provide equalities data.

Impact: It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health (this is not a statutory protected characteristic)</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• About 37,000 people in Lambeth have their day-to-day activities limited by a long term illness or disability. About 60% of people with a limiting health condition are aged over 50(^\text{16}).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Healthy life expectancy for men in Lambeth is 2.7 years lower than in England, and 1.5 years lower for women(^\text{17}).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At any one time, 16.2% of the adult population (age 16 &amp; over) may have a common mental disorder (CMD), such as depression, anxiety, panic disorder, phobias, obsessive compulsive disorders and eating disorders(^\text{18}). This is about 51,000 people in Lambeth (based on the GP registered population).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cardio vascular disease accounted for 25% of the total number of deaths in Lambeth in 2010, with heart disease being the commonest cause. There is a higher than average incidences of mental ill health - 25,500 adults are known to have depression, 4,500 adults have a severe mental health illness and over 3,000 children have received mental health services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hypertension is a major risk factor for heart disease and strokes – it is more common, more severe and has an earlier onset in black Africans than in white British people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Health Survey of England (2012) reveals that, only 56% of adults meet the guidelines for the recommended levels of physical activity and 28.5 of adults fail to achieve 30 minutes of activity over seven days. Only 21% of boys and 16% of girls aged 5-15 are achieving 60 minutes of physical activity per day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25% of 10-11 years olds are obese. 10.8% of children in Reception year and 24.2% of Year 6 children are recorded as obese, with the highest rates amongst the ethnic groups Black and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
\(^{16}\) Lambeth State of the Borough Report 2014
\(^{18}\) Public Health Report 2014
Black British, Asian or Asian British, Any Other Ethnic Group and Mixed. It is estimated that 50% of children in Lambeth are inactive (a risk factor for obesity).  

- There has been increasing recognition of the role the environment can play in enhancing health. Less active lifestyles have led to an increase in preventable diseases, which are placing increasing pressures on the National Health Service. Simply being outside in a green space can promote mental wellbeing, relieve stress, overcome isolation, improve social cohesion, and alleviate physical problems so that fewer working days are lost to ill health (CABE, 2009).

**Lambeth Cultural Trust**

The proposals for the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust will have a positive impact on the health of Lambeth residents. One of the purposes of the Trust will be:

- The development of integrated plans to increase the participation of Lambeth residents in cultural activities, especially those residents at risk of ill health, physical disability and those above the state retirement age.
- Securing new investment into Lambeth’s sports, physical activity and cultural infrastructure
- The transfer to the trust and conversion of three buildings in Vassall, Oval and Herne Hill into Healthy Living Centres that will trial an integrated wellbeing offer is expected to have a positive impact on health.

A separate equalities Impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the development of the Lambeth Cultural Trust.

**Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries)**: Please see separate Equalities Impact Assessment

---

The Great Outdoors:

Parks and Open Spaces are available to all so that everyone can take advantage of the recreational and health opportunities they provide.

No data is collected on the health of residents using our parks and open spaces.

Nationally the evidence of the preventative health value of high quality green space is growing. Green spaces can contribute significantly to stress reduction and the alleviation of depression and dementia. Through easy and affordable access to recreational opportunities, the growing use of GP referral schemes, parks can play a valuable role in reducing otherwise expensive treatments, saving the health service millions\(^\text{20}\).

Over the last decade there has been an increasing recognition of the role the environment can play in enhancing health. Simply being outside in a green space can promote mental wellbeing, relieve stress, overcome isolation, improve social cohesion, and alleviate physical problems so the fewer working days are lost to ill health.

Parks and green spaces contribute to all aspects of health and wellbeing including increasing levels of physical activity\(^\text{21}\).

Living near parks, woodland or other open spaces helps to reduced health inequalities\(^\text{22}\).

60% of interviewees from research conducted by Cabe Space thought pleasant green spaces would improve their overall physical health, 48% thought it could improve their mental health, and 46% thought it would make them feel better about their relationships with family and friends\(^\text{23}\).

91% of people believe that public parks and open spaces improve quality of life\(^\text{24}\).

\(^{20}\) Charted Society of Designers: Understanding the contribution Parks and Green spaces can make to improving People’s Lives 2011

\(^{21}\) Charted Society of Designers: Understanding the contribution Parks and Green spaces can make to improving People’s Lives 2011


\(^{23}\) CABE Space (2010): Community Green: using local spaces to tackle inequality and improve health

\(^{24}\) CABE (2009) Future Health: Sustainable places for health and wellbeing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The closure of the public toilets in parks may impact on residents undertaking physical exercise to stay active and playtime for children impacting on health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation**

- Before making any final decision to close the public toilets at Archbishop’s Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens, alternative plans will be developed. Sports and café operators leasing facilities from the council will be required to provide toilet facilities as part of the condition of their lease. The council will explore the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where no commercial facilities exist that could be leased. We will also explore use of the community toilet scheme. If none of these options provide a viable solution the toilet facilities within these parks will be withdraw after a 6 week notification period.

- If the decision is taken to close the toilet facilities work will be undertaken to sign post the availability of public toilets in council owned buildings and the network of community toilets.

---

**Let’s Get Active: Positive**

Physical inactivity has a significant burden on healthcare costs and the economy. Inactivity costs the UK economy approx. £20 billion every year. UK Active (Turning the tide of inactivity) estimates that just a 1% reduction in the rates of inactivity each year for 5 years would save the UK around £1.2 billion.

**Impact:** the implementation of the proposal for Let’s get active will have a positive impact on health.

- The Active Lambeth, developed with residents, community organisation, Public Health, sport England, London Sport and Lambeth Clinical Commissioning Group sets out the approach to increasing physical activity and sport across the borough. The plan will be delivered over the next five years and will seek to develop and improve access to activities and facilities to increase participation.
• Working with partners we will be able to provide more targeted interventions to communities with specific health and increase the number of people taking part in physical activity on a regular basis.

• The Commissioning of services will focus on prevention; as a long term view to tackle cause rather than symptoms.

• We will explore the possibility of different leisure pricing to cross subside interventions in vulnerable children and adults or those with disabilities.

**Be inspired, Showing Off and The Bigger Picture.**

The above priorities within the cabinet report are not areas in which the council invests large amounts of money. In some cases there is no council investment. These are emerging areas of work where we are developing new working relationships with partners to start and assess an holistic approach to the delivery of activities. It is hoped that this new approach will help promote and grow the unique creativity and diversity of the borough and ensure that cultural activity and investment contributes towards wider positive social impacts across Lambeth.

The council revenue budget for ‘Be Inspired’ is less than £70,000 per annum.

The Borough Archive is the only service delivered by the Council under Showing Off. All other activities/services are delivered by external organisations.

The council does not fund any activity under the Bigger Picture.

The Council does not collect data on the health of residents accessing theatre, performing arts or music, archives, galleries, museums or cinemas.

**Impact:** It is not anticipated that the proposals in the Culture 2020 report for Be Inspired, Showing off or the Bigger Picture will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of health.
### 2.2 Gaps in evidence base

What gaps in information have you identified from your analysis? In your response please identify areas where more information is required and how you intend to fill in the gaps. If you are unable to fill in the gaps please state this clearly with justification.

| Parks and Open Spaces: | no data is collected by the council for any of the equality strands within this report. Given the difficulties in collecting data for 68 parks and open spaces, there are no plans to collect data for this priority in the future. Where possible we will use information from the annual Residents Survey. |
| Let’s Get Active: | no data is collected for the following equality strands: Gender: We will review the collection of data as part of the discussions around the revised leisure contract. Gender re-assignment: the collection of data relevant for this equality strand is not deemed relevant to the delivery of this service. Sexual orientation: the collection of data in respect of a person’s sexual orientation is not deemed relevant for the provision of this service. Religion and Belief: the collection of data in respect of a person’s religion of belief is not deemed relevant for the provision of this service. Pregnancy and maternity: the collection of data in respect of this equality strand is not deemed relevant for the provision of this service. Marriage and civil partnership: the collection of data in respect of a marital status is not deemed relevant for the provision of this service. Socio-economic factors Language: the collection of this data is not deemed relevant to the delivery of this service. Health: |
| Be Inspired, Showing off and the Bigger Picture: | no data is collected by the council for any of the equality strands within this report. Once relationships are established, partner organisations will be asked if they will share equalities data. |

### 3.0 Consultation, Involvement and Coproduction

#### 3.1 Coproduction, involvement and consultation

Who are your key stakeholders and how have you consulted, coproduced or involved them? What difference did this make?

| Key stakeholders include: |
| - Cabinet Member |
| - Third sector organisations/charities |
| - Arts organisations |
| - Sports organisations |
Public consultation on the proposals set out within Cultural services by 2012 took place between 30 January and 24 April 2015.

We used a number of different methods to obtain comments and feedback on the proposals. We used both quantitative and qualitative methods. These included:

**Self-completion questionnaires**
The questionnaire was produced as part of a consultation booklet that could be returned to any Lambeth library, by Freepost address, and online. Bulk copies of the booklets were available at all Lambeth Libraries and leisure centres, the town hall and customer centres, park cafes. Copies were also sent to all GP surgeries and schools, as well as other address on request.

More extensive promotion and distribution of the online questionnaire was undertaken through digital media, the council’s regular communications channels, and via partners, stakeholders and residents.

**On-street survey**
More than 500, 10-minute on-street surveys were undertaken at six locations across the borough – Kennington cross, Gipsy Hill roundabout, Stockwell tube station, Coldharbour Lane/Loughborough Junction, Knight’s Hill in West Norwood and Streatham High Road nr Greyhound Lane.

The Campaign Company was commissioned to do the fieldwork and analysis for the on-street survey. It was a different format to the self-completion questionnaire, given the 10-minute guide time for each interview, and through this activity we aimed to understand how important people...
felt the different themes were, the kind of physical and cultural activities they do currently, and what motivates them.

**Young person’s survey**
A shorter questionnaire was developed to capture young people’s views about the activities they do, what they like to do, what they have done recently and what motivates them to take part in cultural activities.

There were seven questions in total, including tick boxes, rating questions and open questions. The questionnaire was aimed at year 5 and above and distributed primarily through the schools. Every school in Lambeth was sent 30 copies of the questionnaire and we asked that at least one class was encouraged to complete it. More copies of the questionnaire were available on request.

Questionnaires were also sent to Libraries and sports clubs, on request, and were available at the Youth In Action meeting on Monday 30 March 2015 and the young person’s focus group. Where questionnaires were completed outside of school and respondents were under 16 years of age, we required a signature from a parent or guardian. This was to comply with the guidelines set out in the Market Research Society Code of Conduct.

**Seven public events**
These events were held at locations across the borough that reflected geography, venue types and where proposals had greater relevance. We held them at a variety of times to suit as many people as possible. All meetings were held at venues that complied with the Equality Act and had induction loops, were wheelchair accessible and had baby changing facilities.

The format for each event was the same throughout and covered un-structured discussion with council officers and the lead cabinet member, as well as workshop groups and feedback.

**Nine focus groups**
The focus groups were an opportunity to explore some of the issues around the consultation in greater depth. We particularly wanted to hear from groups who are traditionally underrepresented in consultations and we reviewed the demographic data from the consultation after the mid-way point of the consultation to help determine the focus groups we would hold.

The nine focus groups were as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Participants/Recruitment Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>17 older people recruited through the sheltered housing service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents with mental health illnesses</td>
<td>9 people from Mosaic Clubhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents with physical disabilities</td>
<td>7 people recruited with help from DASL (Disability Advice Service Lambeth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind or partially-sighted residents</td>
<td>9 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>23 young people recruited and facilitated by the Young Lambeth Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing tenants</td>
<td>6 residents recruited through Lambeth Living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean residents</td>
<td>7 participants recruited via social media and a recruitment agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African residents</td>
<td>7 participants recruited via social media and a recruitment agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language residents</td>
<td>18 Portuguese residents recruited and facilitated by Stockwell Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other meetings**
A number of additional meetings took place throughout the consultation and officers and councillors attended these to answer questions about the consultation. These events included:

- 30/1/2015 On the first day of consultation, Cllr Jane Edbrooke and council officers met individual with:
  - Minet Hub directors
  - Myatt’s Field Park Project
  - Friends of Carnegie Library
  - Friends of Lambeth Libraries, Chair
  - Carnegie Shadow Trust Board
- 5/2/2015 Carnegie Shadow Trust Board Committee meeting
- 9/2/2015 Friends of Durning Library full committee
- 11/2/2015 Waterloo Community Development Trust public meeting at Waterloo Library
- 11/2/2015 Friends of Durning Library Committee
- 16/2/2015 Upper Norwood Library Trust
- 18/2/2015 Lambeth Community Hubs
- 23/2/2015 Friends of Carnegie Library
- 27/2/2015 Minet Hub director’s meeting
- 11/3/2015 Friends of Tate South Lambeth Library Committee
• 11/3/2015 Longfield Hall Trust meeting
• 12/3/2015 Carnegie Shadow Trust reps meeting
• 29/3/2015 Youth in Action event

The consultation was publicised using a number of different methods:

**Lambeth Council website**

**Lambeth Talk:** the borough magazine is distributed through every door in the borough

- February edition – the consultation was highlighted in the Foreword by Cllr Lib Peck, Leader of Lambeth Council
- March edition: a 4-page centrefold feature gave information about the consultation, the key proposals, the events and other ways to get involved
- April edition: a news story and a half page advert highlighted the end of consultation deadline

**Love Lambeth Blog**

**Council e-newsletters**

**A3 and A4 posters:** The first batch of posters produced was designed to publicise the public events and was distributed to Libraries, leisure centres, other council buildings, schools, GP surgeries and parks. In the week leading up to each of the public events we also visited local shops and cafes to ask them to display copies. After the public events were over, revised posters were designed and distributed to Libraries, leisure centres, other council buildings, schools, GP surgeries, parks cafes, arts organisations.

**On street advertising:** Posters were displayed across the 43 JCD sites on the borough’s pavements between 3/3/2015 and 17/3/2015

**Postcards:** A5 postcards were produced to promote the online consultation and all the public events. These were displayed in Libraries, leisure centres and other council buildings and copies were also distributed to schools, GPs, housing offices, park cafes and arts organisations.

There was a strong response to the questionnaire with almost 1,650 questionnaire responses and
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| 3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation and involvement | more than 200 written submissions
Approximately 203 people attended the public meetings.
The diversity of the communities most represented within the consultation responses does not reflect the diversity of the active borrower population nor of the boroughs residents.
We are not aware of any gaps in consultation, involvement or co-production.

| 4.0 Conclusions, justification and action | Given the significant funding reductions in public sector funding, keeping things as they are is not an option. The proposals set out within the Culture 2020 report are intended to have as little impact as possible given the reduced resources available. However, as set out in this EIA the proposals may have a negative impact on some groups.
A number of actions have been developed to help reduce the impact or mitigate against the impact wherever possible.
There are likely to be disproportionately negative impacts on age, disability, pregnancy and |

3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation and involvement
What gaps in consultation and involvement and coproduction have you identified (set out any gaps as they relate to specific equality groups)?
Please describe where more consultation, involvement and/or coproduction is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification.

4.1 Conclusions and justification
What are the main conclusions of this EIA? What, if any, disproportionate negative or positive equality impacts did you identify at 2.1? On what grounds do you justify them and how will they be mitigated?
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maternity and health around the closure of public toilets within parks.

The proposals for Let’s Get Active will have a positive impact on disability, race, gender, and health.

4.2 Equality Action plan

*Please list the equality issue/s identified through the evidence and the mitigating action to be taken. Please also detail the date when the action will be taken and the name and job title of the responsible officer.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Issue</th>
<th>Mitigating actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to close toilets will have a disproportionate negative impact relating to disability, age, health and pregnancy and maternity.</td>
<td>Before making any final decision to close the public toilets at Archbishop’s Park, Norwood Park, Ruskin Park and Agnes Riley Gardens, alternative plans will be developed. Sports and café operators leasing facilities from the council will be required to provide toilet facilities as part of the condition of their lease. The council will explore the siting of ‘super loos’ in parks where no commercial facilities exist that could be leased. We will also explore greater synergy with the community toilet scheme. If none of these options provide a viable solution the toilet facilities within these parks will be withdrawn after a 6 week notification period. If the decision is taken to close the toilet facilities work will be undertaken to sign post the availability of public toilets in council owned buildings and the community toilet scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing or converting some of the paddling pools to cost neutral options will have a negative disproportionate impact relating to age and pregnancy and maternity.</td>
<td>The council will welcome any proposal from interested parties to either maintain the paddling pools in their current use, as well as suitable alternatives that are cost neutral to the council. If no further proposals are forthcoming the council consider converting these facilities to cost neutral facilities, which may include skateboarding, children’s play areas, or returning to grassed open spaces, etc. The nearest local public swimming pools are located at Streatham Ice and Leisure Centre, Brixton Recreation Centre and Clapham Leisure Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceasing night locking will create public access to unlit parks, which may have a disproportionate impact on race, age, gender, sexual orientation and religion.</td>
<td>The council will carry out a risk assessment of each park before ceasing night locking and monitor whether there is any increase in community safety concerns associated this approach. The council will also evaluate options to integrate this work with neighbourhood organisations that carry out similar locking services. As part of this assessment an equalities impact assessment will also be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reductions in regular maintenance have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of Parks and can create the perception of unsafe spaces particularly if allowed to become overgrown or unrepaired. This perception may discourage the use of open spaces by communities who are more vulnerable or experience fear of crime. Impacting on race, age, gender and sexual orientation.

We will work with the Police to assess crime hotspots and ensure that vegetation in areas of concern is cut back on a regular basis. In open spaces, planted areas including shrubs beds will be heavily reduced on a three year pruning cycle to maintain sightlines and visibility. The council will carry out regular inspections of infrastructure pathways etc. to measure compliance with relevant safety standards for facilities and infrastructure including; children’s facilities, footpaths and public lighting.

5.0 Publishing your results

The results of your EIA must be published. Once the business activity has been implemented the EIA must be periodically reviewed to ensure your decision/change had the anticipated impact and the actions set out at 4.2 are still appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIA publishing date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIA review date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment sign off (name/job title):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All completed and signed-off EIAs must be submitted to equalities@lambeth.gov.uk for publication on Lambeth’s website. Where possible, please anonymise your EIAs prior to submission (i.e. please remove any references to an officers’ name, email and phone number).

Appendix One: Current Cultural Service Provision

The current service

Safe and Interesting Spaces (Libraries)
Lambeth Council runs 10 Libraries spread across the borough. These Libraries are:

- **Brixton Library**: located in the centre of Brixton, next to the Ritzy Cinema. Also contains the Reference Library for the borough.
- **Carnegie Library**: located within a residential area between Denmark Hill and Loughborough Junction.
- **Clapham Library**: located on Clapham High Street (new building opened in 2012)
- **Durning Library**: located in Kennington, close to Kennington Tube station.
- **Minet Library**: located within a residential area on Knatchbull Road, close to Myatt’s Fields Park. Also contains the borough’s Archives.
- **Tate South Lambeth Library**: located on South Lambeth Road, between Vauxhall and Stockwell tube stations
- **Streatham Tate Library**: located on Streatham High Road (refurbished library opened in March 2014)
- **Waterloo Library**: near Waterloo Station, located in Lower Marsh, right next to the market, in a building shared with the a job shop.
- **West Norwood**: temporarily located on Knights Hill, in the Old Library which is now a youth centre, while the development of the new library site next to Norwood cemetery is in progress.
- **Upper Norwood Joint Library**: part of the shopping parade on Westow Hill, near Gypsy Hill and Crystal Palace stations.

**Lambeth Library Service**: Libraries provide free and universal access to books, information, the internet and informal learning and support for families and individuals through reading and training programmes.

**Services in every library include:**

- Books, DVDS, audio books, e-books and e-magazines for loan, including stock in community languages
- A range of daily newspapers and magazines
- Free use of computers with internet access,
- Free Wi-Fi access
- Photocopying, scanning and printing facilities
- An information and enquiry service including free access to book and online reference resources and regular advice sessions.
- Reading Groups for adults and children supported by professional staff
- Support for the visually impaired and those with low literacy levels or dyslexia using advanced reading technology
- Special educational need material and activities
- An extensive programme of events for all ages including the Summer Reading Challenge, Black History Month and the Readers and Writers Festival and regular author talks
- A range of activities covering health, business, careers, IT and coding, arts and craft.
- Parent and toddler sessions supporting school readiness e.g. rhyme time, wriggle and rhyme, baby bounce.
- Study space, study guides and homework clubs
- Meetings rooms and/or library space for hire

Libraries also provide
- Home visit service – delivering books to residents who are unable to access their local library due to age or a disability
- Deposit collections to over 40 sites across the borough i.e. collections of books are left for a three month period in sheltered housing complexes, day centres etc. for residents or those attending the day centre.
- A library for HMP Brixton, which is funded by an agency of the Ministry of Justice.

More information on Lambeth Libraries is provided in the separate Equalities Impact Assessment.

**Parks and Open Spaces**

Lambeth has 68 parks and opens spaces which range from large parks and commons to small open spaces in high-density areas. Some of our larger parks and open spaces include: Streatham Common, Clapham Common, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Norwood Park, Vauxhall Park, Myatts Field Park and Ruskin Park.

13% of residents include parks and open spaces as one of the most important things in making Lambeth a good place to live. (Residents Survey 2014). 59% of residents have accessed a park or open space within the last 12 months. 76% of residents judge our parks and open spaces as good or excellent.

The borough has eleven Green Flag Award-winning parks. Parks that hold a Green Flag Award include: Vauxhall Park, Myatts Field Park, Brockwell Park, Ruskin Park, Kennington Park, Archbishop’s Park, St John’s Church Gardens, Milkwood Road, St Paul’s Churchyard, Hillside Gardens and Streatham Rookery.

**Sports and Leisure**

Lambeth has four core leisure centres, a community sports centre and a number of sports facilities which are run in partnership with GLL to provide a wide range of sport and recreation activities. Within Brockwell Park there is also Brockwell Lido, which is managed by Fusion.

There are a number of membership payment options for use of the sports and leisure facilities. The Lambeth REAL Plus card provides discounts at Lambeth GLL leisure centres whether you are using the facilities at peak or off peak times. Concessionary REAL Plus membership is available to residents receiving any of the following benefits: Council Tax Benefit, Disability Living Allowance, Disabled Person’s Tax Credit, Health Service Certificate HC2/HC3, Housing Benefit, Incapacity Benefit and/or, Incapacity Benefit Youth (IBY), Income Support, Invalid Care Allowance, Jobseekers Allowance, Resident Lambeth Foster Carer, Maternity allowance/statutory, Maternity pay (mat B1 form), Over 60 years.
Details of Lambeth’s Sports and Leisure facilities are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Activities/Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brixton Recreation Centre</strong>:</td>
<td>• Specialist children’s zones featuring Shokk fitness equipment, dance mats, interactive games, soft play and 3G-football pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located within the heart of Brixton, close to the mainline station</td>
<td>• Fitness gym, a climbing wall, squash courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 25m swimming pool and teaching pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sports Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clapham Leisure Centre</strong>:</td>
<td>• A six lane swimming pool and teaching pool,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located just off Clapham High Street, the centre which opened in January 2012</td>
<td>• Fitness gym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A four court sports hall,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yoga, dance and martial arts studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rooms for community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exercise classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streatham Ice and Leisure Centre</strong>:</td>
<td>• Olympic sized ice skating rink (the only one in London).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located on Streatham High Road adjacent to the Tesco Superstore. The state of the art Ice and leisure centre opened on 18 November 2013.</td>
<td>• A multi facility Leisure Centre with a 100 station fully equipped state-of-the-art gym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group exercise studios,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two swimming pools: 25m 6 lane pool and a 13m teaching pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Multi use sport sports hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The West Norwood Health and Leisure Centre</strong>:</td>
<td>A 25 metre swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opened in July 2014:</td>
<td>• Fully equipped state-of-the-art gym gym and studios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located close to West Norwood Station and St Julian’s School. The leisure centre is part of integrated centre for health and wellbeing which also incorporates Lambeth Council customer centre, GP and dental services, community health services and a community space for hire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferndale Community Sports Centre</strong>:</td>
<td>high quality outdoor facilities for football, netball and tennis, and an indoor studio space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located close to Brixton town centre provides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flaxman Sports Centre</strong>:</td>
<td>Fitness gym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located Carew Street,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>712,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>275,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Norwood</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>91,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaxman</td>
<td>62641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,142,226</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health and wellbeing impact assessment screening of LB of Lambeth’s amended Cultural Strategy proposals as they relate to library services and parks and open spaces

CONFIDENTIAL – NOT FOR CIRCULATION

1. Background to proposals

The Lambeth and Southwark Public Health team carried out an impact assessment on the proposals in the Cultural Strategy 2020 in July and these were presented back to colleagues and to the Lambeth Staying Healthy Board. The proposals were about how the council would cut the budget from £10m to around £6m as part of reductions taking place across the country whilst still ensuring that ‘people are healthier for longer’. They focused on the plans for libraries and parks and these are revisited in this work.

2. Library services

Risks flagged in those proposals by the public health team included the closure of libraries which serve unemployed, older and BME communities, in particular, the Minet library, in the second most deprived ward in the borough. We also flagged that any changes to the Durning library may have a negative impact on older people in terms of social isolation and wellbeing and at the Carnegie library on young children and parents. The capacity of local community groups to pick up and manage library facilities was also flagged as in need of assessment and so that Carnegie and Durning libraries were not put at risk of closure. These and comments made by the public and local organisations have been reflected upon by those leading the Strategy and budget plans to develop these updated proposals to Cabinet.

The closure of Minet will no longer take place. Waterloo library will be closed as originally planned, but alternative community provision will be made at the Oasis Centre just 0.3 miles away (and 0.7 miles from Durning, the nearest town centre library) and will incorporate other facilities such as Waterloo food bank and financial advice. Durning library will be made a town centre library and not be at risk of closure in the short term. Carnegie library will be made into a healthy living centre with a neighbourhood library service and the Friends of group will not be expected to undertake any management at this stage. There will be healthy living centres and neighbourhood library services also at Minet and Tate South Lambeth. Details of impact can be viewed in Table 1 and are summarised below.
Positive impacts to health and wellbeing:

- Small grants to support literacy and reading.
- Three new gyms provided (especially positive in Tate South as there is no other nearby local authority commissioned facility) and opportunities to connect with local healthcare providers as part of the development of Local Care Networks. The facilities will mean increased hours for use of computers and study space at these venues.
- Opportunity to start to generate a new library profile with a range of activities and facilities that could promote health and wellbeing.
- Income generating opportunities which can then be reinvested into provision.
- New facilities offered within Oasis Centre eg. financial advice, foodbank, a credit union.
- Enhanced town centre offer in Durning will benefit older residents and those in the North of the borough where the population is increasing in density.
- Gym facilities have the potential to generate income from wealthier residents which can then benefit other residents, especially in Tate South and Carnegie.
- No change to service at HMP Brixton.
- Space will continue to be made for the weekly visual impairment group at Tate South Lambeth library.
- No one will have to travel further to reach a library facility.
- The service will continue to provide home visiting and deposits and collection scheme for sheltered housing, day centres etc.
- Space will continue to be provided for parent/toddler groups.

Negative impacts requiring mitigation:

- Relocation of job shop needs to be described if still a need (Waterloo).
- Ensuring adequate quiet study/online space in healthy living centres (Minet, Tate South, Carnegie) alongside a gym facility.
- Cumulative impact of building works and temporary loss of facilities (Durning, Minet, Tate South, Carnegie).
- Proposals for Carnegie are not congruous with that of Friends of group plans. The impact on children and parents will be greatest.
- Gym opening at Minet may have an impact on local facilities at Flaxman or vice versa.
- Gym facilities at Tate South Lambeth may not be as attracted to older people and they may be affected by the changes to the library service eg. self service. If use of self service for library, need to access support required by local residents to be able to use it. May require a short term investment.
• Friends of Tate South Lambeth may feel challenged by the proposals particularly as they have spent money on repairing and painting elements of the building which may then be altered by the conversion to a healthy living centre
• Whether Friends of groups be expected to hire rooms out at cost in order to assist with income generation
• Plans for Upper Norwood Library are not congruous with those held by the Upper Norwood Library Trust. It is also unclear what longer term plans and vision are held by LB of Croydon and whether conversations have taken place across the two local authorities.
• Black people, older people, disabled and unemployed people will be the most impacted by the proposals and efforts should be made to continue to engage with these groups and take into account their views in the developments as they progress.
• Impact on library staff health and wellbeing during the changes.
• No change to amount of public network computers available. As population density increases this may need to be revisited.

3. Parks and open spaces

The revised proposal for the budget covering parks and outdoors has taken into consideration some of the issues and potential impacts raised at the screening meeting, especially around the potential impacts of reduction of park management budgets.

A very positive point is that there will be no change in term of available parks and outdoor spaces. Green spaces can also contribute to improve air quality. Again poor air quality is concentrated around main transport routes where the most financially vulnerable populations reside. However, parks will need to income generate to support reductions in budget.

The following population groups have highest need for park and outdoor space: Older people and children; People suffering from obesity, cardio-vascular diseases, diabetes; People suffering from mental distress and depression. All these conditions are more prevalent among the most deprived populations. We think it will be critical to maintain access and use of those parks which are close to some of the more deprived areas eg. Norwood Park, Brockwell Park, Max Roach park, Slade Gardens, Myatts Fields park etc (with the exception of Clapham Common). It will also be important to promote green spaces in neighbouring boroughs (and work with these boroughs) eg. St Leonards residents may benefit from using Tooting Bec Common (Wandsworth) and Gipsy Hill residents, Crystal Palace Park (Bromley).

The overall savings may increase the number of people who do not use parks and open spaces if they lead to a decline in quality and therefore may have an impact on health through lack of physical activity, lack of opportunity to relax and for mothers and young children (lack of play space especially when overcrowding is increasing with all the health consequences associated with overcrowding). Currently we know use of parks may be lower in certain part of the borough/ population groups (those from lower socio-economic groups, BME communities), but we do not know why.
The change in management of these spaces may affect: safety and crime, competing use, access to activities and use by certain groups of people eg. BME communities. The need for accessing green space is likely to be higher for low income households. These households are less likely to have resources to travel outside of London or go away on holidays. Older people are more likely to be affected as they may benefit from using parks during the day as part of their routines and way of maintaining social contact.

Details can be viewed in Table 2 and are summarised below:

**Positive impacts to health and wellbeing:**

- No green spaces will be lost or closed.
- Clearer maintenance plan focusing on demand (eg. usage in Summer months) and local needs.
- More community opportunity for input in how parks and open spaces are managed and run.
- Young people’s needs have been recognised – skate parks and paddling pools. Evidence around outdoor play for children and young people’s health and wellbeing is good.

**Negative impacts requiring mitigation:**

- Generating income from parks by allowing more public events. The new event strategy will be expected to address the potential negative impacts raised at screening. There may be a need to ensure a redistribution of the income generated to support critical maintenance in all parks.
- Ensuring the proposals do not impact on inequality of use and maintenance of parks. Lower socio-economic and BME communities may be more impacted by the proposals.
- Volunteering in the borough is decreasing (according to latest residents’ survey) so it might be difficult to get community participation to support some of the work.
- Need to ensure safety is taken into account around skate park usage.
- Need to revamp and re-advertise the community toilet scheme especially in areas where there will be no toilets available.
- Need to ensure we have good evidence around community food growing proposals in terms of need and efficacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed change</th>
<th>What are the needs of the population where the change is due to take place?</th>
<th>How does the change affect health and wellbeing?</th>
<th>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</th>
<th>What are the risks to health and wellbeing?</th>
<th>What mitigation is required?</th>
<th>Further investigation/information needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closure of Waterloo library in April 2016 with Oasis Centre identified to provide a neighbourhood library service as mitigation (45k funding for fit out). 20k is made available for a volunteer literary outreach programme.</td>
<td>Bishops ward – half of residents in the second most deprived quintile on the IMD, but none in the most deprived. 9% of the population are 65+ years and there is a lower proportion of children. 42% of housing is social rented. 8.8% are unemployed. 7.8% of the population are Chinese and 1.4% Bangladeshi. <strong>Health profile</strong> Income deprivation, child poverty, overcrowding, pensioners living alone, older people in deprivation and obese children are worse than the England Health profile.</td>
<td>The Oasis Centre is very close to the existing library and therefore can offer a service to the ward, especially older people who may have mobility issues. The addition of a home for the Waterloo food bank, credit union and access to community activities would enhance the offer to residents. The outreach programme will give additional benefits to local residents depending on details and how monitored. Impact on library staff health and wellbeing (some</td>
<td>Oasis Charitable Trust expected to provide a service funded by LBL.</td>
<td>Oasis Centre 0.3 miles from Waterloo will host a neighbourhood library. Would need to ensure some quiet study space and online access as this is what the current library is mostly used for. A high proportion of library users were unemployed and therefore there needs to be some support on employment. Will need to consider if Bengali and Chinese population will access this venue. How will the service at the Oasis Centre be evaluated and monitored?</td>
<td>Where would the job shop be located? Future of the library site and its usage and impact on the local community. Details on the volunteer outreach literacy programme. What credit union facilities would be located there.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durning library</strong> will be a temporary location for a town centre library until 2022. This means it will have additional capacity and an investment of £800k.</td>
<td>Princes ward – over half of residents in the most or second most deprived quintile of the IMD. Population density is higher than the Lambeth average. 43% are BME and 3.4% cannot speak English well.</td>
<td>There will be an enhanced town centre library offer at this library which should increase capacity. This will benefit older residents. This location for a town centre library will better serve residents in the borough.</td>
<td>Implications for site and local residents/businesses once sold depending on usage. Sustainability post 2018? Meaningful consultation and engagement with affected library staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIPFA Survey</strong> 4% of survey had mobility issues, 4% had mh issues. 3% said they were long term sick or disabled. 13% were unemployed and 16% were retired. 73% travelled to the library on foot. 69% used library for study, 31% for health and wellbeing, 31% for getting online. 11% of survey were Asian (next highest after Streatham) and this may reflect the Bengali population in the area and there is a Bengali book lending service. Bangladeshis have some of the highest rates of ill health in the UK.</td>
<td>may be residents in the borough. The Oasis Centre fit out would be DDA compliant.</td>
<td>A lack of capacity in the community to manage the library has been identified and there are no expectations in</td>
<td>Building work will commence in 2016-17. This may result in temporary loss of access and also construction noise/vehicle movements for nearby residents. Finding a suitable replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding a suitable replacement</strong> Four week consultation will invite further comments on this specific proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will then be an expectation that a new library site is located in the North eg. Oval Gasworks site (OAKDA)</td>
<td>9% of the population are 65+ years but as a proportion of those using the library are three times that (28%). Residents are more likely to be living alone, be users of social care services and concerned about not being done enough for elderly people. A high proportion (3.5%) of residents speak an African language. 9.2% are unemployed. The population has had major growth in the last few years and this is expected to rise. <strong>Health profile</strong> Income deprivation, child poverty, older people in deprivation, unemployment, overcrowding and pensioners living alone are worse than the England average. Life expectancy for men is significantly worse than England. <strong>CIPFA Survey</strong> 8% of those surveyed had</td>
<td>North of the borough. There are opportunities to improve access for disabled people.</td>
<td>site by 2022. Master planning work on OAKDA is underway now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mobility issues. The library appears to have an older user base than other libraries. 28% were retired and 5% were long term sick or disabled. 22% were 65 years and over and 86% walked to the library. 11% were unemployed.

33% used the library for health and wellbeing, 68% for study, 41% for getting online and 17% for job seeking. 17% also said they used the library for help with retirement which was higher than any other library.

Fifth most visited library in the borough. Has Silver Surfers, older persons group, tea and coffee mornings and a reading group. Has a ‘Friends of’ group.

| Carnegie library to become a healthy living centre with a neighbourhood library service | Herne Hill ward: 35% of residents in the most deprived or second most deprived quintile of the IMD. The most deprived | The proposals in the short term are not entirely congruous with that of the community’s wishes. The changes in the short term | The community would like to take on the management of the library | The community need help with capacity building and assistance in gaining the necessary skills and mechanisms to draw in funding from external agencies | Assess links to local healthcare providers and CCG plans for social |
pending the eventual management by the community.  

are in the Thorlands and Lilford estates. However, Herne Hill ward is the least deprived area out of all the libraries that are named in the proposal for changes. Over half the population are from BME communities. 8.1% are unemployed. 7% are over 65 years. Residents are more likely to have children and concerned about not being done enough for elderly people.  

Health profile  
Income deprivation, child poverty, unemployment, overcrowding, pensioners living alone, older people in deprivation and cancer are worse than the England average.  

CIPFA Survey  
8% surveyed had mobility issues, a third cited health and wellbeing as a reason to use the library, 37% said to meet people, 15% personal finances and 19% help with getting a job. 12% may impact on the ability to deliver the wide range of activities on offer.  

The library is the third busiest children’s library so need to understand if this will be impacted. Young children and parents may be impacted more. Eg. there will be a reduced children’s book service.  

Although only 8% of the ward are unemployed, 16% of library usage is to help with finding a job, therefore, reduced hours or changes in focus of activities might impact on this group.  

Need to ensure that activities for priority groups are affordable and accessible to those least likely to take them up.  

Impact on library staff health and wellbeing (some may be residents in the borough).  

building to provide a broader community hub with a wider range of services including a library service, but this is not likely to be realised until 2020.  

The gym facilities have the potential to generate income from the wealthier parts of the ward.  

and be in a position to manage the building from 2019.  

Children’s library may lose capacity. Need to ensure strong child focus re. stock and activities. Activities may reduce temporarily with building works.  

Organisations currently operating eg. Reader Organisation could be asked to pay a fee for room hire and this may challenge their ability to deliver  

Cumulative impact of three libraries being fitted out/closed temporarily.  

Ensure disabled and older people can access gym equipment.  

Meaningful consultation and engagement with affected library staff.  

No staff to support people with IT skills. Will need to signpost to offers re. digital inclusion strategy.  

prescribing through emerging local care networks.
| Tate South Lambeth library will be turned into a healthy living centre with a neighbourhood library service. | Oval ward: 7% over 65+, almost 50% are in the most and second most deprived wards. It has the most household spaces of any ward. There is a high proportion of private rented households. 17% of houses are in council tax | Ensuring the Friends of group are involved in the design and plans going forward. Space will continue to be made for the weekly Sensory Impairment Group. | The gym facilities have the potential to income generate from wealthier parts of the ward. Friends of group Will need to ensure quiet study space and online access. Ensuring there is space to host events organised by the Friends of group eg. events targeted at the Portuguese population, reminiscence, local history, To what extent Latin American/Portuguese speaking communities make use of the facilities and how can this be encouraged in |
bands F, G or H which is high. In 15% of households there is no-one whose first language is English. 4.5% of residents speak Portuguese and 3.6% speak Spanish.

According to CIPFA survey 7% of library users have a mental health issue, 64% use the library for study and 39% for getting online. 25% of library users identified themselves as black. There is a high proportion of white non British residents but these cannot be identified via survey data. 17% said they were unemployed. 16% were retired. 13% were 65+ and over (twice that of the ward profile). 79% of people travelled to the library by foot.

Higher proportion of older people use the library than in the resident population and they may not make as much use of a gym, so may experience a loss related to smaller library collection/self service.

High proportion of library users are black therefore they will be more affected by the changes.

There isn’t currently a local authority commissioned leisure facility in this geographical area so the gym could be a positive addition to local residents.

Need to ensure activities targeting priority groups are affordable and accessible by those least likely to take them up.

Impact on library staff health and wellbeing (some may be residents in the borough).

Older people and disabled are active and have generated small funds for repairs and events. Opportunity to maximise this support by involving early on in the process and plans.

poetry, art, films etc.

Appreciating the funds that the Friends of have used to upgrade the library eg. mural, repainting reading room, installing film showing facilities etc. Therefore, will need to work closely with the group for the new plans and fit out.

Provide support to older people in using the self service facilities.

Cumulative impact of three libraries being fitted out/closed temporarily.

Ensure disabled and older people can access gym equipment.

Meaningful consultation and engagement with affected library staff.

No staff to support people with IT skills. Will need to signpost to offers re. digital inclusion strategy.

future plans.

Will the Friends of group be expected to pay for room hire charges for events?

Assess links to local healthcare providers and CCG plans for social prescribing through emerging local care networks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Minet library</strong> will be turned into a healthy living centre with neighbourhood library service in the short term with a redevelopment option pursued by 2020 via a special purpose vehicle linked to the Lambeth Cultural Trust. The archives will continue to be held in the short term until an options appraisal into longer term location.</th>
<th>people may find it more difficult to use the self service facility. They may also be less able to use the gym facilities.</th>
<th>Most of use is for quiet study, getting online and there is a high proportion of black Caribbean and Somali people. Need to ensure that there will be enough quiet space for these purposes. Need to ensure that targeted physical activities are affordable and encourage those who are least likely to do so. Impact on library staff health and wellbeing (some may be residents in the borough). Older people and disabled people may find it more difficult to use the self service facility. They may also be less able to use the gym facilities.</th>
<th>Friends of Minet Hub Kate Hoey MP Friends of Longfield Hall All need to be engaged in the future plans and longer term redevelopment. New offer needs to work alongside proposals for Longfield Hall and ensure they are complementary and don’t compete. Where the library could add the most value is on disabled IT access, study space and books. Will there be enough demand for fee paying gym in this area? (eg. Flaxman sports centre is not that far away. Is this a viable business model?). Cumulative impact of three libraries being fitted out/closed temporarily. Ensure disabled and older people can access gym equipment. Meaningful consultation and engagement with affected library staff.</th>
<th>More details needed on the redevelopment option. Assess links to local healthcare providers and CCG plans for social prescribing through emerging local care networks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vassall is the second most deprived ward in the borough with 65% of residents in the most deprived or second most deprived quartile on the IMD. It is more densely populated than Lambeth average. Over half of households are social rented. The Cowley estate is one of the poorest areas in the borough. 7% of the population are over 65. The BME population is 52.7% and 3.9% can’t speak English well. Compared to the whole borough this ward has more black people (41% vs 23%), especially black Caribbean and Somali. 39% of those surveyed in the library were BME. 12.1% are unemployed in this ward. The ward population is expected to grow by 13% in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the next ten years.

**Health profile**
Child poverty, unemployment, older people in deprivation, unemployment, overcrowding and emergency hospital admissions are all worse than the England average. (PHE, 2013 ward health profile)

**CIPFA Survey**
Survey shows 36% of usage is for health and wellbeing, 71% for study and 37% for getting online. 31% helped with family and relationships. There could be a potential loss of under 5s provision if it exists at this library.

4% surveyed were long-term sick or disabled, 13% unemployed and 12% retired. 68% travelled to the library on foot. If closed the nearest library would be further North at Tate South.

IT skills. Will need to signpost to offers re. digital inclusion strategy.
Survey shows 5% have mobility issues, 4% mh issues, 3% hearing and 3% eyesight issues. Access to books in an accessible format might be more difficult.

| **Upper Norwood** | Gipsy Hill – third most deprived ward in the borough with 60% of residents in most or second most deprived quartile. 27% of the population are 0-19 years old. This is the highest proportion of all wards. It has the highest rate of residents with no qualifications. 11.1% are unemployed. The Central Hill estate is among the poorer areas in this ward. | The proposals are not in support of the Upper Norwood Library Trust’s plans to manage the library service in its entirety. However, they do ensure that a service is maintained on the site. A third of users are Lambeth residents and will be affected by the change. Almost a third are from BME backgrounds and this will need to be taken into account in future provision. There are regular children’s events, reading group and local history and other talks and these should not be affected by these proposals. Older people and disabled | Relationship with LB of Croydon is critical in the plans. Upper Norwood Library Trust would like to take on management of the building and service. There is support in the community for this library and it is well thought of as a service. The Upper Norwood Library Trust may stop engaging with LBL. Already a co-chair has resigned and the community may lose impetus and capacity to work towards its vision of a managed building. Possible missed opportunity to support the community in their efforts, however, recognise that to date this has meant a restriction in opening hours (closed Weds and Fri). Croydon council may withdraw or amend their match funding agreement. This may restrict what is on offer at the library and its operating hours. Impact may be felt by young people, older people, BME communities, those with no internet access and families with young children. This area needs localised survey info of who uses this library and what for. Need to understand LB of Croydon’s position on the future of the building and how it fits with their borough wide plans for provision. |

**Upper Norwood** library hosts a Lambeth provided neighbourhood library service and will work with London Community Foundation to facilitate a two year funding agreement for the building. 60k will be used to commission the Upper Norwood Library Trust to provide an accessible community hub. 100k building works improvements. Anticipating 100k match from LB of Croydon.
Currently operates reduced hours.

**Information from an EIA carried out by Croydon in 2012**

The library offers children’s activities, outreach work, special events, meeting room hire, computer suite, local history collection and sets of books in various languages and large print. It offers a meeting place for local groups such as the Norwood Society and a book club.

An analysis of 3393 library tickets by Croydon found 31% of users were from Lambeth. There is a high proportion of users aged 0-19 years overall (29.6%). There is a home library service that delivers books to people who can’t get out of their home or in residential care. Activity data shows 28.6% of people who use libraries from SE19 are from a BME people may find it more difficult to use the self service facility. They may also be less able to use the gym facilities.

| | | has limited other council or public spaces and is an area known for night time industry; bars, cafes and restaurants. |

| | | | |
background. In a consultation survey of 1545 people, 82.9% said if they could not access this library they would not use one at all.

2012 consultation with residents found it was perceived as operating better than other libraries and that it was a community focal point in the area. 35% of residents were prepared to pay increased charges. 80.9% of people surveyed made their journey on foot.

| **HMP Brixton** | There are no proposed changes to this service | No reduction in budget is positive as 80% of prisoners have a reading age below that of an 11 year old child and are a key group to target with literacy programmes which will impact on employment prospects and ultimately health and wellbeing outcomes. (National Literacy Trust). | Need details on current service and how it is operating. |
### Table 2: ‘The Great Outdoors’ Parks and open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed changes compared to previous version</th>
<th>Population needs</th>
<th>How does the change address the health and wellbeing needs?</th>
<th>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</th>
<th>What requires further work/investigation?</th>
<th>What are the risks and mitigation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New event strategy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not possible to assess as strategy not yet available</td>
<td>Consultation. Taking into consideration presence of vulnerable people close to site of public events especially hospital, care/nursing home, sheltered housing?</td>
<td>Recommend to have an integrated impact assessment (IIA) screening. Also linking the maintenance budget to income generation from other sources of income (eg. biomass energy generation?)</td>
<td>Noise, alcohol and associated antisocial behaviour. Also risk of exclusion of local community. Should consider how generated income can be reinvested into increasing access to open space for local community, especially those who are least likely to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of community food projects</td>
<td>Community gardening may address chronic and non-communicable disease through the provision of opportunities for physical activity,</td>
<td>If benefit for mental health &amp; wellbeing confirmed, then could help addressing what are currently priorities for health care commissioners.</td>
<td>The issue is that those who could benefit get engaged in this work. Will require some community engagement work to ensure that attracts groups that are least likely to get involved to ensure does not widen health inequalities.</td>
<td>Confirm the evidence of health impacts Consider how this complements existing work of the Lambeth Food Flagship, Green Community Champions etc and ensure does not duplicate.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of evidence. Consider whether the community want this intervention or whether there are other needs/desires.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed changes compared to previous version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population needs</th>
<th>How does the change address the health and wellbeing needs?</th>
<th>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</th>
<th>What requires further work/investigation?</th>
<th>What are the risks and mitigation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved nutrition and reduced stress. Participation in the gardening activities may improve wellbeing through increased social contact, culturally valued activities and mitigation of food poverty.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do communities want more food growing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Park maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised specification for maintenance of the parks &amp; open spaces: a) Meeting</th>
<th>Family with young children; children in deprived areas; older</th>
<th>The revision takes into consideration the safety risk and therefore ensure that family with children &amp; older people, will not</th>
<th>Ensure that maintaining maintenance budget is also a priority for parks with are located at proximity of deprived wards (all except Clapham Common)</th>
<th>Risk could be that parks with little opportunities for income generation are not maintained well. May require</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1 Lovell R, Husk K, Bethel A, Garside R. What are the health and well-being impacts of community gardening for adults and children: a mixed method systematic review protocol. [http://www.environmentalevidencejournal.org/content/3/1/20](http://www.environmentalevidencejournal.org/content/3/1/20)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed changes compared to previous version</th>
<th>Population needs</th>
<th>How does the change address the health and wellbeing needs?</th>
<th>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</th>
<th>What requires further work/investigation?</th>
<th>What are the risks and mitigation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the council’s statutory obligations for litter collection and waste management, to provide clean and safe parks. b) Provide mown grass areas for informal recreation, sports and events and un-mown grass areas, which support nature conservation. c) Meeting European safety standards for children’s plays areas and paddling pools; d) Maintaining sports facilities, which support the Culture 2020 priorities and generate income which can be reinvested in public parks</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>have additional constraints to use the parks. Also, increase maintenance services during period of high usage (e.g. Summer months) will minimise the risks; references to larger parks/open spaces having higher maintenance cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>developing a process of “redistribution” of income generated to cover ALL critical parks’ maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes compared to previous version</td>
<td>Population needs</td>
<td>How does the change address the health and wellbeing needs?</td>
<td>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</td>
<td>What requires further work/investigation?</td>
<td>What are the risks and mitigation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services. e) Maintaining the Heritage Lottery investments at Brockwell Park, Myatts Fields Parks and Kennington Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling pools</td>
<td>Young children (all) but especially those who cannot go on holidays</td>
<td>Prioritised those with high needs which are also located in areas of high needs (except Clapham Common)</td>
<td>To devise an alternative strategy to maintain the other paddling pools in deprived areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>For Clapham Common, consider other revenue sources eg. local businesses to sponsor the maintenance of the paddling pool, local community groups, crowdsourcing? Building a playground in place of paddling pools may raise the issue of future maintenance to ensure safety and we suggest is not cost neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal bedding replaced by perennials and grassed areas.</td>
<td>Wellbeing of all residents</td>
<td>Ensure lower cost, lower maintenance green space, contribute to environment.</td>
<td>Local groups, schools, to establish gardening clubs</td>
<td>Link with sustainability agenda? With Arts? Bee keeping?</td>
<td>This is a mitigation to the reduction of maintenance budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public toilets</td>
<td>Families with Focus on parks with</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linking with the community toilets</td>
<td>All operators in all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes compared to previous version</td>
<td>Population needs</td>
<td>How does the change address the health and wellbeing needs?</td>
<td>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</td>
<td>What requires further work/investigation?</td>
<td>What are the risks and mitigation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young children &amp; older people, disabled people, people with long term health conditions</td>
<td>highest rate of use, and period of highest needs. Not clear in the proposal if the toilets in these parks will remain opened.</td>
<td>schemes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>parks to be requested to provide open access to clean toilet (will be useful to know which % revenue toilet maintenance represents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Gate closure at night to be phased out by April 2016 with the exception of Brockwell Park, Ufford St, St Johns Churchyard, Archbishops Park, Tivoli Park, Ruskin Park, Loughborough Park, Kennington Park, Myatts Fields Parks</td>
<td>Proposed to continue gate closures on a number of park, and assess opportunity for this task to be part of contract with neighbouring facilities. Evidence not known on impact of keeping gates open at night.</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct risk assessment on the remaining before taking decision Gather information about what is known in other areas where park gates have been left open at night. To date there is no evidence that this will lead to crime/anti social behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community engagement</th>
<th>See above</th>
<th>Cancelled as approach based on previous experience</th>
<th>N.A</th>
<th>N.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement in park maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering around concept of</td>
<td>Opportunity to engage more with local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes compared to previous version</td>
<td>Population needs</td>
<td>How does the change address the health and wellbeing needs?</td>
<td>What is the expectation/requirement from the community and other partners?</td>
<td>What requires further work/investigation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership parks based on neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>residents to improve their health and wellbeing. Better local democratic vehicle for involving people in local decision making about parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brockwell Hall**
Not enough information in the paper to assess the benefits and risks. not clear why investing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skateboard parks</th>
<th>Physical health, young people,</th>
<th>Not addressed in previous proposal Skate parks are popular with young people, particularly adolescents, and may have health and wellbeing benefits if they encourage positive activity. They may also help to reduce youth crime and antisocial behaviour.</th>
<th>Inform the specification for assessment of repair</th>
<th>Safety risks control required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Lucy Smith, Public Health Manager**

**Marie-Noelle Vieu, Consultant in Public Health**

---

1 Cabe (2010), Community green: using local spaces to tackle and improve health
Neighbourhood library service is defined as self service facilities with a limited supply of books alongside study space, wifi, computers and space to hire for community groups and small enterprises. There will be no permanent library staff on site but where there is an existing budget for toddler/play groups these will continue.

A healthy living centre is defined as having a fee paying gym, library spoke, community rental and small business space and will be managed as part of LBL’s leisure contracting arrangements.
1. Mission

1.1 Lambeth Libraries strengthen local communities and improve the lives of our citizens by providing and encouraging access to reading, information and lifelong learning and by delivering leisure, health, employment and cultural activities for everyone who lives, studies and works in Lambeth. To deliver our mission, we rely on four great resources:

- our staff;
- our local communities;
- our collections; and,
- our physical and virtual spaces.

1.2 This enables Libraries deliver the following Council priority for which they are commissioned:

- people are healthier for longer.

1.3 Whilst also contributing significantly to these other priorities:

- people have the skills to find work;
- all young people have opportunities to achieve their ambitions;
- people achieve financial security;
- Lambeth plays a strong role in London’s economy;
- people live in, work in and visit our vibrant and creative town centres;
- older, disabled and vulnerable people can live independently and have control over their lives;
- crime reduces;
- people take greater responsibility for their neighbourhood;
- vulnerable children and adults get support and protection;
- all Lambeth communities feel they are valued and are part of their neighbourhoods; and,
- people lead environmentally sustainable lives.

1.4 Libraries in Lambeth will be delivered through a mixture of town centre libraries, neighbourhood libraries, satellite or deposit collections, as well as a 24/7 online service and an outreach home library service, for those who are housebound. These services will deliver the following standards as part of our statutory duty as a library authority.

2. Provision of suitable and appropriate access to public library services in Lambeth

Location of service points and access to them

2.1 The proportion of occupied households within 1 mile distance of a static library service point shall be at least 95%, or where there is no static service point the provision of a satellite service will be provided. In meeting the standard Lambeth will also calculate
the contribution made to the achievement of the Standard by the use of other methods of service provision.

2.2 Such methods could include direct home delivery, the provision of community collections or collection points, and inter-authority collaboration across boundaries. The data used to calculate this aspect of service access should be based on the information held by Lambeth’s geographical information system or its equivalent, and not on broad estimates.

Access to services for user groups with particular access requirements

2.3 Lambeth shall provide access to the library service for those who may not be able to use conventional service points due to physical, sensory or other impairments, (including people who are housebound, and their carers and those in care or residential homes) or because they are resident in prison. Lambeth will provide specialised assistance, facilities and equipment for people with particular access or use requirements at or via service points.

3 Opening hours

3.1 Lambeth Libraries will ensure that the aggregate annual opening hours for all service points administered by Lambeth, defined as those that provide access to materials, staff and a range of services, will be no less than 62 hours per 1,000 resident population. The Standard should be calculated on the basis of the total normal weekly opening hours of all service points as indicated above multiplied by 50 weeks, divided per 1,000 resident population.

3.2 Libraries will also be required to report on emergency or unplanned closures of service points during the year when users were not informed during the previous three weeks that the service would not be provided, and emergency non-opening of static libraries will be no more than 1% of total planned opening hours during any year.

4 Access to facilities and services based on Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)

4.1 The following Standards should apply to all service points open for more than 10 hours per week. Libraries will ensure that the following ICT facilities are available to users:

a) at least 7 networked public access personal or laptop computers per 10,000 resident populations distributed according to Lambeth’s discretion throughout the total number of service points, providing free access to the Internet and full access to Lambeth’s online catalogue of its total holdings;

b) hardware and software available at library service points shall be renewed or refurbished according to the corporate policy in place relating to the programme adopted for the renewal and refurbishment of ICT hardware and software. In most instances those policies seek to renew or refurbish such facilities over a period of no longer than 5 years;

c) facilities that enable residents to use their own laptop computers and other mobile technologies in libraries;
d) all static libraries should provide Wi-Fi facilities;
e) free email access;
f) general information and reference sources, including employment, careers and benefits information;
g) children’s and other social information;
h) community information;
i) scanning and printing facilities;
j) plug-in facilities for digital media sources and portable devices;
k) access to free introductory or basic support in the use of the facilities defined as formal or informal assistance to users in the use of ICT facilities;
l) information literacy sessions for users (formal or informal assistance to users in developing or enhancing their use of library services and facilities);
m) newspapers and other current information sources online;
n) local history, heritage and family history sources;
o) local and national government sources, including health, housing and benefits;
p) access to e-learning resources; and,
q) e-books, e-audio and e-magazines.

5 Neighbourhood libraries
5.1 These will support the delivery of the standards but will provide smaller collections of books than the town centre libraries. There will be IT provision, self-service facilities and a programme of activities that will be provided by Lambeth libraries as well as community groups, or a mixture of these.

- Wi-Fi access;
- computers;
- study space;
- book stock will be planned and managed by the Lambeth library service, which will reflect local needs, culture and community languages;
- where the building permits there will be space for community groups and small enterprises to hire; and,
- Lambeth library staff will regularly visit the neighbourhood libraries.

6. Home Library Service
6.1 Housebound readers will be entitled to borrow from the book stock that is held throughout Lambeth Libraries and the same right of access to the services of professional library staff and borrowing privileges as all other residents in line with disability legislation.

7. Satellite or Deposit collections
7.1 These will be small collections of no more than 300 books provided in residential settings or community spaces such as doctors surgeries. There will be no staff presence, IT provision or self-service machines.
8. **Provision of suitable and appropriate range of services and materials for public use and efficient delivery**

8.1 Acquisitions are defined as including printed and non-book media, e-books and electronic sources purchased for public use should also be included. An electronic service, which provides access to a multitude of bundled resources to which the library service may subscribe should only be counted as a single purchase. Gifts or donations should be excluded, but centrally purchased sources through one subscription should be included in totals. Non-book media with multiple content should be counted as one item.

9. **Stock acquisitions**

9.1 Lambeth Libraries should achieve no less than the median point for the acquisition of new collection items, based on UK performance figures:

- for use by adults per 1,000 total resident population - 62 items per annum *(Welsh Library Standards 124 items)*; and,
- for users under 16 per 1,000 total resident population - 35 items per annum *(Welsh Library Standards 61 items)*.

10. **Expenditure on stock acquisitions**

10.1 Using the same definitions for stock as outlined above:

- Lambeth shall seek to maintain a level of expenditure on collection items for use by adults per 1,000 total resident population that does not fall below £1685 (before supplier discounts are applied) per annum; and,
- Lambeth shall seek to deliver a level of expenditure on collection items for those under 16 per 1,000 total resident population that does not fall below £263 per annum (before supplier discounts are applied). *Note: These are the lowest quartiles in the Welsh Library Standards.*

11. **Replenishment of stock**

- Lambeth Libraries shall ensure that the average time taken to replenish the lending stock on open access for adult users is no more than 8.9 years; and,
- Lambeth Libraries shall ensure that the time taken to replenish the lending stock on open access for users under 16 is no more than 8.9 years.

11.1 This does not mean all items will be replenished in this timeframe. The stock policy will set out criteria for specific areas of stock e.g. travel guides will be replenished more frequently whereas key works that are rarely reprinted will be retained for longer.

12. **Supply of requests for materials**

12.1 Lambeth shall on average over the three-year period ensure that no less than:

- 64% of all requests for materials shall be supplied within 7 calendar days;
• 79% within 15 calendar days; and,
• 89% within 30 calendar days.

13. Information provision
13.1 Lambeth Libraries shall provide a reference information and enquiry service delivered via the Libraries, by telephone and online. This is not limited to bibliographical information but other general information needs. This will include information on education, careers, employment, housing, health, planning, benefits, business, council and central government information. Customers visiting the town centre libraries will be served by a member of staff within 15 minutes. Telephone calls will be answered within 5 rings or if staff are not available the customer will be rung back within four hours. Email enquiries will be answered within 24 hours. Where the information is not held by the library, staff will signpost the customer to the appropriate organisations. To provide a high quality of delivery in this area staff will undertake training in relevant areas such as Dementia Awareness, Money Champions, Come Correct, Benefit Advice, Mental Health Awareness, Safeguarding, and Digital Information.

14. Engagement activities
14.1 The library staff will deliver a range activity and events which will encourage full use of the service and that are suitable for both adults and children. Libraries will provide a broader programme of events by working with partner organisations and local communities that have complementary skills.

15. Study provision
15.1 At least 5 study spaces per 10,000 resident populations will be provided across all Lambeth libraries. (This reflects the local needs of Lambeth residents, where high density population requires provision to support those in overcrowded housing).

16. Staffing
16.1 Lambeth will seek to ensure that total establishment staffing levels for the library service per 1,000 resident populations not fall below 0.23 (Welsh standard is 0.37). Lambeth will work to ensure that at least 23% of the total staff (full-time equivalent) of the library service will be qualified within an agreed qualifications framework following CILIP guidelines or other appropriate qualifications to support the needs of the service.

16.2 Lambeth shall ensure that the designated strategic operational managers of the service shall be the holder of recognised professional qualifications in librarianship or information science or information management or have a substantial track record of delivering a library service at this level in line CILIP work on routes to skills and qualifications.

17. Volunteers
17.1 The Lambeth library service shall not use volunteers to replace core duties of Lambeth library staff. Where volunteers are used they shall have:
• have a designated person to report to and supervise their work;
• have clear written roles and responsibilities provided;
• meet the legal requirements in relation to the role being undertaken;
• be provided with induction training for volunteers; and,
• be provided with appropriate training.

17.2 Lambeth Libraries will comply with the Council’s volunteer policies

18. Physical assets and expenditure on buildings, service points and approaches to their management

• Lambeth Libraries will have an annual budget assigned to meet planned and reactive maintenance;
• Lambeth Libraries will have a rolling capital programme to maintain a high standard in the physical condition of the building and furniture and fittings so that;
• 60% of customers in the CIPFA Plus Survey rate the attractiveness of the library on the inside and outside as good or very good.

18.1 Lambeth Libraries will have undertaken the following in respect of service points on one occasion during a five-year period:

• a condition/asset management survey; and,
• a disability audit.

18.2 Lambeth Libraries will aim to provide a total aggregate public area (i.e. open to public including circulation space) per 1,000 resident population 30 square metres. *(Welsh Standard 27m2, South East Regional Standards 30m2 used in S106. At present Lambeth is non-compliant and provides 20 m2 per 1000 residents).*

**Note**

The Lambeth Standards are based heavily on the Welsh Public Library Standards (there are no current English Library Standards). Some of the Standards have been adapted to reflect Lambeth’s population density and the current standard of provision. Lambeth does not currently meet all the standards set out in this document, but the standards provide a core level for the service to work to and on which to build improvement. In seeking to meet these standards we will seek to mobilise our money and buildings, as well as those resources that sit outside the council within our communities and partners.
Appendix 1: Specification for Lots 1, 1a and 1b: Lambeth Grounds Maintenance services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grass management</td>
<td>• All Amenity grass mown within the height range of 25mm to 60mm on 16 occasions 1st April to 31st March each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rough grass mown once to a height of 50mm between July – October, grass clippings removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Waste management</td>
<td>• <strong>Summer Service:</strong> Daily collection of litter from all Parks and open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Winter service:</strong> Daily collection from Clapham Common, Kennington and Brockwell Parks. Three times weekly collection at all other parks and open spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recycling of green waste produced through maintenance operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Litter picking of hard standing areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of graffiti, posters, and unauthorised advertising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Summer Service:</strong> Daily cleansing of children’s sand play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Winter Service:</strong> Weekly cleansing of children’s sand play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Horticultural services</td>
<td>• <strong>Summer Service:</strong> Staffing and maintenance of traditional walled gardens: mixed herbaceous shrubs and annuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide static skilled gardening staff from Monday to Friday each week in the following locations from 1st April – 30th September:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kennington Park, Walled Garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brockwell Park, Walled Garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Myatt’s Fields Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of fence lines and boundary vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secure stakes and guards on young trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual maintenance of species, hybrid, floribunda, climbing and rambling roses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of herbaceous perennials at 3 area parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of specimen ornamental shrubs, hedges, shrub beds and climbing shrubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Furniture &amp; fittings</td>
<td>• The 3 monthly visual inspections of all furniture, fittings and infrastructure with particular attention to structural condition. Isolate hazardous items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children’s Play</td>
<td>• The weekly inspection of children’s play areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Summer Service:</strong> The Water play areas operate at four locations 31st May–30th September. Clapham, Brockwell, Myatt’s and Norwood parks. All paddling pools will be clean and open for use by 10 am each day. Paddling Pools will be closed to the public at 6 p.m. All pumps will be switched off when the pool is closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **6. Toilets and park gates**   | Open perimeter parks gates by 7.30.am at close at dusk at 8 locations:<br><br>**Summer Service:** Opening and closing Toilets.  
  - Brockwell x 3  
  - Clapham x 2  
  - Myatts x 1  
  - Kennington Park x 1 |
| **7. Sports maintenance**      | • Pitches maintained level, free from holes or trip hazards.  
  • Bowling greens maintained at a height of 5mm.  
  • Turf Pitch line markings accurately marked out in accordance with the relevant sport governing body. Goal posts installed in secure sockets.  
  • Court playing surfaces maintained free from moss and algae.  
  • Astroturf pitches power brushed and top dressed as necessary to maintain the condition of the court surface. Check the condition of the playing surface seams prior to play. |
Cabinet

Date of Cabinet: 12 October 2015

Report Title: Investing in better neighbourhoods and building the homes we need to house the people of Lambeth – South Lambeth

Wards: Stockwell

Report Authorised by: Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and Growth: Sue Foster

Portfolio: Cllr Matthew Bennett, Cabinet Member for Housing

Contact for enquiries:
Neil Vokes, Programme Director: Strategic Capital Projects; Business, Growth and Delivery
NVokes@lambeth.gov.uk, 020 7926 3068

Report Summary

We want to make sure that every resident in Lambeth has the opportunity to live in a good quality and affordable home. Focusing on the South Lambeth estate, this report recommends the retention of Wimborne House and the redevelopment of all the low rise buildings, replacing all existing homes, building at least 100 extra homes for council rent and over 100 homes for private rent; offering the chance of a secure home in Lambeth to hundreds of local families.

The challenge we have here in Lambeth is considerable but we are determined to do something about it. We currently have over 21,000 people on our waiting list for a council home; the number of homeless families in temporary accommodation has risen sharply to over 1,800, the vast majority of which are families with children; and 1,300 families are living in severely overcrowded homes.

We know that there are not enough homes to meet the needs of people in Lambeth and there are not enough homes, particularly ones that families can afford. We are not going to watch as the housing crisis becomes worse. That is why we are investing in our neighbourhoods and building new homes. This will improve the quality of housing for our existing residents and offer the chance of a home to the thousands of local families who desperately need a place to call home.

As well as an historic £490m investment into our estates through the Lambeth Housing Standard (LHS) programme, the Council is committed to building 1,000 extra homes at council rent levels to deliver a new generation of homes for Lambeth’s residents. Our commitment to 1,000 new ‘council rent’ homes will renew our estates and maintain the mixed communities reflective of Lambeth’s diverse population. These homes will be delivered over the next four
years through a combination of initiatives, including estate regeneration, small sites development and specific housing projects. The Council also needs to look forwards to future demand, where it is predicted that more than 1,500 new homes will need to be built every year until 2025, to make sure local communities have the opportunity to stay in Lambeth and to cope with London’s growing population.

The estate regeneration programme gives us the opportunity to improve the quality and size of homes on selected estates, invest in the wider neighbourhood and increase the provision of new homes on those estates. We made a commitment to deliver 1,000 extra homes for council rent over the next four years but we also want to give existing tenants and leaseholders on these estates a series of key guarantees so that they know that they can continue living there.

This report focuses on the future of the South Lambeth estate, which is one of the estates within the Council’s estate regeneration programme. It is recommended that the Council progress with the partial redevelopment of the South Lambeth estate, with the retention of Wimbourne House, to meet the Council’s objectives to provide better quality homes for the residents of Lambeth and to deliver additional new homes. This route achieves more of the Council’s objectives, gives all existing residents the guarantee of a high-quality home, provides many more new homes, and can achieve pay-back at an earlier time which is much more appropriate for the type of development.

What we have learnt from the work to date is that we must engage local people in an open and honest way and be realistic about the options available to us. We also want to be clear that the quality of much of the current housing is not good enough and that redevelopment is often the way we can afford the improvements that are needed. It is clear also that we must be upfront about the approaches, the timescales and the costs. This commitment underpins the way we want to take these issues forward.

Finance Summary

2.1 Financial analyses have so far been undertaken on the basis of the massing studies done with a number of alternative development scenarios tested for financial sustainability.

2.2 At this point, financial assessments indicate that the proposed scheme is feasible based on the initial assumptions in the development appraisals. These assumptions are consistent with those within the HRA 30 year Business plan.

2.3 Further detailed financial modelling and viability assessment will be undertaken as the master planning process progresses. Different funding options, structures and the impact of all taxations (SDLT, Vat and corporation tax) will all be explored further and reported in future cabinet reports.

2.4 Funding is already in place to progress the project through design, planning and land assembly and to resource any property buybacks from those homeowners who wish to sell back to the Council. However, should additional land assembly be envisaged, further funding for this will need to be allocated.
Recommendations

(1) To authorise officers to progress the project on the basis of a partial redevelopment of the South Lambeth estate, in accordance with the approach set out in Section 2 of this report and Appendix B, and to procure a development management team to progress the redevelopment of the estate as set out in paragraph 2.2 and 2.11.

(2) To authorise inclusion of additional land holdings within the masterplan for South Lambeth estate, where such land lies on the boundary of the Estate, and where such inclusions would improve the place-making outcomes and deliver a net increase in the number of homes (see paragraph 2.12).

(3) To require officers and the procured development management team to work closely with residents in the procurement and formulation of the masterplan, including a phasing strategy and a local lettings policy for the Estate.

Attachments

- Appendix A – Site Plan
- Appendix B – South Lambeth – Option Analysis
- Appendix C – Design and Engagement Report
- Appendix D – Consultation Log
- Appendix E – Household Needs Survey
- Appendix F – Financial Appraisal of Options
- Appendix G – Equalities Impact Assessment (South Lambeth)
- Appendix H – Masterplan Objectives
- Appendix I – Resident Engagement Panel – terms of reference (template)
- Appendix J – Financial Summary
- Appendix K – Project Summary
1. **History and Context**

**Demand for Housing in the Borough**

1.1 Lambeth, like all London boroughs, is facing a major housing crisis. Over 21,000 people are on our waiting list for a council home; the number of homeless families in temporary accommodation has risen sharply to over 1,800, the vast majority of which are families with children; and 1,300 families are living in severely overcrowded homes.

1.2 Every year between 3,000 and 4,000 people apply to be on the Council’s housing waiting list. This equates to 60 to 80 households per week.

1.3 At the current time, each year the Council is able to provide housing for around 1,200 households. This equates to around 24 per week and includes internal transfers from one council house to another.

**Background – Introduction to South Lambeth Estate**

1.4 The estate considered in this Cabinet Report is known as South Lambeth. South Lambeth Estate is situated in the northern part of Lambeth, off Clapham Road. The estate was constructed in the 1960’s. The site is bound by neo-Georgian flats to the northwest and backs on to late Georgian properties at Albert Square. The estate is in the Stockwell Ward and a plan is attached as Appendix A and below.

1.5 South Lambeth Estate comprises 205 properties in total, of which 104 are in a single large slab block, known as Wimborne House, and 101 are situated in a series of low-rise blocks. Across the estate, there are 141 tenanted properties and 64 leasehold properties (a tenure split of 31% leasehold). There are also four retail unit shops on the estate, situated on Dorset Road (within Broadstone House).

1.6 Extensive refurbishment works were carried out on Wimborne House in 2006, costing approximately £5m. This represented a full refurbishment to provide a 30 year life for the building components, of which around 20 years remain. These works exceeded those
typically undertaken to meet the basic Decent Homes Standard. They preceded any definition of the Lambeth Housing Standard.

1.7 South Lambeth Estate was included in the Council’s estate regeneration programme through a Cabinet decision made in December 2014. The principal reason for inclusion of the estate in the programme is that it represents an opportunity to build a significant number of additional homes, due to the relative low density of the estate, given its location and public transport accessibility levels. The site is highly accessible to public transport, with the PTAL rating of 6A-5 across the site, supporting an increase in density.

1.8 The Council’s programme objectives for estate regeneration and housing delivery as set out in the Cabinet Report of 13 July 2015 and as applied to an individual estate have been used to guide consideration of the options available for regeneration or redevelopment of South Lambeth estate. The assessment of options is set out in detail in Appendix B.

Consultation and Engagement – Summary

1.9 Since the Autumn of 2014 engagement has taken place with residents of South Lambeth Estate and local stakeholders on the future of the estate. A detailed summary of the design feasibility work and the accompanying resident engagement is provided in Appendices C and D. This is summarised below:

a) during the course of the whole engagement process, 17 events have been held on the estate, including public exhibitions, drop-ins and door-knocking exercises, in addition to which there have been numerous pre-arranged meetings with individuals and businesses on the estate and in the immediate local vicinity;

b) during the course of the engagement process, the Council has issued 14 pieces of correspondence to all households on the estate, including letters, newsletters and event notifications. In addition to this, Council officers have responded to approximately 40 emails and had numerous telephone conversations or other communications from residents;

c) in August 2015 Pollard Thomas Edwards architects (PTE) set up a website to help share and communicate information - http://www.southlambethestate.co.uk/;

d) we estimate that over 90 hours of officer time has been spent physically on the estate engaging with residents;

e) according to our records, the engagement process has enabled conversations, feedback and discussion with 163 households. There remain a small number of households within the low rise blocks, who we have not yet managed to engage and who have been personally invited to the drop-in sessions;

f) early in the engagement process, the Wimborne House TRA reformed; this represents the interests of Wimborne House residents only. In order to extend resident involvement beyond Wimborne House, we have established a Resident Engagement Panel (REP). The membership of the Panel reflects the tenure breakdown on the estate and the Panel has now met twice since July 2015; and,

g) various workshops are currently planned to take place in later September and into October to discuss the particular concerns of tenants and leaseholders and to help them understand better the implications to them individually if they are affected by regeneration of the estate.
1.10 In addition to the consultation, a Household Needs Survey has been carried out (see Appendix E). This provides the following key statistics:

- 27% of households are one parent families;
- 20% of households are retired;
- 18 residents are ‘blue badge’ holders;
- 33 tenanted households consider that they are overcrowded (equating to 23% of tenants); and,
- 28% are White British.

1.11 The view from various consultations and engagement with residents has been that generally people liked the area and many residents have lived here since it was first built and have strong ties to the area. There are concerns over the lack of security to communal entrances and people are affected by anti-social behaviour. There is not enough storage inside and outside of homes, the outside landscaped areas and play areas are under used and fuel bills are large.

1.12 In the low-rise, discussions have largely focused on the offers being made to tenants and leaseholders. Residents wanted to see clear commitments from Lambeth before talking about regeneration scenarios. Four of the maisonette blocks have had a good level of engagement with the exception of Verwood House where fewer residents have attended various consultation events or been engaged via door knocking. Wimborne House meanwhile, has an active TRA and residents there have predominantly stated their desire for the building to be retained. That said, only 39% of Wimborne residents have been engaged in the consultation so far.

**Design Options**

1.13 In mid-November 2014 Lambeth Council appointed Pollard Thomas Edwards (PTE) architects to work with the Council’s Regeneration Team to prepare capacity studies for South Lambeth Estate and to carry out the resident and public consultation. Lambeth Council and PTE have been working closely with residents so that consultation feedback has informed the development of the capacity studies and the masterplan objectives which will form the brief for the future masterplanning team. This is summarised in more detail in Appendices C and H. During the design process, there have been two major iterations of the capacity studies, where the second iteration took into account feedback from the original ideas.

1.14 From the outset, it was made clear to residents at South Lambeth Estate that the rationale for considering the estate revolved around the potential for an increase in the number of homes. This meant that all capacity studies, from the very beginning, assumed replacement of the low-rise blocks (101 homes). However, it was made clear that a decision needed to be made concerning Wimborne House (whether to retain or replace it). Design scenarios therefore tested these different options, but always involved replacing the low-rise buildings.

1.15 Given the high level of investment in Wimborne House, it was agreed that there was a need to establish the current condition of the building to provide an informed, evidence-
based view for the building’s future in the regeneration of the South Lambeth Estate. A Stock Condition Survey was carried out and is available on request.

1.16 The stock condition survey was undertaken by Baily Garner Ltd on Wimborne House in June 2015. The surveys covered all external fabrics, communal areas and surveyors accessed 8 properties. The general findings stated that the building was considered structurally sound with a lifespan for the building components in excess of 20 years. The survey identified some items of general maintenance and some areas where improvements to the quality of the building should be considered. These are considered in more detail in Appendix B.

1.17 Arising out of the design feasibility work and accompanying resident engagement, three scenarios have emerged: one of these involves demolition and replacement of Wimborne House and two involve retention of Wimborne House. The two that involve retention of Wimborne House produce very similar numbers of new homes. The numbers of homes retained, replaced and in addition to existing numbers are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No. of homes retained</th>
<th>No. of homes demolished</th>
<th>Net Additional New Homes</th>
<th>Total Homes in future estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Avenue scenario v2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>Retention of Wimborne Hse (excludes Mar Azul site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Square scenario v2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Demolition of Wimborne Hse (includes Mar Azul site)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Avenue scenario v3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Retention of Wimborne House (excludes Mar Azul* site) (minimises development to the north of Wimborne)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mar Azul is a café on the corner of the Estate, sited on Clapham Road. Conversations have been held with the owner regarding whether or not to include the Mar Azul site within any future regeneration of the Estate.

1.18 These capacity studies suggest that regeneration of the estate involving demolition of Wimborne House could give rise to an additional 295 new homes, whereas regeneration scenarios involving retention of Wimborne House can provide around 220 additional new homes.

1.19 In considering the various options for the future of the estate that have emerged from the design feasibility and engagement work, the Council has applied the tests that were initially set out in the Cabinet Report of 13 July 2015, which were formulated to help decide on the optimal regeneration option. Self-evidently, these have to be considered in the context of delivery risk and the likelihood of being able to achieve the desired outcomes; the Cabinet Decision on 13 July 2015 made it clear that design solutions must
be feasible. The decision matrix for considering potential regeneration options is therefore:

- **Viability:** option achieves a positive Net Present Value (NPV);
- **Deliverable:** that delivery risk is manageable and that phasing and construction programmes are feasible;
- **Meets Key Guarantees:** delivers the re-provision of existing homes in line with the Key Guarantees to residents;
- **Meets Planning Policy and Tenancy Strategy:** option meets as a minimum Council planning policy and Council tenancy strategy on affordable housing for the net additional new homes;
- **Additionality (1):** favouring options where the quantity of new homes provided is higher;
- **Additionality (2):** favouring options where the quantity of new homes for council rent is higher;
- **Optimal Tenure Split:** aim to achieve a tenure split between market and affordable homes, which is closest to a 60% affordable/40% market split (taking into account any localised reasons for moving away from this split);
- **Nature of Market Housing:** preference for private rent;
- **Pay-back Period:** favouring options that provide shorter pay-back periods, while acknowledging that the Council is able to invest in the local community over a far longer period than a private developer, to support the needs of local families; and,
- **Subsidy:** favouring options that require the least subsidy to meet the other objectives.

*(Items in bold are criteria that all options under consideration must achieve).*

1.20 Viability analyses have been carried out on two options: (a) replacement of Wimborne House, and (b) retention of Wimborne House assuming an uplift of 220 new homes.

1.21 Taking into consideration the objectives set out above and the outputs of the viability analyses, an optioneering analysis has been undertaken and is set out in detail in Appendix B.

1.22 The combination of these factors (the social, economic and environmental considerations, as well as the viability issues) leads to a recommendation to seek to retain Wimbourne House while the low-rise blocks would be redeveloped.

**General Planning Commentary**

1.23 In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the London Plan (2015) the Council has adopted planning policies, which seek to maximise the supply of additional homes, including affordable housing, within the Borough. The delivery of new housing is a key priority of the development plan, but this has to be balanced against the requirements of other policies, which deal with a wide range of issues such as design, heritage, amenity, trees, open space and transport.

1.24 The Local Planning Authority has been involved in the initial design development work, which has been undertaken at the South Lambeth estate. Planning officers have visited
the site, assisted in identifying constraints and opportunities in terms of the existing built form and its surrounds, they have advised on key constraints and provided commentary on the emergent design study proposals in the context of adopted planning policies.

1.25 It is recognised that the South Lambeth estate is almost surrounded by conservation areas. The future design of the estate needs to be very sensitive to the character of this surrounding area.

**Procurement**

1.25 At the Cabinet meeting on 27 July 2015, authorisation was given to extend the programme of feasibility work and in parallel to commence procurement of a development management team to take forwards the masterplanning, planning and any land assembly required to progress the regeneration of the estate. This decision was taken to provide more time to carry out the stock condition survey of Wimborne House and so as to minimise any delay to the project once Masterplan Objectives were confirmed.

1.26 An OJEU compliant procurement process is underway to procure a development management team so should a decision be taken to progress the regeneration of South Lambeth estate, masterplanning will be able to start in November 2015.

**Resident Commitments**

1.27 Key Guarantees for those residents affected by regeneration were adopted for the Cressingham Gardens estate at the Cabinet Decision on 13th July 2015. We have continued to receive feedback on the original draft Key Guarantees from residents on other estates. There are, however, no reasons to make any changes to these. It is therefore proposed to adopt the same Key Guarantees for the residents of South Lambeth, if it is confirmed to proceed with regeneration of the estate.

1.28 The Council has further developed consultation principles, which will guide the process by which the Council engages with residents going forwards on the development of masterplans for each estate. These are:

- keep uncertainty for residents to a minimum;
- ensure residents have an understanding of the bigger picture;
- make it clear to residents that their voices have been heard by decision makers; and,
- ensure that residents have the information they need to make the best choices about their families’ futures.

1.29 The adoption of Masterplan Objectives represents a key part of these communications principles. The Masterplan Objectives at this stage of the regeneration process:

- give certainty to residents about which homes will be retained and which homes replaced;
- help residents appreciate the bigger picture about the future design of their estate;
- show residents how their voices have been heard through the feasibility process to influence the future form of their area; and,
together with the Key Guarantees, contribute to providing residents with the information they need to make informed choices.

**Resident Response and Masterplan Objectives**

1.30 Through the engagement process with residents, the architects PTE, were able to test out how residents felt about the different design scenarios that were being presented. The full set of observations made by residents are noted in the Design and Engagement Report at Appendix C. The main points made by residents on the design options being were:

- people like living in the location;
- the green spaces could be so much better;
- some homes should be specifically built for the elderly;
- there should be shops in all scenarios;
- a community space for residents is important;
- high quality energy efficient homes are important;
- traditional streets with front doors would be safer; and,
- new homes with more space and storage would be desirable.

1.31 This feasibility work, together with investigations such as the stock condition survey, has fed through to influence the formulation of the proposed Masterplan Objectives for the estate. These are provided in more detailed in Appendix H. These Objectives, set out below, are intended to form part of the brief to the development management team that will be procured.

1. Retain Wimborne House and redevelop the five low-rise Houses - Osmington, Sturminster, Broadstone, Verwood and Swanage (totalling 101 homes to be redeveloped).
2. Re-provide those 101 homes plus the addition of a minimum of 220 new homes.
3. Provide new homes which are energy efficient (cheaper to run), meet current space and design standards and which will age well, with limited maintenance.
4. Create a masterplan with a distinctive character which responds to the existing local context of Albert Square, Bolney Meadow, Dorset and Clapham Roads.
5. Create a safe and neighbourly environment (streets with front doors and an easily located address). Provide clearly defined pedestrian routes through from Clapham Road to Kibworth Street and Dorset Road.
6. Provide a neighbourhood which is not dominated by vehicular routes or parking, only re-providing resident parking in defined areas, and dedicated wheelchair user parking.
7. Provide safe and overlooked open spaces creating landscapes for a variety of outdoor activities such as a tree lined park extending to Clapham Road and a new London square.
8. Provide an accessible Community Space for South Lambeth residents adjacent to one of the open space.
9. Provide new retail units onto Dorset Road, closer to Clapham Road.
10. Work closely and communicate clearly with the South Lambeth residents and stakeholders on their aspirations for future proposals.
11. Work with those resident groups with specific housing needs such as the elderly residents, or those with disabilities and ensure the proposals going forward reflect these needs.

**Consequences of the Recommendations in this Report**

1.32 If the recommendations in this Report are adopted, then the Council will embark on a programme of masterplanning of the South Lambeth estate based on the assumption that all the low-rise blocks on the estate would be redeveloped. The financial viability of the project will continued to be assessed as the master planning develops. If the Council is unable to reach agreement for acquisition of leasehold properties, then it would be necessary to seek to acquire them by compulsory purchase. Residents in Wimborne House would remain in their current homes; however, they need to be aware that there would be disruption over a period of time due to construction works directly around the building.

**2 Proposal and Reasons**

2.1 The proposal is to proceed with the partial redevelopment of South Lambeth Estate, in which Wimborne House is retained. The solution gives residents the guarantee of a high-quality home that meets their needs and which increases the overall number of homes for Council rent. The detailed consideration of options is set out in Appendix B.

2.2 A development management team will help the Council and the residents to work up a masterplan for the estate and to seek to secure a planning consent for development.

2.3 For the sake of clarity, the proposed partial redevelopment involves demolition and replacement of all the low-rise properties on the South Lambeth estate (Broadstone House, Sturminster House, Swanage House, Verwood House and Osmington House). Wimborne House will be retained.

2.4 Partial redevelopment of South Lambeth estate will deliver:

- replacement of all existing low-rise dwellings at South Lambeth estate – all existing tenants and resident leaseholders will have the opportunity to move into new high quality homes in a well-designed new neighbourhood;
- a minimum of 220 additional new homes;
- around 100 additional homes for council rent, with the potential of increasing this to 111 while still meeting all other Council objectives;
- significant improvements in the urban character of, and of the local area around, South Lambeth estate; and,
- tenants in Wimborne House, who are over-crowded, will have the opportunity to move into new properties on the estate.

2.5 The Masterplan Objectives provided in Appendix H will be provided to the development management team as part of their brief for the regeneration of the estate.

2.6 The design brief for the development management team (to be procured) will look to develop a phasing strategy for the regeneration of the estate so as to minimise the need
to move anyone temporarily off the estate and to make sure (as far as is possible) that households only need to move once.

2.7 The design brief will also seek to minimise disruption to residents on the estate through both the re-housing and construction processes.

**Land Assembly**

2.8 As the masterplan is developed, it may become apparent that acquisition of additional land holdings adjacent to the estate, in particular where such land holdings might be partly enclosed by the land area of the estate, would enable an enhanced masterplan to be produced and allow delivery of more homes. Where this is the case, the following tests should be applied:

- that the incorporation of such additional land area within a masterplan would qualitatively improve the it in place-making terms (both within the masterplan area and in terms of how it fits within its wider context); and,
- that incorporation of such additional land area would achieve net additional new homes.

Incorporation of such additional land holdings should be pursued in first instance through negotiation with the existing landowners. If this is not successful, then inclusion of such properties within the South Lambeth redevelopment would be confirmed at the time the Council decides whether to proceed with a compulsory purchase order for the estate. The decision to use CPO powers will require a further report to Cabinet.

2.9 There is a strong likelihood that a compulsory purchase order (CPO) will be required in order to proceed with the redevelopment. This is most likely to be once the masterplan has been prepared and the perimeter for the future estate determined, prior to making a planning application. This will enable the making of a CPO to run in parallel with the planning determination process.

**Resident Commitments**

2.10 The “Key Guarantees” for secure tenants and homeowners, as adopted through the Cabinet decision of 13 July 2015, will now be implemented at South Lambeth in accordance with the following principles:

- they will be implemented in the context of existing Lambeth Policies, noting specific exceptions that are set out in the above referenced information documents;
- officers will be tasked to work with the residents of the estate to formulate a local lettings policy that will determine how new built homes will be allocated, taking into consideration the housing needs of the existing residents on an estate (this will include Wimborne House); and,
- while recognising that there is no obligation on the Council to do this, officers should explore what opportunities there may be to provide assistance to tenants of private landlords on estates, with a view to enabling such tenants to remain part of the community of the estate or at the least to remain part of the community of Lambeth.

**Procurement Strategy**
2.11 Authorisation to commence procurement of a development management team was given in the Cabinet decision on 27 July 2015. This procurement process is now well advanced and it is anticipated that a preferred development management team will be identified in early November. This will enable progressing into masterplan stage with minimal delay.

2.12 The reasons for the selected procurement strategy for taking forward regeneration of the estate include:

- this approach best enables the Council to control all elements of the project including quantity, design, housing mix, housing tenure and cost; and,
- this direct delivery route negates the need for a ‘developer margin’ which is currently at 20% for most schemes; this means that more value can be reinvested back into the developments themselves, improving the quality of housing and the proportion of affordable housing.

Activities as a consequence of these recommendations

2.13 Set out below are the immediate activities to be progressed by Council officers if these recommendations are adopted. These are just the actions that will be observed from a resident’s perspective.

- **Communication**: Letter announcing the recommendation to residents, setting out what this will mean for them (this will be tailored to different residents).
- **Engagement**: Council officers are now holding weekly drop-in sessions on the estate, available to any resident to drop by and ask questions. These will continue as a permanent fixture.
- **Resident Engagement Panel**: The current Resident Engagement Panel at South Lambeth covers the whole estate. If the recommendations in this report are adopted, then the membership of this Panel will need to be re-visited to make sure that there is appropriate representation amongst residents from the low-rise buildings, who will be most affected by the proposed regeneration strategy.
- **Independent Resident Adviser**: A panel of Independent Resident Advisers has been established and, during October, residents at South Lambeth will be able to interview and select an Independent Resident Advisor from this panel.
- **Procurement**: Progression of the procurement of the development management team to completion. This process has already started and will continue as follows:
  - selection of resident representatives to be on the interview panel;
  - capacity building training for the selected resident representatives (and any others who want to participate);
  - exhibition of the bidders for the development management role;
  - interviews with the bidders;
  - announcement of the successful bidder; and
  - event – “meet the development management team”.
- **Key Guarantees**: Commencement of implementation of Key Guarantees, including:
  - notification to residents on what the Council’s offers mean to them;
  - details of the process involved in different options under the Key Guarantees;
  - description of the “Resident Journey” from current home to new home; and
  - formal buy-back of leaseholds (where desired by residents) will likely commence at the beginning of 2016.
- **Household Needs**: Council starting to gather detailed household needs information from tenants.
- **Masterplanning**: Early work of the selected development management team, including setting out for residents what the masterplanning process will involve.
- **Other**: Further meetings with landowners and retailers affected by the recommendations to consider their options.

### 3 Finance

3.1 Taking forward the estate regeneration programme represents a commercial endeavour for the Council. The programme is not about selling off our estates to private developers, but investing in them for the future. Each estate regeneration project is a significant development project that will require commercial and financial acumen and understanding and management of development risk.

3.2 As set out in the Cabinet Report of 13 July 2015, it is the Council’s intention to establish a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to facilitate the delivery of the new homes. This will need to be supported by appropriate commercial advice and expertise. In due course, this may enable a degree of cross-subsidy from one project to another. However, in the shorter term, projects that are being progressed as part of this programme are each being considered separately in terms of their individual financial merits and viability.

3.3 Consultants have been retained to carry out the feasibility analysis on the basis of the massing studies that have been undertaken. A number of alternative development scenarios have been tested for financial sustainability. Layered onto this are the Council’s objectives for individual projects, as set out in paragraph 1.19 (such as aspirational tenure split).

3.4 At this point financial assessments indicate that the proposed scheme is feasible based on the initial assumptions in the development appraisals. A full Financial Appraisal of Options is provided as Appendix F. And in response to requests for greater clarity on financial matters, a Financial Summary is provided at Appendix J.

3.5 Further detailed financial modelling and viability assessment will be undertaken as the masterplanning process is progressed. Different funding options, structures and the impact of all taxations (SDLT, Vat and corporation tax) will all be explored further and reported in the future cabinet reports.

3.6 In June 2015 AMCAP (Asset Management Cabinet Advisory Panel) recommended the allocation of resources to fund the master planning work on the six estate regeneration sites. (Westbury, Knights Walk, South Lambeth, Fenwick, Central Hill, Cressingham). This was followed up by the Cabinet Decision on 27th July 2015 to begin the procurement process for development management teams for the estates within the estate regeneration programme.

3.7 £5m per annum was also approved by Cabinet in 2014 to support the provision of affordable housing including property buybacks and site assembly costs. For any additional land acquisitions further approval for the funding would be required.
4 **Legal and Democracy**

4.1 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 introduced a new “general power of competence” for local authorities, defined as “the power to do anything that individuals generally may do” and which expressly includes the power to do something for the benefit of the authority, its area or persons resident or present in its area.

4.2 Section 9 of the Housing Act 1985 empowers the Council to provide housing accommodation by erecting houses, or converting buildings into houses, on land acquired by them.

4.3 Section 105 of the 1985 Housing Act requires the Council to maintain such arrangements as it considers appropriate to enable those of its secure tenants who are likely to be substantially affected by a matter of housing management, including a new programme of maintenance, improvement or demolition:

a) to be informed of the authority’s proposals in respect of the matter; and,

b) to make their views known to the authority within a specified period.

4.4 The Council is required, before making any decision on the matter, to consider any representations made to it in accordance with those arrangements.

4.5 Article 1 of The First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998 provides that every person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and that no one shall be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law. These provisions do not impair the rights of the state to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.

4.6 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to:

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other form of conduct prohibited under the act; and,

(b) to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, and sexual orientation) and persons who do not share it.

4.9 Having regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;

(b) take steps to meet the needs of the persons who share that characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; and,
(c) encourage persons of the relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

4.10 This proposed key decision was entered in the Forward Plan on 29 May 2015, having subsumed a previous edition of estate regeneration reports, and the necessary 28 clear days’ notice has been given. In addition, the Council’s Constitution requires the report to be published on the website for five clear days before the proposed decision is approved by the Cabinet Member. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the decision-maker before the decision is taken. A further period of five clear days - the call-in period – must then elapse before the decision is enacted. If the decision is called-in during this period, it cannot be enacted until the call-in has been considered and resolved.

5. Consultation and Co-production

5.1 Estate regeneration projects involve a series of stages of work. There is initial feasibility, during which the Council is making a first approach to residents to discuss regeneration of the estate, followed by a process of engagement, in which residents can become closely involved in the planning and design of the future of their estate. We appreciate that local residents need to be able to bring forward ideas and also objections at an early stage. This also allows us to set out our own objectives about improving quality and providing more affordable homes.

5.2 There has been an extensive programme of consultation and engagement on South Lambeth which has provided clear and consistent messaging to the residents and provided opportunities for residents to shape the masterplan objectives which will in turn shape the new development. The process by which the design and engagement has operated is set out in detail in the Design and Engagement Report at Appendix C. A detailed consultation log of all the activity is set out in Appendix D.

5.3 The communication and engagement principles that are being followed to progress the regeneration of the South Lambeth estate are set out in paragraph 1.28. The key to success is that the dialogue is open and honest and that we acknowledge early on that not all decisions and approaches will be fully accepted. This is why the masterplan objectives must be fully understood and once drawn up adhered to.

5.4 Once these masterplan objectives have been adopted, the Council will continue to work with residents in detailed design and masterplanning both of the estate and of their new homes.

5.5 In parallel with the work to formulate masterplan objectives, the Council has been working with residents to establish Resident Engagement Panels for each estate in the estate regeneration programme. A Resident Engagement Panel has been formed at South Lambeth, comprising representation from across the whole estate. The Council and the residents are currently in the process. At time of writing this Cabinet Report, the Council is working with residents to agree Terms of Reference and Codes of Conduct for this Panel. A draft of these Terms of Reference is provided as Appendix I. If the
recommendations in this report are adopted, then the membership of this Panel will need to be re-visited to make sure that there is appropriate representation amongst residents from the low-rise buildings, who will be most affected by the proposed regeneration strategy.

5.6 We are establishing a panel of Independent Resident Advisers. This panel is now available for residents at South Lambeth estate to select a preferred Adviser for themselves. Independent Resident Advisers are experts in housing and estate regeneration. They are well versed in the rights of residents in the context of estate regeneration.

6 Risk Management

6.1 A project team is in place and a risk register is maintained. Key risks and mitigations are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents do not feel engaged in the process.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>The approach we are adopting is to have direct engagement throughout all the processes and phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents do not agree with the data on which regeneration, demolition and new build actions are based.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resident reps involved in the Resident Engagement Panel can help to demonstrate that the information and data is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have instances of legal objections or an unwillingness to vacate properties.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Project plan – delivery stage addresses tasks required to mitigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterplan is too expensive.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>The Council is using a wide range of communication methods to work with residents to explain the benefits of estate regeneration at both and individual and collective level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where individual residents have concerns, the Council can work with them to seek to address issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Independent Resident Advisor retained to advise residents on options and impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robust financial advice and modelling to make sure we are completely clear about costs. A development management team will be procured, where it will be their responsibility to present back to the Council viable options for regeneration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial oversight to be provided by the Financial Planning and Management Team, reporting to AIMG/AMCAP.

Planning permission not granted.  L  H  Planning colleagues and advisers to remain engaged throughout masterplan development.

PPA in place to ensure engagement.

7 **Equalities Impact Assessment**

7.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment was recently completed for the South Lambeth estate. This is based on the information available at this time. This Equalities Impact Assessment will be up-dated as the project progresses and more information becomes available. The Equalities Impact Assessment will inform the development of supporting strategies for the overall regeneration strategy for the South Lambeth estate, including a placemaking strategy (to consider the wider area around the estate, including socio-economic factors) and socio-economic strategy for the residents of the estate. Both the latter are included as part of the proposed services for the development management team to be procured.

7.2 Set out below are some initial considerations that need to be taken forwards in regard to equalities impacts and associated issues.

8 **Community Safety**

8.1 Our aim is that the new development will contribute positively to community safety by removing areas that attract anti-social behaviour. The wider regeneration initiatives will also promote greater pride in the estates and look to make sure the estates are designing out crime.

9 **Organisational implications**

9.1 Environmental
The new homes will strive to be as sustainable as possible with the resources available.

9.2 Staffing and accommodation
None

9.3 Procurement
An OJEU compliant procurement process is underway to procure development management teams to lead on the masterplanning of South Lambeth.

9.4 Health
The new homes should provide better health outcomes for our residents and we will look at how this can be monitored and captured (see above commentary addressing issues raised by the EqIA).
10 Timetable and Implementation

10.1 The diagram on the following page shows a generic programme for the regeneration of estates. As the work is progressed, more detailed programmes will be developed for each estate and communicated to residents. Some of the larger estates may involve multiple phases of planning and construction work.

10.2 At South Lambeth, the following indicative timetable can be expected at this time. Once the development management team has been procured, they will develop a much more detailed programme for the project. Indicative timeline:

- Procurement of Development Management Team – to complete by end of November 2015;
- Masterplanning process – to run through to Summer 2016;
- Confirmed masterplan and business plan for South Lambeth regeneration project – September 2016;
- Planning application (hybrid application, including detailed planning application for a phase 1) – December 2016; and,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate Regeneration - Generic Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masterplanning</td>
<td>Planning Application Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Key Guarantees</td>
<td>CPO Referencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate Local Lettings Policy</td>
<td>Planning Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with residents in design</td>
<td>On-going consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of phasing strategy for decant</td>
<td>On-going buy-back - non-residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm detailed housing needs on estate</td>
<td>Finalise Decant Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Confirm Masterplan Objectives               | On-going consultation     |
| Viable Masterplan                          | First decant to new properties |
| Confirm Red-line                           |                           |
| Authorise to proceed with CPO             |                           |

| Planning Application                        | Planning Permission       |
| Applicaiton (probably) hybrid               |                           |
| outline + detailed)                        |                           |

| CPO Confirmed                              |                           |
| Make CPO                                   |                           |
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APPENDIX B – SOUTH LAMBETH ESTATE
MORE DETAILED BACKGROUND AND CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS

Introduction

1.1 This appendix provides more detail on the South Lambeth Estate and explains the option analysis that has been undertaken to reach a recommended approach for the regeneration of the Estate, considering the viability appraisal and respective benefits of the alternative scenarios.

1.2 The conclusion is for a recommendation for partial redevelopment of South Lambeth Estate, in which Wimborne House is retained. This solution gives all existing residents the guarantee of a high-quality home that meets their needs and which increases the overall number of homes for council rent.

1.3 This option analysis is based on viability assessments of massing studies (known to residents as Scenarios Avenue version 2/3 and Square version 2). Through the next stage of detailed masterplanning, the Council will work with residents to develop a final model for a rebuilt estate, which enables the Council to achieve new homes for council rent.

Background

1.4 South Lambeth Estate is situated in the northern part of Lambeth, off Clapham Road. The estate was constructed in the 1960’s. The Estate is bound by neo-Georgian flats to the north-west and backs on to the late Georgian properties at Albert Square. The estate is in the Stockwell Ward. The area of the Estate is around 2ha.

1.5 The Estate comprises 205 homes in total, split between a single 12-storey tower, called Wimborne House, which comprises 104 properties. There are 101 homes in low-rise blocks, primarily comprising stacked maisonettes (3 storey buildings).

1.6 Across the whole Estate there are: 142 tenants and 63 leaseholders (around 30% leaseholders). Within the low-rise element, there are 60 tenants and 41 leaseholders. Within Wimborne House, there are 82 tenants and 22 leaseholders.

1.7 Parking: There are some estate parking spaces, disabled spaces and limited street parking within the estate boundary.

1.8 Local Shops and Businesses: There are four local businesses/shops on the estate; each has different terms left on their leases, ranging from 2 years to 18 years. One of the premises is a local Portuguese deli, which provides a key meeting place for the local Portuguese community in the area.

1.9 Discussions with shop owners have been positive and all have expressed an interest in remaining local to the estate. The Council will continue negotiations on the terms of the leases and buy outs if applicable. The current scenarios all include provision for relocation of the shops and ensure no downtime or business loss by placing them in the first phase of the redevelopment to a position closer to Clapham Road.
1.10 Adjacent land holdings. The Mar Azul Café is situated on the northeastern corner of the Estate with frontage on to Clapham Road. The café site forms a strategic location for the frontage of the estate redevelopment and has been included in the square scenario as a means of testing the implications of including this plot of land within the redevelopment of the Estate. A meeting has been held with the owner of the premises and he is aware that his land holding has been included in one of the redevelopment scenarios.

1.11 Adjacent land holdings. A block of studio flats, originally the Phoenix Pub, are located on the northwestern corner of the Estate with frontage onto Dorset Road. The studio flats are all rented properties. Given its tight physical relationship with the Estate buildings, this land holding has been included within design scenarios. The land owner has been notified.

**Estate Regeneration Programme**

1.11 The estate was included in the Estates Regeneration Programme in December 2014. The principal reason for inclusion of the estate in the programme is that it represents an opportunity to build a significant number of additional homes, due to the relative low density of the estate, given its location and public transport accessibility levels. The site is highly accessible to public transport, with the PTAL rating of 6A-5 across the site, supporting an increase in density.

1.12 This original estimation has been borne out through the feasibility work that has been done over the last 9 months, which has shown that a significant up-lift in number of homes can be achieved through regeneration of this Estate.

**Feasibility Work**

1.13 In mid-November 2014 Lambeth Council appointed Pollard Thomas Edwards (PTE) to carry out the residents’ and public consultation and to prepare capacity studies for South Lambeth Estate. Consultation began in December 2014 and has been followed with design work since mid January 2015. Lambeth Council and PTE are working closely with residents so that consultation feedback has and can inform the development of the capacity studies.

1.14 A more detailed summary of the progress of the design feasibility work and the engagement with residents is provided in Appendix C.

1.15 It should be noted that the following analyses have so far been undertaken to explore the regeneration of the South Lambeth estate:

- Stock condition surveys, which have sought to identify the state of the housing across the estate; and in particular the lifespan of Wimborne house
- Design Studies (otherwise known as massing studies), which have explored various scenarios of regeneration and which confirm that additional new homes could be accommodated across the Estate;
- Financial appraisals have been carried out of specified design scenarios (Options) to ascertain viability of different approaches to regeneration;
- Extensive consultation and engagement with residents over 9 months;
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- Proposed engagement of an Independent Residents Adviser to help residents of all tenures to understand the implications of the regeneration proposals and the Key Guarantees and supporting information that has been made by the Council; and,
- Household Needs Survey.

Analysis of the Existing Situation and Condition of the South Lambeth Estate

1.16 In order to inform proposals for the regeneration of the estate, consideration has been given to its existing form and the condition of the buildings.

1.17 The Estate sits within an area almost entirely surrounded by Conservation Areas. In comparison to the surrounding urban neighbourhoods it looks relatively run-down. Whilst the buildings have a relatively good relationship to local roads, creating a degree of active frontages, the land is not efficiently used by the situation of the buildings. In addition, in the manner of many 1960s estates there is open space that is poorly defined and under-used.

1.18 In 2006 Wimborne House underwent major refurbishment works costing circa £5m. The intention of these works was to extend the life of the building components by 30 years. In theory there should therefore be another 20 years before any new major works would be required to the building. In addition to this, four large purpose built disability flats were previously sited at the base of Wimborne House.

1.19 Given the relatively recent investment by the Council in Wimborne House, it was considered from the outset that this property might be worth retaining. To help inform the option analysis, a stock condition survey was undertaken during the summer of 2015.

1.20 The stock condition survey was undertaken by Baily Garner Ltd on Wimborne House in June 2015. The surveys covered all external fabrics, communal areas and surveyors accessed 8 properties. The general findings stated that the building was considered structurally sound with a lifespan for the building components in excess of 20 years. The survey identified some items of general maintenance and some areas where improvements to the quality of the building should be considered.

1.21 The output from this survey has now been used to prepare an Investment Plan for the entire South Lambeth estate. This Investment Plan sets out what works need to be carried out on Wimborne House over the longer term and what works need to be carried out on the low-rise buildings until such time as they would be demolished as part of the redevelopment of the estate. This Investment Plan is available on request.

1.22 In considering the regeneration options, the assumption has been made that if Wimborne House were retained, some works could be carried out to resolve any residual problems with the building and to ensure that residents can live in high quality homes. To this end, in the viability analyses of design scenarios, for those scenarios involving retention of Wimborne House, a contingency sum of up to £500,000 has been assumed as a project cost to contribute towards refurbishment works on Wimborne House.
1.23 Whereas Wimborne House received major refurbishment in the last 10 years, no such works have been carried out on the low-rise properties at South Lambeth estate.

1.24 It should be noted, however, that regardless of the condition of any individual properties within the low-rise blocks, the primary reason for including South Lambeth Estate within the regeneration programme has been because of the opportunity to deliver additional new homes. Being a tall building, Wimborne House is an inherently higher-density built form than the other low-rise blocks. It is for this reason that all regeneration scenarios have considered replacement of the low-rise blocks, but variations have been considered which retain or replace Wimborne House.

**Analysis of Regeneration Options**

1.25 The three regeneration scenarios which PTE developed through the engagement process are not masterplans; they are initial massing studies, exploring the potential capacity of the Estate to accommodate new homes. These studies have enabled an approximate estimate of the number of new homes that could be delivered through regeneration.

1.26 Two of the three scenarios involved replacement of all the low-rise dwellings and assumed retention of Wimborne House. One of the scenarios involved redevelopment of the entire estate, including Wimborne House. The quantitative output from these scenarios is provided in Table 1. There is only a minor difference between the two scenarios involving retention of Wimborne House and therefore only Options 1 and 2 have been analysed in detail in terms of viability.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of homes retained</th>
<th>No. of homes demolished</th>
<th>Net Additional New Homes</th>
<th>Total Homes in future estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Avenue scenario v2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>Retention of Wimborne Hse (excludes Mar Azul site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Square scenario v2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Demolition of Wimborne Hse (includes Mar Azul site)*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Avenue scenario v3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Retention of Wimborne House (excludes Mar Azul site)* (minimises development to the north of Wimborne).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.27 The Financial Appraisal of Options is attached as Appendix F. As set out in the Viability Report, the Council has defined a series of delivery aspirations. In carrying out the viability assessment, various scenarios (in terms of tenure mix) have been considered for each of the design options in order to test the delivery aspirations and enable comparison between the different design scenarios.

1.28 On any given capacity study that identifies a potential number of homes to be built, the two key determinants of the viability for new estate regeneration projects are the mix of
tenures within the new development and number of additional homes that can be accommodated on an estate (in particular the proportion of additional homes versus replacement homes).

1.29 In carrying out the viability analysis, the following assumptions have been made for all scenarios:

- all secure tenanted properties are replaced and re-provided at council rent levels;
- 80% of leasehold/freehold properties are replaced through an equity swap, the remainder of leasehold/freehold properties are bought back;
- 30% of capital cost of net gain affordable homes is funded by RTB receipt;
- a borrowing rate of 5.57%; and,
- in the case of partial regeneration, involving retention of Wimborne House, a contingency sum of up to £500,000 has been assumed to contribute towards refurbishment works to Wimborne House.

1.30 Viable and policy compliant baseline positions (see Table 2) have been identified for each design scenario. In summary these reflect the following mix of tenures for the net additional new homes:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure details for Net Additional New Homes</th>
<th>Retention of Wimborne House</th>
<th>Replacement of Wimborne House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Split for Net Gain New Homes</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/market Rent</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Rent (80% market)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Housing Allowance rate rent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council rent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.31 Other viable variations have also been considered in the Viability Report, which consider various flexes against the baseline position. These other variations seek to explore the degree to which other aspirations can be met by changing the tenures.

1.32 As set out in paragraph 1.19 of the main Cabinet report, the Council has applied a series of tests to consider how the two design options compare. These are considered below

Table 3

| Positive NPV essential | The two tested design options can both achieve positive NPV solutions, albeit in the baseline case Option 2, involving demolition of Wimborne House, requires an increase in the number of homes over the design option in order to enable the 40% of net |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverability</th>
<th>additional homes to be all provided at council rent levels.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverers the re-provision of existing homes in accordance with the Key Guarantees</td>
<td>Option 1 provides a more deliverable solution – see paragraph 1.33 for further discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets the Council planning policy and tenancy strategy on affordable housing for the net gain new homes</td>
<td>All options enable re-provision of existing homes in line with the Key Guarantees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantum of new homes provided – which option provides more</td>
<td>All options enable 40% of the net additional new homes to be provided at council rent levels, thereby exceeding the minimum requirements of Council planning policy and tenancy strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantum of new homes for council rent – which option provides more</td>
<td>Option 2, involving replacement of Wimborne House, delivers a greater quantum of new homes overall and a higher number of homes for Council rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure split between market and affordable homes – which option is best able to provide a 60% affordable/40% market split</td>
<td>Option 2, involving replacement of Wimborne House, delivers a greater quantum of homes for Council rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of market housing – preference for private rent</td>
<td>Both scenarios are able to deliver solutions where all the market housing is private rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-back period – preference for shorter pay-back periods</td>
<td>Option 1, involving retention of Wimborne House, tends (across various tested viable options) to be able to provide a higher proportion of homes for Council rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy – which option requires the least subsidy to meet the above objectives</td>
<td>All shown scenarios rely on a proportionate level of subsidy – being 30% of the construction costs of the net additional affordable homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.33 It is critical that any development strategy is deemed to be deliverable. In the process of working up the design options to enable the engagement process with residents, the design team has considered possible phasing strategies for the estate. As these were developed, it became apparent that Option 2 carries significant development risk in that it would require the re-housing of all residents of Wimborne House in a single significant phase. This may prove challenging and could risk the delivery of the whole project.

1.34 Option 1, on the other hand, is relatively easy to phase and does not rely on a single large decant as required in Option 2.

1.35 In summary, Option 2 provides the potential to deliver more new homes and, of particular importance, more new homes for council rent levels than does Option 1. However, Option 2 is reliant on the demolition of a tall building that has been shown to be in good condition (having had significant investment in it in the last 10 years) and significantly increases the overall project risk.
Weighing all these factors together, it is recommended that Wimborne House should be retained and that a development strategy be taken forwards that only replaces the low-rise buildings at South Lambeth estate.

Assessment of Complete versus Partial Regeneration

As set out in the December 2014 Cabinet Paper, each of the scenarios are also assessed against a set of criteria (encompassing social, environmental and economic factors); these are:

1. Homes meet the Lambeth Housing Standard;
2. Additional homes for Council rent are built;
3. Quality of life for residents is improved;
4. Residents influence over decision-making is increased; and,
5. The scheme is financially viable for the Council.

The table below considers the three scenarios (as defined in paragraph 1.26):

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Avenue Scenario Version 2 and 3 (retaining Wimborne House)</th>
<th>Square Scenario (replacing Wimborne House)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Homes meet the Lambeth Housing Standard</td>
<td>Wimborne House was modernised to an equivalent of the Lambeth Housing Standard in 2006; therefore 104 homes already meeting the LHS. All new homes would meet and exceed the Lambeth Housing Standard.</td>
<td>Demolition of 104 homes, which currently meet the LHS. All new homes would meet and exceed the Lambeth Housing Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Additional homes for council rent are built</td>
<td>A significant number of new homes for council rent would be built.</td>
<td>A significant number of new homes for council rent would be built – slightly more than would be achieved under the options retaining Wimborne House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of life for residents is improved</td>
<td>All residents would experience disruption in the short-term. All residents would experience an improved quality of life in the long-term. The urban area could be significantly improved in urban design terms and in terms of provision of good quality open spaces and amenity.</td>
<td>Demolition of Wimborne will result in more residents experiencing disruption and will result in a longer phasing programme to decant 104 families. There are 4 specially adapted homes in Wimborne House and have been advised by residents that the level of disruption to these residents could be severe. The urban area could be significantly improved in urban design terms and in terms of provision of good quality open spaces and amenity, albeit no more so than the other options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Residents influence over decision-making is increased

All residents would be able to influence the masterplan for the whole new estate and be involved in the decision-making regarding the future of the Estate. 

5. Scheme is financially viable for the Council.

Options are financially viable.

Options are financially viable, albeit are reliant on a higher development risk and require longer pay-back periods.

1.39 The combination of these factors (the social, economic and environmental considerations, as well as the viability issues) leads to a recommendation to seek to redevelop the Estate through demolition of all the low-rise blocks and the retention of Wimborne House. Partial Regeneration of the Estate is preferred.
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1.1 Introduction

PTE was appointed by Lambeth in December 2014 to provide resident engagement and urban design services for the South Lambeth Estate, as detailed in this Briefing Document.

This document is in three parts:

The first part sets out the initial Lambeth Council brief and a review of the existing estate;

The second part describes the resident engagement carried out to date and the initial development of ideas for providing additional homes on the estate.

The third part looks at the three current design scenarios in more detail.

The Masterplan Objectives for the South Lambeth Estate is a separate document, to be read in conjunction with this Briefing Document.

Client
Lambeth Housing Delivery

Architects
Pollard Thomas Edwards
1.2 Strategic definition

Briefing
During 2014, Lambeth carried out an assessment across all its estates to explore the potential for regeneration.

This exercise identified the South Lambeth Estate as one with the potential for a high intervention to provide new residential development.

Lambeth presented the Building the homes we need to house the people of Lambeth report to Cabinet in December 2014. The commitment to deliver more Council homes was approved and PTE was appointed to provide resident engagement and urban design services, following a competitive tender in November 2014.

The initial briefing confirmed the Estate boundary as the remaining six ‘Houses’ on the former South Lambeth Estate, plus the associated public space, roads and parking areas. There is the potential for adjacent land swap or acquisition which would further benefit the regeneration, and this is identified within the proposed regeneration scenarios. Lambeth confirmed that there has been no commission of topographical or arboricultural surveys. Lambeth commissioned a Limited Condition Survey for Wimborne House and a Housing Needs Survey across the estate.
1.3 The existing estate

Historic maps
The map in 1951 shows Melcombe House, Lulworth House, Pulham, Purbeck and Sherborne House already constructed, but it was not until 1952 that London County Council sought approval to develop the remaining part of the area, which would be known as the South Lambeth Estate, completed in the early 1960s.

The existing South Lambeth Estate
The estate area was originally far larger than it currently is, including the Houses to the north west up to Bolney Street and also to the north of Dorset Road extending to Oval Place and Fentiman Street. The Estate signage below still shows the historic extent of the of the estate.

The South Lambeth Estate today comprises:

- Wimborne House: 104 homes
- Verwood House: 12 homes
- Osmington House: 26 homes
- Swanage House: 28 homes
- Sturminster House: 14 homes
- Broadstone House: 21 homes and 4 retail units

A total of 205 homes and 4 retail units

Who lives on the South Lambeth Estate?
From information supplied (dated December 2014) there are 142 Lambeth tenants and 63 leaseholders across the Estate.

The homes range from studios to 5 bedroom flats but predominantly they are either 2 bed plus (186). 84 are 3 bed, 90 are 2 bed and 12 are 4/5 bed homes.
Who lives on the existing South Lambeth Estate?

Data taken from LBC Dwelling Stock Report Dec 2014
What homes are on the existing South Lambeth Estate

Winborne - 104 Homes
- 1 or 2 Bed: 81
- 3+ Bed: 13

Osmington - 26
- 1 or 2 Bed: 0
- 3+ Bed: 26

Broadstone - 21
- 1 or 2 Bed: 0
- 3+ Bed: 21

Swanage - 28
- 1 or 2 Bed: 1
- 3+ Bed: 27

Sturminster - 14
- 1 or 2 Bed: 0
- 3+ Bed: 14

Verwood - 12
- 1 or 2 Bed: 12
- 3+ Bed: 0
2.1 Resident engagement: strategy

Our initial approach involved a series of resident events starting with a drop-in introduction in December 2014. These events followed an exhibition format with one to one discussions and feedback forms. It had been envisaged that there would have been sufficient representation from residents for some of the events to include workshops which would focus on specific issues in more depth. However it was clear from the outset that the resident focus was not so much on the specifics of design but the principle of development, and how, quite understandably, this might affect them as a leaseholder or a tenant. In addition there is no estate wide Tenants and Resident Association (TRA), with the Wimborne TRA being specifically for Wimborne residents.

We adapted the resident engagement to ensure that these emerging concerns were listened to and discussed, to provide residents the opportunity to reflect and consider and return to discuss their individual circumstances with Lambeth officers.

The intention of the resident engagement was not to select a preferred option, but to look at and consider design approaches to enable the delivery of more affordable homes for Lambeth Council.

Should Lambeth Council decide to progress the scenarios and develop on the South Lambeth Estate then a further detailed series of consultation and engagement events will be critical to its success.

The following section sets out the structured resident engagement to date, the attendance, the comments and the development of the scenarios for new development through this process:

- Information Gathering - Event 1
- Sharing Emerging Ideas - Event 2
- Sharing Developing Ideas - Event 3
- Sharing Further Developing Ideas - Event 4
2.2 Resident engagement: event 1

Information Gathering
The first step on the South Lambeth Estate was to meet with the residents and retail owners to gather information about the Estate from the people who know and understand it best.

PTE and Lambeth held an introduction event at Wimborne House foyer in December 2014. This was to introduce ourselves, listen to the residents and understand more about the Estate.

It was important to hold this introduction on the Estate, but with no community space or meeting room the Wimborne foyer was the only available location. This inevitably meant that Wimborne House was more represented than other Houses.

We discussed the positive aspects of the estate:
— generally people liked the area
— many residents have lived here since it was first built and have strong ties to the area
— most people are happy in their homes
— most people felt safe in their home but not always on the estate

And the negative:
— a lack of security to communal entrances
— the effects of anti-social behaviour
— not enough storage inside and outside of homes
— too much paving and no front gardens or planting
— large fuel bills
— too much rubbish and not enough recycling
— no communal space or youth projects
— under used landscape and play areas

Other issues that were raised that evening were:
— specific maintenance problems with some flats (mould growth, rodent infestation etc)
— a mistrust of the Council with a belief that decisions had been made already to develop on the estate

47 people were spoken to that evening with 29 existing homes represented, comprising 16 tenants and 13 leaseholders.

People attended from:
Wimborne House 18 homes
Verwood House 0
Osmington House 7 homes
Swanage House 3 homes
Sturminster House 1 home
Broadstone House 0

Next Steps
During this introduction and gathering exercise PTE informed residents that we would now be looking at the potential of the Estate in more depth, reviewing the information gathered from residents and looking at the opportunities and constraints, the planning context and the neighbouring characters.

From this exercise emerged three scenarios which were then discussed with Lambeth officers and Councillors and then shared with the residents at the following February event.
Resident comments: event 1

Do you like your home?

Yes: 15
No: 5

Do you feel safe in your home?

Yes: 16
No: 3

Is it a friendly place to live?

Yes: 15
No: 3

Do you use the Playground/Football Pitch?

Yes: 7
No: 12

Do you use the Estate Shops?

Yes: 15
No: 4

Do you use the Estate's Landscaped Areas?

Yes: 11
No: 17

Do you like your home?

I really like my home
I like that my home is dual aspect
I love the amount of light in the Maisonettes

Do it suit your needs?

Yes: 14
No: 4

I'm a senior citizen and it's getting less suited gradually
No, it's only a two bed and I need a four bed

Is it accessible?

Yes: 15
No: 3

It's close to the the bus stop and the Oval Underground
For me it is however a disabled person would struggle

Is it Energy Efficient?

Yes: 8
No: 9

Double Glazed so reasonably so
Not at all! No Insulation. Needs improving
Not efficient or sustainable due to the age of the building
No and large bills as a result

Have you got enough storage?

Yes: 9
No: 10

Yes, I have enough in the garden
No, don't want my older boiler removed and use that space as storage
No, need more outdoor storage

Is it a Friendly Place to Live?

Yes: 15
No: 3

Yes but sometimes youths gather on the stairs which is intimidating, Security Doors need adding on Osmington Ground Floor

Does it suit your needs?

Yes: 14
No: 4

I like my home but not the building
It could be improved
It is a roof over our heads

Is it accessible?

Yes: 15
No: 3

It's close to the the bus stop and the Oval Underground
For me it is however a disabled person would struggle

Are there any facilities you would like?

Yes: 8
No: 11

A Leisure Centre and a well equipped playground
A laundrette
A Pub
A Barrier on the Carpark
Outside Storage
Recycling Points
Youth/Community Centre
More CCTV
More Hour Concierge Service
Plants, pictures and comfy chairs for visitors

Have you got enough storage?

Yes: 9
No: 10

Yes, I have enough in the garden
No, I want my older boiler removed and use that space as storage
No, need more outdoor storage

Is it Energy Efficient?

Yes: 8
No: 9

Double Glazed so reasonably so
Not at all! No Insulation. Needs improving
Not efficient or sustainable due to the age of the building
No and large bills as a result

Do you feel safe in your home?

Yes: 16
No: 3

No but sometimes youths gather on the stairs which is intimidating, Security Doors need adding on Osmington Ground Floor

Is it a Friendly Place to Live?

Yes: 15
No: 3

Yes but sometimes youths gather on the stairs which is intimidating, Security Doors need adding on Osmington Ground Floor

Does it suit your needs?

Yes: 14
No: 4

I like my home but not the building
It could be improved
It is a roof over our heads

Is it Energy Efficient?

Yes: 8
No: 9

Double Glazed so reasonably so
Not at all! No Insulation. Needs improving
Not efficient or sustainable due to the age of the building
No and large bills as a result

Have you got enough storage?

Yes: 9
No: 10

Yes, I have enough in the garden
No, I want my older boiler removed and use that space as storage
No, need more outdoor storage

Is it a Friendly Place to Live?

Yes: 15
No: 3

Yes but sometimes youths gather on the stairs which is intimidating, Security Doors need adding on Osmington Ground Floor

Does it suit your needs?

Yes: 14
No: 4

I like my home but not the building
It could be improved
It is a roof over our heads

Is it Energy Efficient?

Yes: 8
No: 9

Double Glazed so reasonably so
Not at all! No Insulation. Needs improving
Not efficient or sustainable due to the age of the building
No and large bills as a result

Have you got enough storage?

Yes: 9
No: 10

Yes, I have enough in the garden
No, I want my older boiler removed and use that space as storage
No, need more outdoor storage

Is it a Friendly Place to Live?

Yes: 15
No: 3

Yes but sometimes youths gather on the stairs which is intimidating, Security Doors need adding on Osmington Ground Floor

Further comments/suggestions:

"I love the amount of light in the Maisonettes"
"I really like my home"
"I like that my home is dual aspect"
"At the moment, however I'm a senior citizen and it's getting less suited gradually"
"It's close to the the bus stop and the Oval Underground"
"For me it is however a disabled person would struggle"
"I like my home but not the building"
"It could be improved"
"It is a roof over our heads"
"Yes but sometimes youths gather on the stairs which is intimidating, Security Doors need adding on Osmington Ground Floor"
2.3 Resident engagement: event 2

Sharing Emerging Ideas
Event 2 was widely advertised through individual household letters and estate posters. It was held at the Bolney Meadow Community Centre in early February 2015. We shared and discussed three emerging scenarios for providing new homes on the estate, summarised as:

Scenario 1 - streets and private gardens
Scenario 2 - streets and landscaped avenue
Scenario 3 - landscaped London square (drawings on opposite page)

Each scenario showed that over a phased development, ensuring every affected existing resident could move directly into a new home, there was the potential to create more homes and estate-wide improvements to the landscape.

The discussions with residents and the feedback forms completed indicated that the elements people liked from Scenario 1 - streets and private gardens were also the ones that would be achieved in Scenario 2 and 3. These were:
— new landscaped areas for residents
— different types and sizes of homes
— front doors on streets providing increased surveillance and security
— new play areas and landscape

28 people were spoken to that evening with 19 existing homes represented comprising 13 tenants and 6 leaseholders.

People from:
Wimborne House 4 homes
Verwood House 0
Osmington House 6 homes
Swanage House 4 homes
Sturminster House 3 homes
Broadstone House 2 homes

There were a further 11 households represented so this second event meant that we had spoken to people from 40 homes on the Estate: 40 out of 205 homes, approximately 20% of the homes.

Only 10 people completed the feedback forms, with many preferring to take away (and these have not been sent back to date). It was agreed that Lambeth Housing Officers would be present at the next event to discuss personal circumstances in more detail.

Next Steps
On reviewing the feedback (the forms and the conversations) it was decided to continue developing the Avenue Scenario (retaining Wimborne House) and the Square Scenario (no Houses retained) maintaining the preferred aspects of Scenario 1 within them, for sharing at Event 3.
Resident comments: event 2

Scenario 1: streets + private gardens
- “New housing acceptable; not too congested”
- “Development is welcome as long as it’s a mix of property sizes, i.e. 1 to 3 bedrooms, catering for all needs”
- “New access to Clapham Road not a good idea. Could potentially create a rat run through estate”
- “Too many 2 bedroom homes at present. More variety needed”

Scenario 2: streets + landscaped avenue
- “Better use of green spaces, especially residents square. Creates a safe environment for children”
- “New access to Clapham Road not a good idea. Could potentially create a rat run through estate”
- “If I had my way, I would not like to move into these new homes”
- “Could be more activity areas for children?”
- “Potential for Drop-in Centre?”

Scenario 3: landscaped London squares
- “The squares and frontages would give a better community feel to the Estate”
- “Yes to the green spaces”
- “Would be interesting to see this design developed further”
- “Faceless blocks removed”
- “New access to Clapham Road not a good idea. Could potentially create a rat run through estate”
- “Undercroft to mews is quite odd. Street scene would be more open without it.”
2.4 Resident engagement: event 3

Sharing Developing Ideas
Event 3 was again held at the Boleyn Meadow Community Centre, this time early evening and on a Saturday morning in April 2015. The Saturday session was in response to residents asking for an opportunity to attend at a weekend.

Both the Avenue and the Square Scenarios demonstrated that with a phased development, each existing resident could move into a new home with a single move; that no resident, whether leaseholder or tenant would have to move off the estate, unless they chose to do so; that with a phased development there is the potential to create more new homes and estate-wide landscape and play improvements.

The key differences at this stage between the two scenarios are that the Avenue one retains Wimborne House, and the Square one does not.

People told us over the Event’s two sessions that:
— The shops require a continuous business operation and their relocation must allow for this
— Lambeth need to meet with the residents in the purpose built units on the ground floor of Wimborne House who have specific housing needs and circumstances
— There were still differing opinions on whether there should or should not be vehicle access to or from Clapham Road – the concern being that it might create a ‘rat-run’
— Again, understandably, the main concerns were the individual circumstances for leaseholders or tenants and the Lambeth Officers were there to meet with each household
— A keen focus on the desire to stay on the Estate

A number of older residents expressing an interest to live in appropriately accessible accommodation, in proximity to others of same age
— An understanding of the shortage of Council homes

45 people attended and were spoken to over the two sessions, with others only speaking to Lambeth officers regarding their individual circumstances. 31 existing homes and 3 shops were represented comprising 18 tenants and 13 leaseholders and 3 shop leaseholders.

People from:
Wimborne House 10 homes
Verwood House 2 homes
Osmington House 8 homes
Swanage House 5 homes
Sturminster House 4 homes
Broadstone House 2 homes plus 3 shops

15 of the homes represented had not attended the first or second events, so this third event meant that we had spoken to people from 55 homes on the Estate
55 out of 205 homes, approximately 27% of the homes

15 people completed the feedback forms, but the main focus of Event 3 was the individual conversations and discussions with the Lambeth officers on the specifics of household circumstances.

Next Steps
PTE then further reviewed the 3D form and massing, the layout, the vehicular routes, the retail location and the open spaces. The next steps involved meeting separately with the retailers, with the ground floor Wimborne House residents and with the adjacent restaurant at 124 Clapham Road. A meeting was also held with Lambeth Planning Officers (see Section 11) Lambeth Officers carried out an estate ‘door to door’ session in early June, continuing awareness and discussion with households who had not attended any of the previous events.
Resident comments: event 3

**Landscaped Avenue Scenario**

- Linear park, new landscaping a good idea
- Like idea of new access to Clapham Road
- Wants shops to stay, yes
- Yes to new high quality energy efficient homes

- New access to Clapham Road not a good idea.
- Clapham Road too noisy
- Shops must not close
- Don't want to move from estate

**London Square Scenario**

- Like the idea of large open spaces
- What about homes just for the elderly, all together?
- Would like new high quality energy efficient homes
- Community space a good idea

- No access to Clapham Road - it will cause problems
- I need my business to stay open throughout any building works
- I do not want to move from the area

South Lambeth Estate
2.5 Resident engagement: event 4

Sharing Further Developing Ideas
Event 4 was again held at the Bolney Meadow Community Centre, in an early evening and on a Saturday morning in June 2105.

The key changes from Event 3 were:
— The shops now located within the first phase of any development, on Dorset Road, so that businesses can continue in operation until the new shops are completed and ready to move into
— The vehicle connection to Clapham Road has been removed, in all scenarios
— There are now three scenarios, two retaining Wimborne House, with different arrangements along Dorset Road, and one with all new build development
— Each scenario can deliver: more homes than on the estate at present; can provide a phased development so each resident who wishes to stay on the estate can do so in one move to a new home; provides a range of home types and sizes; provides streets with front doors; provides a community space and a high quality landscape equal or exceeding the amount (and quality) of current useable external areas.

People told us over the Event’s two sessions:
— Many people keen to see Wimborne House retained
— Many were pleased that there would be no traffic route through the estate to Clapham Road
— Everyone was surprised but pleased that current space standards are larger than their current homes
— Residents want to understand the effect of new homes and larger sizes on the rent or purchase prices, so they can stay on the estate

— Shop location on Dorset Road, closer to Clapham Road, was well-received
— The desire to stay on the Estate
— Older residents enthusiastic about new accessible flats, with lift access.

52 people attended and were spoken to over the two sessions, with 45 existing homes and 1 shop represented comprising 28 tenants and 17 leaseholders and 1 shop leaseholder

People from:
Wimborne House 16 homes
Verwood House 1 homes
Osmington House 9 homes
Swanage House 9 homes
Sturminster House 5 homes
Broadstone House 5 homes plus 1 shop

18 of the homes represented had not attended the previous three events, so this fourth event meant that we had spoken to people from 73 homes on the Estate.
73 out of 205 homes, approximately 35.5% of the homes

Next Steps
Lambeth officers and PTE know how important it is, both for the resident belief in the process, and the benefit of the regeneration programme, that the momentum of engagement continues, whilst Lambeth review the development potential and agree the way forward. PTE will be continuing with a further drop in and a summer event in September plus the launch of the South Lambeth website and a resident tour to other PTE completed projects. This will lead to a Resident Aspiration Document being produced, which will become part of the briefing for the next stages. (see Section 9)
Resident comments: event 4

Landscaped Avenue Scenario version 2

“Good to keep Wimborne as Lambeth has spent money on it recently”
“Pleased to see that there is no route for cars through to Clapham Road”
“Shops in a good position”
“like bits of this one and bits of the other Wimborne one”

London Square Scenario version 2

“I like the traditional street layouts and squares - safer place to live”
“It is good that new homes will be bigger, brighter”
“It would be good for my mum to live in a flat rather than a house”

Landscaped Avenue Scenario version 3

“I like all the ideas especially now the through road is not included”
“Yes, keep Wimborne House”
“Lots of green space is good”
“I would like to live in a small flat block with other older people”

“Make sure you don’t lose too many trees”
“Will I be able to afford my new home - my flat is worth far less than the new homes will be?”

“Will my rent go up if I have to move into a new flat?”
“I liked the idea of a through route for cars to Clapham Road”
“Potential for Drop-in Centre?”

“Don’t want Wimborne House to be kept”
“Worried about whether I can afford to stay on the estate”
“Not sure if square in front of shops is good idea?”
2.6 Summary of estate engagement as of August 2015

The structured events comprised:

- **Information Gathering: Event 1**
- **Sharing Emerging Ideas: Event 2**
- **Sharing Developing Ideas: Event 3a & 3b**
- **Sharing Further Developing Ideas: Events 4a & 4b**

Over the 6 sessions we met with 73 of the existing households on the estate, 36% of the 205 households. This is made up of 29% of the households in Wimborne House and 42% of those from the other estate Houses.

In addition to these structured events Lambeth and PTE have been seeking to meet, discuss and inform residents via a range of engagement methods:

- ’door to door’ visits and on-site surgeries;
- emails;
- Wimborne TRA meeting;
- meeting with ground floor Wimborne residents

This has further increased the numbers of households with whom we have had discussions on the regeneration proposals: 113 households and 4 shop leaseholders - 55% of the households on the estate, comprising 74 tenants and 39 leaseholders. This is made up of 39% of the households in Wimborne House and 71% of households from the other estate Houses.
A South Lambeth Estate household needs survey was sent out to each of the 205 households on the estate in March 2015 and over 130 were returned. 50 of those returned were from households that had not been represented at previous events or met during the additional engagement.

We know that the numbers of households who are aware of or we have had discussions with on the regeneration proposals are:

- **163 households and 4 shop leaseholders**
- 80% of the households on the estate, comprising 118 tenants and 45 leaseholders.
- This is made up of 75% of the households in Wimborne House and 84% of households from the other estate Houses.
Households engaged with from December 2014 to June 2015, including Household Needs Survey Responses

Wimborne House - 104 Homes
Leaseholder: 45
Tenant: 118
78/104 (75%)

Clilmington House - 26 Homes
Leaseholder: 17
Tenant: 61
19/26 (73%)

Broadstone House - 21 Homes
Leaseholder: 5
Tenant: 15
20/21 (95%)

Swanage House - 28 Homes
Leaseholder: 9
Tenant: 10
26/28 (93%)

Stumleeter House - 14 Homes
Leaseholder: 4
Tenant: 9
13/14 (93%)

Verwood House - 12 Homes
Leaseholder: 2
Tenant: 5
7/12 (58%)
2.7 Resident engagement: observations and summer activities

Reaching Residents
The engagement process enabled conversations/feedback/discussion with 163 households, and over 250 individuals. There are a further 42 households who have not attended, did not provide us with contact details, or did not respond to information sent to them. That is not to say they are unaware, having received flyers, household needs surveys and feedback newsletters, as there will always be some residents, in private rental arrangement or due to health, language or communication issues, who cannot come to events. Lambeth are continuing with door knocking and estate surgeries to meet with these residents.

The engagement process enabled Lambeth and PTE to introduce the residents and retailers to the potential of estate regeneration. The regeneration scenarios that emerged through the engagement process responded to the feedback from, and discussions with, the residents. The observations made by residents are noted previously in the ‘Event comments’, with the main points made by residents on the scenarios being:

• people like living in the location
• the green spaces could be so much better
• some homes should specifically for the elderly
• there should be shops in all scenarios
• a community space for residents is important
• high quality energy efficient homes are important
• traditional streets with front doors would be safer
• new homes with more space and storage would be desirable

With Lambeth we continued to engage with residents from June to September with a summer programme of events to encourage greater attendance and interest, and to actively work with the residents to help shape the future of their environment and home. This included:

The website for South Lambeth Estate, launched in August, www.southlambethestate.co.uk

Event 5: September 2015, another event to share the further developing ideas from Event 4 in June. There were 35 households represented at Event 5, six households having not been to an event previously (but communicating via submitting a Household Needs Survey) and 1 household who was participating in discussions for the first time.

Summer Event: September 2015, an Event on the estate which attracted tenants and leaseholders from 32 households. It enabled further discussions on the regeneration scenarios and the detail of the report being presented to Lambeth Cabinet in October 2015. It successfully communicated the Masterplan Objectives and the recommendation for the partial redevelopment of the estate: retaining Wimborne House and redeveloping the low-rise buildings, Osmington, Sturminster, Broadstone, Verwood and Swanage Houses.

Resident Trip, with 18 households signed up to visit the Packington Estate in Islington on 1 October 2015, a phased regeneration project nearing completion.

Resident Panel, with new residents agreeing to represent the low-rise Houses on the panel.
3.1 Planning and council context

Overview
The regeneration of existing housing estates to widen the choice of homes and improve the quality of accommodation for existing and future residents of Lambeth is strongly supported in adopted and emerging national, strategic and local planning policy.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes sustainable development; it recommends the replacement of poor design with better design, improving the conditions in which people live and widening the choice of high quality homes for a wide range of people.

The core Planning Principles in the NPPF, amongst others, include using land effectively (including previously developed land), managing patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, promoting walking and cycling and seeking a high quality design to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of buildings.

Estate Regeneration has the potential to significantly increase the supply and quality of new homes to maximise the delivery of affordable homes to meet local needs, including increasing the provision of family housing, a particular priority set out in Lambeth’s Local Plan.

Lambeth presented the ‘Building the homes we need to house the people of Lambeth’ report to Cabinet in December 2014.

Summary of ‘Building the homes we need to house the people of Lambeth’:
Our ambition is to ensure that every resident in Lambeth has the opportunity to live in a good quality home that is affordable and suitable for their needs. Recognising that good quality housing is a key priority for achieving our community outcomes, we intend to target our resources and use our influence to make sure residents have a range of housing options available to them.

This administration is committed to delivering 1,000 extra homes at Council rent levels, levering in more investment via new, radical methods to fund and deliver a new generation of homes for Lambeth’s residents. These 1,000 new Council homes will be delivered over the next 4 years through a combination of estate regeneration, small sites development and specific housing projects.

This report sets out an ambitious programme of Council-led housing delivery that will provide more opportunities for better quality homes. The programme will improve the living conditions for existing residents and provide much needed, new, high quality housing which is affordable to our residents.

The intention is to maximise the provision of new homes at Council rent levels by using external capital and long-term investment models; retaining the homes within the Council’s ownership and optimising the use of private sale to subsidise social housing. Local people and local partners will be central to the programme’s success. The Council will continue to embrace innovative delivery models that maximise the number of genuinely affordable homes and retain as much control as possible within the local community.

The Scenarios within this document have considered Lambeth’s adopted and emerging planning policies to highlight the opportunities to redevelop and utilise existing Council owned estates to increase the delivery of housing in the borough.

The Scenarios seek to maximise the development potential of the South Lambeth Estate through enhancing the public realm whilst respecting the local and wider context of the estates to create a connected neighbourhood for existing and future residents.

The Scenarios have considered the adopted planning policy expectations for new development set out in the Core Strategy (2011) and the Lambeth’s current Local Plan is made up of the Core Strategy 2011, saved UDP policies and the Mayor’s London Plan.

The Council will be updating policies in line with the recent Housing Standards Review and going forward the scheme will reflect these policy changes.

This review of the building regulations framework and housing standards, intends to consolidate and simplify codes, standards, rules, regulations and guidance in order to reduce unnecessary costs and complexities in the house building process on the issues of:
Accessibility; Space; Security; Water efficiency; Energy; Indoor environmental standards; Materials; and Process and compliance
3.2 Engagement with Lambeth

Lambeth Planning Officers

The 2 Scenarios, as then presented at Resident Engagement Event 3, were discussed on 23 March 2014 with Lambeth Officers, including planning and urban design.

The key points from that meeting were:
- Avenue Scenario v1
  - concern for the setting of Wimborne House
  - the Clapham Road Conservation Area

Square Scenario v1
- the principle of increased height was acceptable
- to consider the location of the taller element
- the Clapham Road Conservation Area

Lambeth Planning Officers

It was agreed that the changes to Avenue Scenario v2 improved the setting of Wimborne House by relocating the linear park, also by removing the through vehicular route and relocating the retail to ensure continuous operation.

The Square Scenario v2 had further developed to increase the height of the landmark building, remove the through vehicular route and relocate the retail to ensure continuous operation.

The Avenue Scenario v3 was a variation on v2, seeking to minimise the amount of new development to the north side of Wimborne House. Whilst this avoided overshadowing it was agreed that it could create an unresolved urban square, especially if the 124 Clapham Road building does not form part of future development. V2 does demonstrate an alternative masterplan with increased flats and no houses, but with the retention of Wimborne House.

Lambeth Councillors

There have been two briefings with Lambeth Councillors: one in February and one in July 2015.
3.3 Site analysis
The South Lambeth Estate is located in the northern part of Lambeth and is well connected to central London. The site sits off Clapham Road (A3) and is roughly equidistant to Oval Station (Northern Line) and Stockwell Station (Northern and Victoria Lines) both a 5 minutes walk away.

The South Lambeth site comprises 6 existing residential flat blocks ranging from 12 storeys to 3 storeys. The larger Wimborne House was refurbished within the last 6 years and the conditions survey commissioned by Lambeth Council will inform whether further work is required, and the potential lifespan of this building.

The estate was constructed in the early 1960s using a concrete frame and pre-cast concrete panel cladding. The site has pedestrian only access from Clapham Road and formerly had pedestrian access from Albert Square. Vehicular access is provided off Dorset Road. A limited number of parking spaces are provided on street in addition to some estate parking spaces.

The site is bound by neo-Georgian flats to the north west and backs on to late Georgian properties to the south west which front Albert Square. Significant zones around the site have been designated as conservation areas and there are also a number of listed properties around Albert Square. On the southern side of Clapham Road is Holland Rise House, a 25 storey high rise residential block, constructed in 1967. This sits adjacent to Whitebeam Close and form part of the same Tenant Management Organisation.

Key issues

Accessibility
The site is highly accessible to public transport, with the PTAL rating of 6A- 5 across the site, supporting an increase in density.

Parking
There are some estate parking spaces, disabled spaces and limited street parking within the estate boundary.

Existing homes
There are 205 homes on the estate, mainly 2 bed and 3 bed homes.

Site Area
The site area is 2.06 ha (note: the site boundaries need clarification).

Current Density
99 units per hectare.

Underground services
The underground services information are the Utility Services searches obtained by Ellis and Moore in 2014. This highlights the need for further investigation, and discussion with London Underground Asset Performance Power Maintenance due to proximity of the underground tunnel crowns; gas, water and electricity estate distribution and substation which will need relocation, reorganisation with any future redevelopment.

Flood Risk
A section of the north part of the site sits in Flood Zone 2, on the edge of Zone 3. Any future development will need to demonstrate appropriate mitigation measures and a Flood Risk Assessment will need to accompany an application.

Archaeological Priority Area
Clapham Road is an APA, with associated zones either side of the road. Future development will need to address this, and further discussions will be needed regarding any inspection trenches, watching briefs and method statements.

Trees
There has be no tree survey or Arboricultural Impact Assessment to date. Any future development will need to maximise tree retention subject to conditions of existing trees, and improve the ecological benefits of the site with new landscaping.

Site Boundary
The site boundary is based on Lambeth redline information. There are certain areas, as highlighted on the plans opposite which require clarification and will notionally affect the overall site area, thus density calculations.

Neighbouring Opportunities
PTE has identified certain areas immediately outside of the site area which would be beneficial to any future development, to allow a stitching together of the immediate context, providing extended benefits to the wider context.
3.4 Design principles

There are key principles important for the success of all estate regeneration proposals which form the guiding evaluation criteria for the ongoing future development:

**Urban Design**
Layout and massing which has a strong and well-tested urban framework, based upon streets and spaces, with high quality architecture and landscape design.

**Planning**
Redevelopment options which will be acceptable in Lambeth planning policy terms, and where there may be variance to policy, a strong justification.

**Housing**
Any new development will reprovide the same number of council homes and where possible use the land assets to maximise the delivery of new genuinely affordable housing.

**Finance**
Proposals which are financially viable and deliverable – this means a redevelopment which maximises the value of the land and opportunities for high quality mixed tenure housing.

**Community**
A preferred regeneration framework which has the future support of the existing residents, results in minimum disruption to them, and builds a strong and sustainable community.

The design principles we have applied to all the scenarios seek to deliver the aspirations of Building For Life 12 (BfL 12):

**Integrating into the neighbourhood**

1. **Connections**
The scheme should be integrated into its surroundings by reinforcing existing connections and creating new ones, while also respecting existing buildings and land uses around the development site.

2. **Facilities and services**
The development should provide (or be close to) community facilities, such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs or cafes.

3. **Public transport**
The scheme should have good access to public transport to help reduce car dependency.

4. **Meeting local housing requirements**
The development should have a mix of housing types and tenures to suit local requirements.

**Creating a place**

5. **Character**
The scheme should create a place with a locally inspired or otherwise distinctive character.

6. **Working with the site and its context**
The scheme should take advantage of existing topography, landscape features, wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimates.

7. **Creating well defined streets and spaces**
The buildings should be designed and positioned with landscaping to define and enhance streets and spaces and buildings designed to turn street corners well.

8. **Easy to find your way around**
The scheme should be designed to make it easy to find your way around, as resident or visitor.

**Street & home**

9. **9 Streets for all**
The streets should be designed in a way that encourage low vehicle speeds and allow them to function as social spaces.

10. **Car parking**
The resident and visitor parking should be sufficient and well integrated so that it does not dominate the street.

11. **Public and private spaces**
Public and private spaces should be clearly defined and designed to be attractive, well managed and safe.

12. **External storage and amenity space**
There should be adequate external storage space for bins and recycling as well as vehicles and cycles.

In addition, with a site specific South Lambeth approach, future regeneration must address the key issues raised by residents:
- underused external spaces;
- deterring anti-social behaviour;
- maintaining the existing shops within a redevelopment;
- accessible homes, suitable for all ages;
- a community space for the residents.
3.5 **Avenue Scenario v2**

**Principles of the Avenue Scenario v2**

This scenario proposes:
- Retaining Wimborne House with works to the ground floor only
- New homes, flats and houses
- A new community space
- Create a new landscaped Avenue park
- New shops to Dorset Road

**Details of Avenue Scenario v2**
- Provides circa 327 new homes (mix to be determined)
- Phased redevelopment maintaining Wimborne House (104 existing homes)
- Total homes circa 431 including Wimborne House
- Allows all residents to remain on site, with phased decanting
- Development entirely within Lambeth existing ownership
- Discussions to be had with freeholder of former Phoenix Pub on Dorset Road
- Street parking and also disabled parking spaces to be provided, adjacent to the specific homes
- Creates new landscaped ‘linear park’ connecting Clapham Road to a new community space
- Creates new neighbourhood retail on Dorset Road
- Creates a new legible street layout with front doors and a home address
- Approximate density: 209 units per hectare
3.6 Square Scenario v2

Principles of the London Square Scenario v2

This scenario proposes:
— No existing homes retained
— All new homes, flats and houses
— A new community space
— Create a new landscaped London Square
— New shops to Dorset Road

Details of the Square Scenario v2
— Provides approx 500 new homes (mix to be determined)
— Phased redevelopment of all buildings
— Allows all residents to remain on site, with phased decanting
— Creates a new landmark building on Clapham Road
— Development mends the boundaries, assuming some work outside of the site boundary
— Discussions to be had with freeholder of former Phoenix Pub on Dorset Road as to inclusion within development
— Street parking and also disabled parking spaces to be provided, adjacent to their homes
— Creates a protected garden courtyard for new residents and those in adjacent Melcombe House
— Creates new landscaped square, with associated community space
— Creates new neighbourhood retail on Dorset Road
— Creates new legible street layout with front doors and a home address
— Approximate density: 247 units per hectare
Demolition Plan (no phasing indicated)

View of the Square looking south from Dorset Road

View of the Square, looking south west from Clapham Road

View of the Square, looking north up Clapham Road
### 3.7 Avenue Scenario v3

**Principles of the Avenue Scenario v3**

This scenario proposes:
- Retaining Wimborne House with works to the ground floor only
- New homes, mainly flats, plus some mews houses
- A new community space
- Create a new landscaped Avenue park
- New shops on a new Dorset Road square

**Details of Avenue Scenario v2**
- Provides circa 319 new homes (mix to be determined)
- Phased redevelopment maintaining Wimborne House (104 existing homes)
- Total homes circa 423, including Wimborne House
- Allows all residents to remain on site, with phased decanting
- Development entirely within Lambeth existing ownership
- Discussions to be had with freeholder of former Phoenix Pub on Dorset Road
- Street parking and also disabled parking spaces to be provided, adjacent to their homes
- Creates new landscaped 'linear park' connecting Clapham Road to a new community space
- Creates new neighbourhood retail and shared surface square on Dorset Road
- Creates a new legible street layout with front doors and a home address
- Approximate density: 203 units per hectare
3.8 Comparison of space standards for existing and new homes

**Existing**

- **Broadstone House Maisonette**
  3 bedroom 5 person: 74sq.m (797sq.ft)

- **Wimborne House Maisonette**
  2 bedroom 4 person: 61sq.m (657sq.ft)

**Typical New Homes**

- **Typical New 3 bed Maisonette**
  3 bedroom 5 person: 96sq.m (1033sq.ft)

- **Typical New 2 bed Maisonette**
  2 bedroom 4 person: 83sq.m (893sq.ft)
**Osmington House Maisonette**
3 bedroom 5 person : 75sq.m (807sq.ft)

**Typical New Homes**

**Commentary on space standards**
Many residents had said how large their homes were and we wanted to understand the existing provision vs the current standards (using London Housing Design Guide standards).

This was a useful exercise and demonstrated that space standards (as well as acoustic, thermal and energy efficiency) have increased substantially since the design and construction of South Lambeth Estate, which are pre-Parker Morris guidance.

The indicative flat and house/maisonette plans led to detailed discussions with many residents, in particular some of the elderly currently residing in 3 bedroom maisonettes were very positive about new 2 bedroom flats being more suited to their needs.

This conversation was continued with residents at the Summer Event around the constructed 1:20 scale models of the existing maisonettes and of current flat types.
3.9 Summary

Section 2 summarises the resident engagement process. It highlights both the positive and negative aspects of living on the estate, the responses and feedback to the regeneration scenarios and how those scenarios developed through this process.

It is very clear from the resident engagement and the relationships we have built with many individuals on the estate that the majority of residents enjoy living on the South Lambeth Estate and, for those who do not feel that way, it is generally because the accommodation does not suit their needs, or that there are problems with the building fabric.

Section 3 covers the constraints and opportunities of the existing estate and the good practice design principles for the future masterplan.

As noted in Section 3.4 a future masterplan and regeneration must achieve certain objectives in order that it is successful, sustainable and viable:

— The scenarios demonstrate that there is the potential to deliver further homes - the minimum numbers and the extent of redevelopment is to be determined with currently each scenario delivering 220 + new homes, in addition to the 205 existing homes on the estate (which will be replaced with new homes, or potentially retained in the case of Wimborne House).
— All affected existing residents, whether Lambeth tenants or leaseholders can remain on the estate, moving in a single phased move into a new home, enabling the established community to continue. The detail of this is to be developed further by Lambeth.
— Future design development will be in close collaboration with existing residents to ensure the masterplan delivers a shared vision.
— The masterplan should seek to be integrated into the neighbourhood, reviewing the potential of adjacent land opportunities to maximise the quality of the proposals.
— The masterplan must deliver a sense of place, with a distinctive character whilst responding to the local context.
— Each home within the overall masterplan must achieve the fundamental requirements for a successful home: a safe environment, the sense of arrival, the distinction between public realm and private spaces.
— Streets must not dominate, parking must be to the minimum requirements and refuse and recycling strategies must be suitably incorporated for ease of use and yet visibly unobtrusive.
— The landscape, the play and the community space must be developed with the existing residents, and consider the increase in numbers of residents in the overall scheme.

The South Lambeth Estate is able to provide the much needed additional homes for Lambeth residents and can deliver these objectives for both existing and new residents.

The accompanying document, Masterplan Objectives for South Lambeth Estate, identifies the key masterplan objectives for the future masterplan and the successful regeneration and ensure that the positive aspects of the estate are integrated and supported by the future masterplan design.
“A major estate regeneration project. By the end of the third phase, a profound relationship of good will and mutual respect had been established. One of the resident coordinators exclaimed about life in her new home ‘it’s like waking up everyday and thinking you must be on holiday.’”

Olive Bailey
Resident

Lefevre Walk, a PTE project
Appendix D

Log of consultation and engagement – South Lambeth Estate regeneration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drop-in sessions</th>
<th>Households represented</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Leaseholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business briefing**

*May 2015* 4 retail units engaged 100% of retail units on estate

**Door-knocking**

*June 2015* 32 households  *

**Surgery (Wimborne House)**

*July 2015* 11 households

**TRA meeting (Wimborne House)**

*June 2015* 26 households

**Estate Fun Day**

*September 2015* 32 households

i. In total, 113 different households have been engaged from across the estate (55%)

ii. From the low rise blocks we have engaged 72 households out of 101 (71%)

iii. With the Household Needs Survey, this figure increases to 163 households (80% of residents)

iv. South Lambeth Estate yielded the highest completion of Household Needs Surveys of all the 6 estates (68% response rate)

v. Three estate newsletters published to date (September 2015)

**Breakdown per block**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Low rise blocks)</th>
<th>Households engaged</th>
<th>Total properties in block</th>
<th>Percentage engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone House</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmington House</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanage House</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturminster House</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verwood House</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimborne House</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Led by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1st December 2014</td>
<td>First letter explaining the regeneration project and inviting residents to the first drop in</td>
<td>All Homes</td>
<td>Regeneration Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10th December 2014</td>
<td>Drop-in session #1</td>
<td>Foyer, Wimborne House</td>
<td>Pollard Thomas Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11th December 2014</td>
<td>Drop-in session #2</td>
<td>Lambeth Town Hall</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15th December 2014</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 17th December 2014</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team/PTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 20th December 2014</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 22nd December 2014</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 29th December 2014</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 5th January 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12th January 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19th January 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26th January 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2nd February 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 9th February 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 16th February 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 23rd February 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1st March 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 8th March 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15th March 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 22nd March 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 29th March 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 5th April 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12th April 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19th April 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26th April 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 3rd May 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 10th May 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 17th May 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 24th May 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 31st May 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 7th June 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 14th June 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21st June 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28th June 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 5th July 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12th July 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19th July 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26th July 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2nd August 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 9th August 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 16th August 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 23rd August 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30th August 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6th September 2015</td>
<td>Door-knocking on estate</td>
<td>Low Rise Blocks</td>
<td>LB Lambeth Regen Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21st September 2015</td>
<td>Letter to all residents informing them of the Cabinet recommendation</td>
<td>All Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translated version sent to Portuguese households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 23rd September 2015</td>
<td>Visits arranged to residents who need translation</td>
<td>4 Residents</td>
<td>6:30 – 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th September</td>
<td>Resident Engagement Panel Meeting</td>
<td>Caretakers office</td>
<td>6:30 – 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1st October 2015</td>
<td>Residents Tour</td>
<td>To other estates</td>
<td>All Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Appointment of Masterplanners</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment of Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAFT PROGRAMME GOING FORWARD:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Homeowner workshop</th>
<th>Tenants Workshop</th>
<th>Newsletter – Cabinet Decision</th>
<th>Resident Engagement panel meeting</th>
<th>Wider Stakeholders Meeting</th>
<th>Fortnightly/weekly surgeries</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBL Regen Team/PT</td>
<td>Bolney Meadow</td>
<td>South Lambeth Estate</td>
<td>Caretakers Office</td>
<td>Caretakers Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w/c 12th October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>5-7pm</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.30-8pm</td>
<td>7-8.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>w/c 13th October</td>
<td>w/c 26th October</td>
<td>w/c 9th November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>w/c 19th October</td>
<td>w/c 19th October</td>
<td>w/c 9th November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>w/c 26th October</td>
<td>w/c 26th October</td>
<td>w/c 9th November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>w/c 9th November</td>
<td>w/c 9th November</td>
<td>w/c 9th November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>October 2015 – Summer 2016</td>
<td>A range of events to be confirmed following the appointment of Masterplanners</td>
<td>LB Regen Team/PTE</td>
<td>LB Regen Team/PTE</td>
<td>LB Regen Team/PTE</td>
<td>LB Regen Team/PTE</td>
<td>LB Regen Team/PTE</td>
<td>October 2015 – Summer 2016</td>
<td>LB Regen Team/PTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 1st December 2014

To All Residents of South Lambeth Estate.

Dear Resident,

**New Council homes on the South Lambeth estate**  
**Drop In Session Wimborne House - 10th December 2015 5-8pm**

We know the shortage of affordable housing in Lambeth is a real worry for local people. That's why we're looking at ways to build new Council homes and improve existing ones. We think there is potential on the South Lambeth estate to do this and want to work with you in developing the idea together.

To be clear from the start, this is not a private development. We are not selling the estate to private developers or a housing association, this will be a Council development and the new homes will be homes owned by the Council.

So, the next step is to meet with you and your neighbours to find out more from you about life on the South Lambeth estate. Your local ward councillors will also be involved. We think it’s important to start these conversations as soon as possible and will bring in urban design experts and people who’ve worked on projects like this before, to make sure your views are heard and options can be discussed openly and honestly with everyone.

**We will begin with a drop in session on the 10th December 2014, between 5-8pm, which will be held in the meeting room at the bottom of Wimborne House. We would invite you to come along to the drop session to meet the Regeneration Team and the Architects. We will be holding further workshops, information and consultation sessions in the New Year.**

It takes a long time to build new homes and if all goes well, the earliest you’ll see completed new homes on the South Lambeth estate will be 2019. So we hope to agree an outline plan for new homes and improvements to existing homes by June 2015.

Of course, day to day services continue as usual but if you have any questions please don’t hesitate to contact, your local housing office, myself, your ward councillors or members of your own Tenants and Residents Association.

Your faithfully

Lucia Deere  
Estates Regeneration Manager
SOUTH LAMBETH ESTATE REGENERATION

You can speak to a member of the team directly by telephoning 0207 926 4166

You can find out more about the regeneration of South Lambeth Estate by visiting: www.lambeth.gov.uk/southlambethestate

You can also follow us on Twitter: https://twitter.com/South_Lambeth

You can make suggestions (suggestion box is in the concierge suite at Wimborne House on Dorset Road)

We hold regular drop-in sessions where you can discuss the future of the estate with council officers and architects.

We produce a regular newsletter.

We will be holding weekly surgeries on the estate in August (further details will be provided in the next newsletter).

We will be holding an Open Day on the estate for people of all backgrounds and ages.
16 March 2015

[Name and address of tenant]

Dear [Name of tenant]

**South Lambeth Estate**

The Council is talking to the residents of South Lambeth about the future of the estate and the options for investing in the estate through housing regeneration. Over the coming months the Council is looking to determine a preferred option/s for taking forward the regeneration of the estate. During March 2015, a **Household Needs Survey** will be undertaken by Acuity Research and Practice Limited. This is an important survey which will help the Council understand the housing needs of the households of South Lambeth Estate.

Full details of how the survey will be undertaken are set out below.

**The Household Needs Survey**

The household needs survey will be started during the week commencing Monday 23 March 2015.

**Why are we undertaking a household needs survey?**

The purpose of the survey is to allow the Council to understand better the current household needs of the community at South Lambeth Estate. This information can then be used to help inform the detailed development of any regeneration proposals for the estate. It will also help the Council to determine the numbers and mix of replacement homes that would need to be provided in the event that any homes were to be demolished.

In particular we would like to find out:

- The size of property you require (the age and gender of your children and other dependants in the household);
THE REGENERATION OF YOUR ESTATE

INFORMATION FOR SECURE TENANTS

IF YOU ARE A COUNCIL TENANT,
YOU WILL BE ABLE
TO CONTINUE LIVING ON YOUR ESTATE
THE REGENERATION OF YOUR ESTATE

INFORMATION FOR HOMEOWNERS

IF YOU ARE A RESIDENT HOMEOWNER,

THE COUNCIL WANTS TO WORK WITH YOU

TO HELP MAKE SURE THAT

YOU WILL BE ABLE

TO CONTINUE LIVING ON YOUR ESTATE
22\textsuperscript{nd} April 2015

Dear Proprietor

BRIEFING FOR BUSINESSES – SOUTH LAMBETH ESTATE REGENERATION

I am writing to inform you that the Council has identified South Lambeth Estate for inclusion in its estates regeneration programme and new homes will be developed on the estate as Lambeth invests in its housing.

This is likely to mean that redevelopment of a number of properties will take place and you could be affected.

We would like to work closely with all residents and businesses to ensure that they are kept fully informed throughout the process and have the opportunity to shape the regeneration of South Lambeth.

I would like to invite you to a meeting with other local business people in the regeneration area where we can discuss the proposals in more detail.

Briefing for Businesses: Wednesday 6 May 2015 – 6.00 to 7.00pm in the foyer at Wimborne House, Dorset Road, London SW8 1AH.

Please RSVP to this invite by contacting me via the details below.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Marcus Shukla
Housing Projects Officer
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk

London Borough of Lambeth
Business Growth and Regeneration
3\textsuperscript{rd} Floor Hambrook House
Porden Road
London SW2 5RW

Telephone: 0207 926 4166
www.lambeth.gov.uk
9 June 2015

[Name and address of tenant]

Dear [Name of tenant]

**Wimborne House: South Lambeth Estate Regeneration**

The Council has commissioned Baily Garner Building Surveyors Ltd to undertake stock condition surveys across a sample of properties on South Lambeth Estate. The first of the surveys will take place at Wimborne House, during the week beginning the 15th June 2015.

The purpose of the surveys is to establish the structural condition of Wimborne House.

Survey work will commence on **Monday 15 June**.

Baily Garner will write to all residents asking for you to contact them to arrange an appointment. They need to get into 10 properties to survey the internal flats. The surveyors will also be surveying the external areas of Wimborne House.

Baily Garner will produce an identification card when they call, please do not let anyone into your home without seeing their identification card, or if you feel uncertain.

Should you have any queries relating to this letter please telephone **0207 926 4166** or email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

Marcus Shukla
**Housing Projects Officer**
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166.
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
Monday 22 June 2015

Dear

**South Lambeth Estate Regeneration Steering Group**

We are establishing a Steering Group for the regeneration of South Lambeth Estate. The group will work with councillors, other residents, members of the Regeneration Team and key local stakeholders.

The group will meet regularly and discuss issues related to the Regeneration of South Lambeth Estate. Steering Group members will be able to make recommendations and ensure that residents’ views are fed into the project.

To complete the group membership, we are looking for tenant and leaseholder representatives from the following blocks:

- Broadstone House
- Osmington House
- Sturminster House
- Swanage House
- Verwood House
- Wimborne House

If you are interested in becoming a member of the group, please contact the Regeneration Team: telephone 0207 926 4166 or email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk by **Friday 3 July**.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Shukla
**Housing Projects Officer**
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
What special needs you or members of your family have (disabilities, medical conditions etc.) that affect the type of housing that you need? and
- Other household information (car parking, vehicles owned, employment, and equality monitoring)

**How will the survey be undertaken?**

**Acuity Research & Practice Limited** will carry out the surveys on the Council’s behalf. Acuity will send out postal survey questionnaires with a stamped addressed envelope for you to return the questionnaire and a stated return date.

Please note that the questionnaire should be completed by the named tenant or joint tenant or the named homeowner. If you wish to nominate another member of the household to complete the survey on your behalf please confirm this on the form. Completion of the survey is voluntary however it will help the Council identify the types of housing needed on the estate.

Your participation in this important survey will be much appreciated. As an incentive we are offering four prizes of £50 shopping vouchers to residents who answer the questionnaire. Names will be ‘drawn out of a hat’ on completion of the survey. If you do not wish to participate in the survey please confirm this on the returned form.

The Council will ensure that any personal or sensitive information given to them will be treated in the strictest confidence and in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Two weeks after the survey has been delivered a postcard will be sent to residents as a reminder to return the survey.

Should you have any queries relating to this letter please telephone 0207 926 3649 or email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Marcus Shukla
**Housing Projects Officer**
Direct Line: 0207 926 3649
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
Monday 13 July 2015

Dear

**South Lambeth Estate Regeneration Steering Group**

Thank you for expressing an interest in joining the South Lambeth Estate Regeneration Steering Group.

I am pleased to confirm that the first meeting will take place on **Monday 27 July** at the Caretaker’s Office, Wimborne House, Dorset Road (corner of Cobbett Street) from 6.30 to 8.00pm. At the meeting we will agree a Terms of Reference and how the group will work together going forward.

The next steps for the project include:

- Cabinet Report scheduled for 27.7.2015
- Visits to other regeneration projects (dates to be agreed)
- Estate-wide event (dates to be agreed)
- Next phase of project (detailed design and masterplanning)

These will be discussed in more detail at the meeting.

If you have any questions about the Steering Group or the regeneration of South Lambeth, please contact the team: email southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk or telephone 0207 926 4166.

I look forward to seeing you on the 27th.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Shukla
**Housing Projects Officer**
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk

London Borough of Lambeth
Business Growth and Regeneration
7th Floor International House
6 Canterbury Crescent
London SW9 7qe
16th July 2015

Dear Resident

As you know your estate has been included in the council’s Estate Regeneration programme. This will give us the opportunity to improve the quality and size of homes on your estate, invest in the wider neighbourhood and increase the provision of new homes.

Lambeth, like all London boroughs, is facing a major housing crisis. Over 21,000 people are on our waiting list for a council home; the number of homeless families in temporary accommodation has risen sharply to over 1,800, the majority of which are families with children; and 1,300 families are living in severely overcrowded homes. That is why we are looking at rebuilding some of our estates to provide high quality homes for existing and new residents.

If a decision is made to rebuild any part of your estate we have made a firm commitment to re-provide every home. As a tenant you will have a right to a new lifetime home at council rent and as a homeowner there will be a series of offers available that will allow you to remain on the estate if you wish to.

We know how important your home is to you and that’s why we want to work closely with you as we consider how to make the best investment in the estate. I am writing to you to explain the next steps in the process and set out how you can find out more information and get involved in the coming months.

A Cabinet Report will be published on Lambeth’s website this Friday evening, ahead of a Cabinet meeting on 27 July. This report will provide an update on the consultation that has taken place so far and talk about how the process will continue. The report will not make any recommendation about the future of your estate. This report recommends that we:

1. **Continue with feasibility work towards confirming Masterplan objectives for your estate by the end of October 2015**

This means we will as a minimum, identify which homes are to be replaced. We will also indicate how many new homes could be built on the estate. We anticipate that these proposals will also reflect the contributions of residents that emerge as part of the consultation process. Once these Masterplan objectives have been confirmed, we’ll continue to work with you in more detail on the look and feel of the estate.

2. **Authorize the procurement of a development management team to take forwards the regeneration or redevelopment of your estate**
This will involve appointing consultants to work with the Council and residents to develop a Masterplan for your estate.

3. Include residents in the process of procurement of the development management teams for your estate

We want to work with residents to make sure that we appoint consultants who will be most able to help shape a vision for your estate. We will do our best to make sure that this fits around your needs and are committed to providing training to help residents take part in the process.

We want to start the selection process for this team as soon as possible, since we know that delays and uncertainty can be stressful. We want to have this team ready to start work at the same time that the Masterplan aims are agreed.

The team will work out the timings for each stage of work on your estate so that we minimise the need to move anyone temporarily off the estate and make sure, as far as possible, that people only need to move once. For further detail on these recommendations, please do read further detail about your estate at [www.lambeth.gov.uk/southlambethestate](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/southlambethestate).

So you can come and ask us any questions about any of the information in this letter, we’re organising a drop-in session on Thursday 23rd July between 5-7pm at Wimborne House Foyer, Dorset Road, SW8 1AH. You can also email us at southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk or phone us on 0207 926 4166, and if you cannot attend the drop in session and would like to request a home visit to discuss any of this, please also contact these numbers.

If you have any other concerns, your local ward councillors are there to represent you and raise concerns on your behalf. You can get in touch with your ward councillors using the details below.

Cllr Imogen Walker  
iwalker@lambeth.gov.uk  
07946 216 941

Cllr Alex Bigham  
abingham@lambeth.gov.uk  
07814 566 011

Cllr Guilherme Rosa  
GRosa@lambeth.gov.uk  
07920 547 916

Yours sincerely

Cllr Matthew Bennett, Cabinet Member for Housing
31 July 2015

Dear South Lambeth resident

**South Lambeth Estate regeneration**

The Regeneration Team called today to talk to you about the regeneration proposals for South Lambeth Estate.

We want to hear from you, so please get in touch with us as it is important that you understand what is proposed for the future of the estate.

Please contact a member of the team on **0207 926 4166** and we can arrange another time to discuss the regeneration with you.

If it is more convenient, members of the Regeneration Team will be holding weekly surgeries in the Caretaker’s Office at Wimborne House, Dorset Road. The dates and times will be confirmed in our next newsletter.

Alternatively, you can find out more about the regeneration of South Lambeth Estate and contact the Regeneration Team by:

Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
Blog: www.lambeth.gov.uk/southlambethestate
Twitter feed: https://twitter.com/South_Lambeth
Suggestion box - situated in Wimborne House concierge suite

Yours sincerely,

**Estate Regeneration Team**
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
25 August 2015

Dear South Lambeth resident

**South Lambeth Estate regeneration**

The Council is holding another drop-in session where regeneration proposals for South Lambeth Estate will be presented, and we wish to ensure that all residents are aware of the regeneration proposals and how they will affect you.

A decision on the future of the estate will be taken by Council Cabinet in October and this drop-in is a further opportunity to discuss the proposals before then. If you have not attended a drop-in yet please try to come along as the regeneration proposals will mean that the low rise blocks on the estate: Broadstone, Sturminster, Verwood, Osmington and Swanage House will be recommended for redevelopment. The Council is still gathering information for the future of Wimborne House whether it will be retained or redeveloped as part of the development.

Details for the event are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Lambeth Estate regeneration drop-in session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time: 4.30 to 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: Thursday 3rd September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: Bolney Meadow Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 31 Bolney Street, London SW8 1EZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please see map overleaf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will also be holding an estate event on Saturday 12th September from 12 to 3.00pm, details will be sent to all residents.
You can find out more about the regeneration of South Lambeth Estate and contact the Regeneration Team by:

- Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
- Blog: www.lambeth.gov.uk/southlambethestate
- Twitter feed: https://twitter.com/South_Lambeth
- Suggestion box - situated in Wimborne House concierge suite

Yours sincerely,

Estates Regeneration Team
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
25 August 2015

Dear South Lambeth resident

**South Lambeth Estate regeneration**

The Council is holding a further drop-in session to enable residents to come along and discuss the regeneration proposals for South Lambeth Estate.

A decision on the future of the estate will be taken by Council Cabinet in October and this is a further opportunity to discuss the future of the estate. It is highly likely that this will involve the redevelopment of your home. We are aware that you have not attended one of our drop-in sessions to date, and we would urge you to come along to ensure you fully understand what is being proposed for the estate and how it affects you.

Council officers and representatives from the architects, Pollard Thomas Edwards, will be available to answer any questions that you have.

Details for the event are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Lambeth Estate regeneration drop-in session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time: 4.30 to 7.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: Thursday 3rd September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: Bolney Meadow Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 31 Bolney Street, London SW8 1EZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A map of Bolney Meadow Community Centre is provided overleaf.
Alternatively, if this is not convenient, you can make an appointment for Council officers to visit you in your home. Please telephone 0207 926 4166 or email southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk if you would like to arrange a visit.

You can find out more about the regeneration of South Lambeth Estate or contact the Regeneration Team by:

- Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
- Blog: www.lambeth.gov.uk/southlambethestate
- Twitter feed: https://twitter.com/South_Lambeth
- Suggestion box - situated in Wimborne House concierge suite

Yours sincerely,

Estates Regeneration Team
Direct Line: 0207 926 4166
Email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
Pollard Thomas Edwards and Lambeth Council are holding another drop-in consultation event where we will be sharing the developing ideas for more affordable housing for Lambeth’s residents on the former South Lambeth Estate.

NEXT RESIDENTS’ DROP-IN CONSULTATIONS

Thursday 16 April 2015 5pm-8pm
& Saturday 18 April 2015 10am-1pm
BOLNEY MEADOW COMMUNITY CENTRE
31 BOLNEY STREET, LONDON SW8 1EZ

Thank you to those who attended the second event held on 11 February 2014. See inside this leaflet for feedback from that event and Lambeth Council’s answers to your questions.
FEEDBACK FROM RESIDENTS’ DROP-IN 2
SOUTH LAMBETH ESTATE - 11 FEBRUARY 2015

Scenario 1 - streets + private gardens
- Houses and flats/maisonettes with front doors on new streets
- New playgrounds + community space
- Resident-only landscaped square
- Different types of homes - flats/houses/maisonettes
- New access to Clapham Road

Scenario 2 - streets + landscaped avenue
- New landscaped park along Cobbett St
- New square on Dorset Road
- New community room + playgrounds
- Different types of homes - flats/houses/maisonettes
- New access to Clapham Road

Scenario 3 - landscaped London squares
- New landscaped square surrounded by new homes
- New playgrounds + community space
- New shops on Dorset Road
- Different types of homes - flats/houses/maisonettes
- New access to Clapham Road

Your comments:
- New house acceptable; so far not too congested
- New access to Clapham Road not a good idea - rat run
- New road access to Clapham Road wanted - Dorset Road is already a racetrack
- Any development would be welcome as long as it is an equal mixture of property sizes, i.e. 3 - 1 bedrooms, catering for everybody as opposed to current amount of 2 bedrooms

Your comments:
- Local activities, such as cafe, swimming, hall for residents and local people; drop centre e.g. advice, counselling; fitness centre; play group centre for under-5s; any activities for family, elderly to generate income. New playground for children and shops acceptable
- New access to Clapham Road not a good idea - rat run

Your comments:
- The squares/proper fronts to houses would give a good community feel. Yes to green spaces, and no ‘faceless blocks’ where can’t identify houses and where lots of dark/unlit walkways - as at present.
- Undercroft is quite strange. Street scene would be more open without it. Will be interested to see the developed design.
LAMBETH’S ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS

1. **How long will this take?**
The Council is looking to make a decision on the scope of works required for South Lambeth Estate by July. After this, we will begin the process of detailed masterplanning (where we take a more detailed look at design, scale and location of possible developments) to formulate plans for the future of South Lambeth in collaboration with the residents. Assuming all timeframes are met, we expect works to commence on-site in 2017. The length of these works depends on the chosen service for regeneration.

2. **TRA dissolved**
Lambeth Living are working closely with residents to re-establish the South Lambeth Estate TRA. We are listening to the views of both tenants and leaseholders, and encourage you to attend future discussions and join the TRA when it is re-established.

3. **Survey demographics**
At this stage we are undertaking general consultation. We will be capturing all important demographic information throughout the programme of consultation and particularly when we undertake a Household Needs Survey. We want to ensure that all sections of the community have the chance to share their views.

4. **Why are we being called an estate?**
South Lambeth Estate consists of 205 homes. It is usually for housing management purposes that areas of social housing are called estates.

5. **How many new homes?**
There will be an increase in the number of homes on South Lambeth Estate; the majority of the new homes will be at council rent levels. At present however, we do not know what this number is as this is dependent on the completion of the initial consultation period and results from various surveys.

6. **I am a single pensioner in a 3 bed flat – a tenant – will I have to move into a 1-bed flat?**
Tenants who are under-occupying by one bedroom or more will be offered a new home with one bedroom above their need. In this case you would be offered a two bed home.

7. **How much money will I get for my house and disruption?**
If you are a leaseholder and your home is to be redeveloped the Council will buyback your home at market value. The Council will pay relevant and reasonable legal and valuation costs which enables homeowners to obtain independent advice in addition to the statutory home loss and disturbance payments. For secure tenants, a home loss payment of £4,900 plus reasonable costs for removal and disturbance will be made.

8. **I have just been offered the Right to Buy, does this mean I can’t now?**
Regeneration won’t affect your Right to Buy at this stage. There is a period when Right to Buy is halted to stop property speculators. We will inform people when this happens.

9. **Why would Lambeth want to demolish Wimborne, having spent money on it recently?**
No plans or designs have been produced yet, nor have any properties or blocks been identified for redevelopment. We will get a better idea when relevant surveys have been completed.

10. **I am a tenant and overcrowded in my home – will I get a larger flat through regeneration?**
We will review all circumstances but the likelihood is that if you are currently in an overcrowded household you will be offered a property with the number of rooms to meet your needs.

11. **If Lambeth buy back my home, how can I afford to live in the area?**
We will work closely with homeowners who wish to remain on the estate. If there is a gap in values between your existing property and a new build, we will discuss options such as shared equity or ownership. More information will be in the information pack for residents.

Lambeth will have representatives available at the next event for you to speak with about your specific queries and concerns.
Why has Lambeth Council included South Lambeth Estate in the Estate Regeneration Programme?

BUILDING MORE HOMES FOR LAMBETH
Lambeth plans to build 1,000 new homes at council rent levels across the Borough over the next 5 years. We are looking to do this on our existing land, which includes 6 housing estates where we can accommodate additional housing. This is our response to the growing housing need in the Borough. We currently have 21,000 people on the housing waiting list, 1,300 households that are severely overcrowded and 2,000 families in temporary accommodation.

Lambeth’s main aim in regenerating the South Lambeth Estate is to build more homes at council rents. Lambeth will keep ownership and control of the whole estate throughout the process, and after regeneration is finished.

INFORMATION PACKS FOR RESIDENTS
The Council has produced information packs for tenants and homeowners on all of the estates included in its Estates Regeneration Programme. The information pack tells you what you can expect from Lambeth, as a tenant or leaseholder, if your home or block is to be redeveloped. Please note that this is a general information pack for the six estates and more details will be forthcoming as we move through the programme.

More information on the Resident Offer will be available at the April consultation events.

If you have any queries please email us at southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
April consultation event
The third consultation session was held at Bolney Meadow Community Centre on Thursday 16th and Saturday 18th of April. Both sessions were well attended and included lots of meaningful conversations about the regeneration scenarios (see inside). Council officers met with tenants and homeowners to discuss the draft information documents; copies of which are included with this newsletter. These outline the range of offers which will be made to you if your home is identified for redevelopment.

Please note that these documents are currently in draft format and are subject to change; they have been produced for all six estates included in the regeneration programme. Once a preferred option is agreed for South Lambeth Estate, a final ‘Offer Document’ will be issued. This document will be tailored specifically to the issues and needs on the South Lambeth estate.

Why have the draft information documents been produced?
We are in the early stages of talking to residents about the future of their homes. We understand that residents have many questions; the information document clarifies some of the main concerns residents have. The draft information document provides information for residents on the range of offers available for residents whose homes are identified as part of the regeneration option. The document’s principles have been co-produced with a residents’ working group. The draft document includes commitments from the Council to you as residents on the estate; key information about how you will be supported through the process and how you can be compensated if your home or block has been identified for redevelopment.

When will a formal “offer” document be issued to residents on South Lambeth Estate?
A final version of the Offer documents will be sent to all households on the estate once a preferred option is agreed by the Council’s Cabinet and a phased timeline for the regeneration project has been developed.
Developing ideas for South Lambeth Estate
Feedback from Consultation Event 3

There have been three drop-in consultation events to discuss the South Lambeth estate. At the third event, on 16 and 18 April, the design team presented two possible scenarios for how the estate might be redeveloped to create more homes and better quality open spaces and facilities. This is a summary of the emerging ideas and what people told us. If you have any queries please email: southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk

‘The Avenue’ scenario

The resident feedback forms noted the following which are listed in order of most ‘likes’ ticked on questionnaire:

— A range of home sizes and types, including flats, houses and maisonettes
— New urban square with shops on Dorset Road
— New, high quality, energy efficient homes
— Allows residents to remain, with phased decanting into new homes
— New linear park connecting to Clapham Road
— New landscape and play areas, to be developed in consultation with residents
— New community space
— New, more traditional street layout with front doors and ‘an address’ for all homes
— New access to Clapham Road
— Phased redevelopment of all existing buildings, including Wimborne House
— Residents’ garden courtyard

other comments you made

feel there are a lot of cracks/building doesn’t look good
none of the above
about to do right to buy in Wimborne (not with mortgage)
Do not wish to move from the estate
breaking up the spaces between Wimborne and creating Cobbett ‘park’ creates tiny strips of green. I think better scenario is the one mixing buildings C & D from square plan
ensure outsides security e.g. security electric door for residents, so people who don’t live there can’t enter without a reason
‘The London Square’ scenario

The resident feedback forms noted the following which are listed in order of most ‘likes’ ticked on questionnaire:

— A range of home sizes and types, including flats, houses and maisonettes
— Allows residents to remain, with phased decanting into new homes
— New, high quality, energy efficient homes
— New shops onto Dorset Road
— New, more traditional street layout with front doors and ‘an address’ for all homes
— New landscape and play areas, to be developed in consultation with residents
— New community space
— New large, landscaped square at the heart of the neighbourhood
— Residents’ garden courtyard
— New access to Clapham Road
— Phased redevelopment of all existing buildings, including Wimborne House

other comments you made

- Do not wish to move from the estate
- Noise levels too high on Clapham Road
- I prefer this layout of new estate
- Homes for over-80s – ground floor if possible, with garden or patio
- Roof gardens
- A pub and stay in the area is most important
- Ensure outside security e.g. security electric door for residents, so people who don’t live there can’t enter without a reason
Lambeth Council questions and answers
Feedback from Consultation Event 3 – 16 and 18 April 2015

At the April drop-in sessions we received a number of questions about the regeneration of South Lambeth and have included these (with answers) below. We will be producing an Information Pack for all estates included within the Estates Regeneration Programme which will provide a more detailed question and answer sheet.

What is the Estates Regeneration Programme?
Lambeth has developed an Estates Regeneration Programme to help ensure investment into six estates in the borough: South Lambeth, Central Hill, Fenwick Estate, Cressingham Gardens, Knight’s Walk and Westbury Estate and on estates where we can provide more housing. The Council has made a commitment to build new homes at council rent levels, to ensure Lambeth residents are able to access homes in the borough. The programme aims to deliver 1,000 additional new homes across the borough. Some of these homes will be built on the six estates and also on the handful of small sites projects that we currently have in place in Lambeth.

Why has South Lambeth been included?
We have included South Lambeth in the programme because there is an opportunity to build new homes on the estate. These will include homes at council rent levels, shared ownership and a number for private sale.

When will work start?
The project is currently in the very early (feasibility) stages and we are still looking at different options for the future of the estate. It is unlikely that any works will start on site until 2017 however you will receive plenty of notice once a start date is confirmed.

Will the estate be sold to private developers?
It is the Council’s intention that the six projects in the Estate Regeneration Programme will remain Lambeth estates and managed by the Council.

If I am affected by the regeneration will I be able to receive compensation?
Yes, if you are a tenant or homeowner and your home is to be redeveloped you will be offered the statutory compensation. Please refer to the draft information documents for further details.

Will the new homes be ‘like for like’ and how will this be defined? (i.e. will gardens and balconies be replaced?)
Like for like refers to numbers of bedrooms. More details of this can be found in the information documents however there is no guarantee that the current garden designs will be retained. We wish to include outside space for residents’ private use where possible.

At what point do property valuations take place?
Once a preferred option is agreed all affected households will be formally contacted and we will enter into formal negotiations with individual residents.
**Why has the regeneration not appeared in local authority searches?**
The regeneration scheme will appear on local authority searches once a decision on a regeneration option is taken by the Council. This is likely to be after late summer / autumn 2015.

**Surely it is cheaper to refurbish the estate than to regenerate it?**
We have recently commissioned a series of building surveys to be undertaken in a sample of homes on the estate. The purpose of this exercise is to identify the condition of the buildings and levels of investment needed. However, refurbishment of existing properties alone will not address the housing shortage that we are currently facing. It is the Council’s aim to build new homes to provide opportunities for people on our waiting list which currently stands at 21,000 and is rising.

**What are the current space standards and how do they compare with existing sizes?**
Lambeth Council will be providing all the new homes, whether for leaseholder or tenants, to the current required space standards in accordance with Mayor of London standards. The 2015 sq.m areas are larger than the standards used when the South Lambeth Estate was built.

---

**What happens next?**

**Consultation events**

Two further consultation drop-in sessions to discuss the regeneration scenarios on:

- **Thursday 11th June** - 5.00 to 7.00pm
- **Saturday 13th June** - 10.00am to noon

at Bolney Meadow Community Centre

Please come along to make your views known and discuss issues with Council Officers and the Design Team.

Also we will be holding an estate-wide event towards the end of August (more information will be sent before the event).
What happens next?

**The Stock Condition Survey**
To help us get a better understanding of the works that are needed, we have commissioned Baily Garney Ltd to undertake building surveys across a sample of homes on the estate. The purpose of this exercise is to enable us to identify if / what works are required to bring a building up to standard and what the cost would be. Baily Garney may contact you to book an appointment to visit your home. They will produce identification before entering your homes to carry out a survey. Please do not let anyone into your home unless you are happy to do so. The surveys will be taking place in late May / June (later than planned). We apologise for any inconvenience caused.

**Household Needs Survey**
All households on South Lambeth Estate were sent a Household Needs Survey. The purpose of the survey is for the Council to develop an understanding of individual household circumstances such as number of people living in each property, if residents had disabilities or accessibility issues and so forth. The survey is now complete and we will produce the headline findings in the next newsletter. Please be assured that once a preferred option is agreed for the estate, the Council will make individual appointments to see all residents whose home is affected by the regeneration proposal.

**Decision by Cabinet**
A report will be submitted to the Council’s Cabinet meeting in July 2015, outlining the progress of the project and the recommendations for taking option/s forward for a final decision in the autumn.

If you have any queries please contact the Lambeth Regeneration Team on 0207 926 4166 or email southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk.

---

**Spanish**
Si desea esta información en otro idioma, rogamos nos llame al 0207 926 4166

**Portuguese**
Se desejar esta informação noutro idioma é favor telefonar para 0207 926 4166

**French**
Si vous souhaitez ces informations dans une autre langue veuillez nous contacter au 0207 926 4166

**Bengali**
এই তথ্য অন্য কোনো ভাষায় আপনার প্রয়োজন হলে অনুরূপ করে ফেলন করন 0207 926 4166

**Somali**
Haddii aad jecaaan lahayd in aad warbixinta ku hesho luqad kale, fadlan annaga nagala soo xiriir lamburga. 0207 926 4166

**Polish**
Aby otrzymać niniejsze informacje w innej wersji językowej, prosimy o kontakt pod numerem 0207 926 4166
Lambeth and PTE have engaged with over 250 residents, representing 163 households, on the South Lambeth Estate since December 2014.

During this period we have talked through a number of scenarios for regeneration and these have evolved because of your feedback. The scenarios have looked at the introduction of much needed new homes, in addition to reproviding for the existing residents and shops, an improved landscape and play areas and a community space.

Three emerging scenarios have evolved (the ones which were displayed at the Consultation Event 4 in June) and these will be presented to Lambeth Council’s Cabinet on Monday 12th October, together with the information we have gathered, for a decision to be made on the preferred scenario of South Lambeth Estate.

Avenue Scenario - 1
Square Scenario
Avenue Scenario - 2

These scenarios are described in more detail on the next pages.

Also Lambeth and PTE are hosting a

SUMMER EVENT
on Saturday 12th September - 12noon to 3pm
on the Estate

This is for all the estate residents - food and drink, activities based around regeneration at South Lambeth Estate, information on the tour to a completed regeneration scheme in London - please come along!
The Emerging Scenarios

The Avenue’ scenario - 1

This scenario proposes:
— Retaining Wimborne House with improvement works to the ground floor
— New homes, flats and houses
— A new community space
— Create a new landscaped Avenue park
— New shops to Dorset Road

Details of Avenue Scenario v2
— Provides approximately 327 new homes (mix to be determined)
— Phased redevelopment retaining Wimborne House (104 existing homes)
— Total homes approximately 431 including Wimborne House
— Allows all residents to remain on site, with phased decanting
— Street parking and disabled parking spaces to be provided, adjacent to disabled homes
— Creates new landscaped ‘linear park’ connecting Clapham Road to a new community space
— Creates new neighbourhood retail on Dorset Road
— Creates a new legible street layout with front doors and a home address
— Approximate density: 209 units per hectare
The Square scenario

This scenario proposes:
— No existing homes retained
— All new homes, flats and houses
— A new community space
— Create a new landscaped London Square
— New shops to Dorset Road

Details of the Square Scenario v2
— Provides approximately 500 new homes (mix to be determined)
— Phased redevelopment of all buildings
— Allows all residents to remain on site, with phased decanting
— Creates a new landmark building on Clapham Road
— Development mends the boundaries, assuming some work outside of the Lambeth ownership
— Street parking and disabled parking spaces to be provided, adjacent to disabled homes
— Creates a protected garden courtyard for new residents and those in adjacent Melcombe House
— Creates new landscaped square, with associated community space
— Creates new neighbourhood retail on Dorset Road
— Creates new legible street layout with front doors and a home address
— Approximate density: 247 units per hectare
The Avenue scenario - 2

This scenario proposes:
— Retaining Wimborne House with improvement works to the ground floor
— New homes, mainly flats with some mews houses
— A new community space
— Create a new landscaped Avenue park
— New shops on a new Dorset Road square

Details of Avenue Scenario v2
— Provides approximately 319 new homes (mix to be determined)
— Phased redevelopment retaining Wimborne House (104 existing homes)
— Total homes approximately 423 including Wimborne House
— Allows all residents to remain on site, with phased decanting
— Street parking and disabled parking spaces to be provided, adjacent to disabled homes
— Creates new landscaped ‘linear park’ connecting Clapham Road to a new community space
— Creates new neighbourhood retail and shared surface square on Dorset Road
— Creates a new legible street layout with front doors and a home address
— Approximate density: 203 units per hectare
Household Needs Survey:
The Household Needs Survey was completed in July 2015, with 68% of households responding by returning the questionnaires. This survey provides Lambeth with valuable information on the needs of residents and will be used to inform our future discussions with all residents when the Cabinet makes the decision on Monday 12th October on the future of South Lambeth Estate. Later this year, and through 2016, the Council will be meeting with individual residents in each block to agree their household needs and discuss the range of offers available for residents.

Wimborne House, Stock Condition Survey:
The stock condition survey was completed in July, thank you to all residents who gave access to their homes. Following the survey's findings we have undertaken some further internal inspections.

Five Low Rise Blocks, Stock Condition Survey:
The stock condition surveys of the low rise blocks will begin in the next couple of weeks. The purpose of this survey will enable the Council to work up a programme of meanwhile works to the blocks leading up to the redevelopment of each block.

Resident Engagement Panel:
A monthly Resident Engagement Panel (REP) has been established for South Lambeth. The purpose of the panel is for resident representatives to engage with the Council as we move towards the masterplanning process. We will work with resident representatives and Wimborne House TRA to shape the future of the estate. The minutes of the meeting will be posted on the recently launched website www.southlambethestate.co.uk and placed on block notice boards. The panel members are tenants and leaseholders, Ward Members, and Council Officers. We still have spaces for Broadstone and Verwood House residents so if you live in either of these blocks and would like to become a member of the group please contact the team on 0207 926 4166 or email southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk

Appointment of the Independent Resident Advisor (RA)
The Council is enabling the appointment of an independent advisor to work with the residents on the estate to ensure there is access to independent advice and to support residents on the Resident Engagement Panels. Residents will be involved in the selection of the RA in September.
A report will be submitted to the Council Cabinet in October 2015, outlining the progress of the project and making recommendations for taking scenarios forward:

If the Cabinet approves the report we will move into the next stage of the project which is known as the masterplanning stage. This stage is where more detailed design will be agreed and it will take us through to next spring/summer. We will be engaging with residents throughout this next stage.

We know that this can be a worrying time and we want to assure you that any redevelopment of the estate will not begin until 2017. Between now and the end of 2016, the Council and the design team, will be arranging a number of events to provide information and discussion of issues with residents. The Council’s rehousing team will meeting with each resident to discuss your individual needs to ensure you have the home which is best for suited for your needs, and to outline the range of offers available to tenants and leaseholders. A South Lambeth Offer Document will be issued to all residents which confirms the range of opportunities for residents.

The following timetable sets out the events that are being organised to engage with residents. Dates will be confirmed prior to each event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Led by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/C 12th Sept</td>
<td>Selection of the Independent Resident Advisor</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>REP members and Council Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Sept</td>
<td>Summer Event</td>
<td>South Lambeth Estate</td>
<td>12.00pm – 3.00pm</td>
<td>Regeneration Council Officers/PTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Sept</td>
<td>Site Visits for Residents</td>
<td>Packington Estate and others</td>
<td>10.00am – 4.00pm</td>
<td>PTE /Regeneration Council Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Sept</td>
<td>Resident Engagement Panel Meeting</td>
<td>Caretakers’ Office (Ground Floor, Wimborne House)</td>
<td>6.30 – 8.00pm</td>
<td>Council Officers/Ward Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2015 – Summer 2016</td>
<td>A range of events to be confirmed following the appointment of Masterplanners</td>
<td>Bolney Meadow Community Centre, 31 Bolney Street</td>
<td>5.00 – 7.00pm</td>
<td>Lambeth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 12th Oct</td>
<td>Homeowner workshop Tenants Workshop</td>
<td>Bolney Meadow Community Centre, 31 Bolney Street</td>
<td>5.00 – 7.00pm</td>
<td>Council Officers / PTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 19th Oct</td>
<td>Newsletter to include decision made by Council</td>
<td>South Lambeth Estate</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Council Officers/PTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 26th Oct</td>
<td>Resident Engagement panel meeting</td>
<td>Caretakers’ Office (Ground Floor, Wimborne House)</td>
<td>6.30 – 8.00pm</td>
<td>Council Officers/Ward members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 9th Nov</td>
<td>Wider Stakeholders Meeting</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>7.00 - 8.30pm</td>
<td>Council Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Oct</td>
<td>Masterplanners present bids for South Lambeth regeneration</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Rep members and Council Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Nov</td>
<td>Appointment of Masterplanners</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>REP members and Regeneration Council Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Fortnightly Monday surgeries</td>
<td>TBC has details on next page</td>
<td>5.00-7.00pm</td>
<td>Council Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The team and contact details

Lambeth Council
Lucia Deere  Estate Regeneration Team Manager
Marcus Shukla  Housing Projects Officer
Chris Guthrie  Project Officer

Architects - PTE:
Carl Vann  PTE partner
Sarah Eastham  PTE architect
Joanne Smith  PTE communications

You can contact us in the following ways:
Phone  0207 926 4166
Email  southlambeth@lambeth.gov.uk
Website  www.southlambethestate.co.uk
Twitter  http://twitter.com/South_Lambeth

Suggestion Box in Wimborne House, concierge suite
Fortnightly Monday Surgeries, 5-7pm in the Caretakers Office under Wimborne House
   September 7th, 21st
   October 5th, 19th
   November 2nd, 16th
   December 7th, 14th
(there is no need to make an appointment)

Spanish
Si desea esta información en otro idioma, rogamos nos llame al 0207 926 4166

Portuguese
Se desejara esta informação noutro idioma é favor telefonar para 0207 926 4166

French
Si vous souhaitez ces informations dans une autre langue veuillez nous contacter au 0207 926 4166

Bengali
এই তথ্য অন্য কোনো ভাষায় আপনার প্রয়োজন হলে অনুরূপ করে ফোন করুন 0207 926 4166

Somali
Haddii aad jeecla lahayd in aad warbixintan ku hesho luqad kale, fadlan annaga nagala soo xirir lambarka 0207 926 4166

Polish
Aby otrzymać niniejsze informacje w innej wersji językowej, prosimy o kontakt pod numerem 0207 926 4166
London Borough of Lambeth

Household Needs Survey
Draft Report – 5 Lambeth Housing Estates:
   Central Hill, Cressingham Gardens, Fenwick,
   South Lambeth, Westbury
Household Needs Survey 2015
Prepared for: London Borough of Lambeth
by: Acuity
May 2015

Produced by Acuity
Acuity Research & Practice
61 Surrenden Crescent
Brighton
BN1 6WE
Tel: 01273 287114

© Acuity Research & Practice Limited, www.arap.co.uk
Registered in England No. 3503391
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Central Hill Estate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cressingham Gardens</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fenwick Estate</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. South Lambeth Estate</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Westbury Estate</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1 - Questionnaire script
1. Introduction

Acuity (an independent research agency specialising in the housing sector) was commissioned to undertake a household survey of the London Borough of Lambeth’s (Lambeth) residents to refresh current data on household needs and help inform the development of the regeneration proposals for the future of five Lambeth borough estates: Central Hill, Cressingham Gardens, Fenwick, South Lambeth and Westbury.

1.1 Aim of the survey

The aim of the project was to provide fresh data that can usefully inform the existing needs of residents which will feed into decisions about the regeneration of five specific housing estates in Lambeth as well as to update records on residents’ households needs and future requirements.

1.2 Methodology

Lambeth elected to carry out a face-to-face survey of all households currently living within Cressingham Gardens estate in order to achieve the highest possible response rate. For the other estates the survey was carried out by a self-completion questionnaire with a follow up face to face interviews with non-responders.

Letters were sent out to all resident households advising that Acuity had been appointed to carry out a survey on behalf of Lambeth Council. As an incentive four prizes of £50 shopping vouchers were offered, to be drawn from those taking part.

At Cressingham Gardens interviewers visited each property up to three times at different times of the day to speak to the resident. If there was no answer on the third occasion a questionnaire and reply paid envelope was left requesting that the survey be returned by post. At the other estates survey questionnaires were initially sent by post, with a reminder postcard sent after two weeks if there was no response. After a further two weeks interviewers from Acuity visited residents who had not responded to see if they would prefer to have a face-to-face interview.

In all, it was possible to carry out 514 face-to-face interviews were completed and 402 surveys were returned by post - a 58% response rate. A breakdown of the responses from the different estates is shown in Figure 1 at the end of this section.

1.3 Survey design

The script used by the interviewers comprised of 29 questions and took around 15 – 20 minutes to complete depending on household characteristics. A copy of the script can be found in Appendix 2.

1.4 Presenting the findings

This report presents the findings of the survey by:

- Household demographics
- Health issues
- Property details
- Housing needs
- Equalities
- Communication and information
- Residents’ views on information and consultation

1.5 Notes to figures

Throughout this report the figures show the results as percentages and base numbers are also shown where appropriate.
Rounding
The majority of charts and tables show the results as percentages. The percentages are rounded up or down from one decimal place to the nearest whole number, and for this reason may not in all cases add up to 100%.

Rounding can also cause percentages described in the supporting text to differ from the percentages in the charts by 1% when two percentages are added together. In some parts of the report percentages may be expressed to one decimal place.

1.6 Acknowledgements
Our thanks go firstly to the residents from the six estates who took part in the survey. We would also like to thank the staff of Lambeth Regeneration team for their assistance with the project, and our particular thanks go to Lucia Deere (Estate Regeneration Manager), Julian Hart (Estate Regeneration and Housing Delivery Programme Manager), Bashir Miah (Project Officer), and Marcus Shukla (Project Officer) for their help throughout the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Hill</th>
<th>Cressingham Gardens</th>
<th>Fenwick</th>
<th>South Lambeth</th>
<th>Westbury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal surveys left or</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despatched (excluding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voids)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal surveys returned</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before face-to-face stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number completed F2F</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number returned by post</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after F2F stage start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RETURNED</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Central Hill Estate

The Central Hill Estate – located in Gipsy Hill in the south of the borough - was built in the early 1960s and 1970s. It is the Council’s only housing regeneration project in the South Area. The following analysis of results looks at the standards of current housing in Central Hill as viewed by residents, along with resident housing needs of as indicated by the survey.

2.1 About Central Hill

Central Hill is a mixed tenure estate with social housing tenants, leaseholders and key workers.

The are 456 homes on the estate – made up of houses and low-rise flats.

203 tenants and 68 leaseholders participated in the Central Hill survey.

2.2 Demographics

Age

Almost a half of all council tenants who were willing to give their age are aged between 35 and 54 years (49%), while one in seven are aged 65 years or over or 34 years or under (14%).

More residents in leasehold or freehold properties are aged 65 years or over (30%), with less than half aged between 35 years and 54 years (43%) and one in six aged 34 years or under (18%).

Gender

The balance between male and female respondents to the survey showed overall a higher proportion of female residents (56%) than male (44%), which was reflective of the tenant population but not of the leaseholder population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tenants (base 198)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sublessees (base 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household characteristics

The most common household type on the estate is single adults (43% of tenants and 38% of leaseholders).

Other households groups providing information for this survey are listed in figure 2.3, which shows that the smallest individual group are households with three or more adults aged 16 years or over (10% tenants and 16% leaseholders).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household group</th>
<th>All residents (base 271)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single adult</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults without children</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more adults, 16 or over</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of 58 responses to the question of how many family-dependent children over the age of 21 live in the home; 49% of tenants had no children aged over 21 years of age, while 29% had one child over that age, 17% had two children over that age and 5% had three children over that age.

**Economic status**

Of those residents completing the survey 56% are in employment (35% full-time, 16% part-time and 5% self-employed).

21% are retired and 10% are classed as long-term sick. 3% are at home looking after family. 10% of the resident population are unemployed

Economic status varies within different tenures as shown in the following figure.

**Figure 2.4: Economic status by tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All residents (base 271)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 203)</th>
<th>Leasehold (base 68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after family</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term sick/disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle ownership**

Residents were asked how many vehicles their household owned. The majority of residents do not own a vehicle at all (59%). Around a third have one vehicle (35%), 5% have two vehicles and 1% have three vehicles.

Residents in leasehold accommodation are more likely to own one or more vehicles (48%) than tenants (39%).

Out of 182 tenants answering, 19 advised that they are disabled “blue” badge holders, with 2 out of 66 leaseholders also holding a blue badge.

Only 25 residents in total advised that they currently use the underground garage facilities.

**Ethnic origin**

Around a third of residents are White British residents (34%) – with a higher percentage of in leasehold accommodation (43%) than in Lambeth tenanted properties (31%).

Of those of a different ethnicity or origin, Caribbean residents account for 25% of residents, whilst those from any other African or Black background (12%) or any other White background (12%) are the next largest ethnic groupings.

**Figure 2.5 Ethnicity or origin of resident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White or White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other White Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other African or Black background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Somali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main spoken language
91% of residents use English as the main spoken language in the household. The remaining households speak a variety of different languages as shown in figure 2.6

Figure 2.6 Main language spoken in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese/Spanish/Catalan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian and Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic and French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Base 257 residents)

Religion or belief
Almost two-thirds of respondents advised that they were of a Christian faith (64%), with around a fifth not following any religion (18%) and some preferring not to say (7%). A small number were of the Muslim (6%), Hindu (2%) or Buddhist (1%) faiths or followed another religion (1%).

Figure 2.7 Religion or belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/belief</th>
<th>Base 269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Health problems
A significant number of residents reported they or a member of their household have a disability or medical condition that is affected by the size, location or design of the home they live in (98 tenants and 7 leaseholders).

Four of these households have more than one person with a disability.

When asked for brief details of the disability/medical condition and how this impacted on the household’s current home and future housing needs the responses covered a variety of medical ailments.

Figure 2.8: Description of health issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Base 49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General mobility problems</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues/learning difficulties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis/Osteoarthritis/ Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal defects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer’s disease</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibromyalgia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aids and adaptations identified by respondents with medical needs were: ground floor accommodation (8) walk-in shower/wet room facilities (7 homes) and wheelchair accessible (3 homes).

Care and support
A small number of households advised that the disabled member receives an element of care (21) - two on a paid full time basis and the others informally by family members.

2.4. Property details

Length of residency
A third of tenants surveyed have been in their current property from between 10 to 14 years (34%), with a quarter having lived at Central Hill for 20+ years. One in six have been tenants for less than 5 years (16%) or between 15 to 19 years. A smaller number have been tenants for between 5 to 9 years.

A third of residents in leasehold/freehold accommodation have been at Central Hill for between 10 to 14 years (31%) or over 20 years (34%).

Property type
The majority of completed interviews were from residents in Flats (43%) or Maisonettes (44%), with one in eight from residents in houses 12%.

Three of the leasehold/freehold properties had been refurbished either with new kitchen, bathroom and flooring; an extra room added; or double glazing and new boiler.

Number of bedrooms
There were properties of all bedroom sizes included in the survey as shown in the tables below. Three-quarters of tenants (75%) stated that they had the right number of bedrooms for their households, with 25% of the opposite view. 24% of tenants (40 in number) consider they are overcrowded and 15% stated they were under-occupying.

Almost all residents in leasehold properties feel they have the right number of bedrooms (94%), with 7% (4 in number) advising they are
overcrowded and 9% (5 in number) that they are under-occupying their property.

**Figure 2.12: Property size (leasehold/freehold)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leasehold properties (62)</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>maisonettes</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One bed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four bed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aids and adaptations

Seven of the leasehold/freehold properties had been adapted to suit household requirements, these include: handles in the bathroom, walk-in showers and an extra room for someone to stay if in need of help.

Just 12 of the tenanted properties visited had been adapted in some way to assist with living requirements. For 10 of these properties this had taken the form of bathroom adaptations, usually incorporating a walk-in shower or wet room and handrails. The other two were a renovated kitchen/bathroom, stair banister rails and stair lifts.

Garden for private use

More than four-fifths of tenants (85%) and two-thirds of leaseholders (65%) have private use of a garden.

**Figure 2.13: Use of private garden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All residents (base 2591)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 193)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Preferred ways for Lambeth to make contact

Letter and telephone are most preferred methods residents would like Lambeth to use when making contact with them (55%).

Communication by email is a higher preference among those in leasehold accommodation (53%) than those in LA properties (18%), whereas contact by telephone is a higher preference for tenants (50%) than for leaseholders (26%).

**Figure 2.14: Best ways to contact residents**

110 phone numbers were supplied and 67 email addresses.

2.6 Communication

Local papers

In an effort to reach as wide an audience as possible to explain the regeneration programme the Borough wished to be aware of the level of readership of local and other papers among residents on its estates.
In respect of local papers, a third of residents (33%) read the South London Press (31%), with many fewer regularly reading the Streatham Guardian (8%) or Brixton Bugle (5%).

Of other papers read in the area the most popular is the Metro (11%) or Evening Standard (2%).

Figure 2.15: Readership of local papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenants (base 203)</th>
<th>Leasehold (base 68)</th>
<th>All residents (base 271)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brixton Bugle</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Press</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Guardian</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social media

The most popular social media used by residents is Facebook (38%), followed, to a much lesser extent, by Twitter (8%).

2.7 Local facilities and services

Thinking about the future of Central Hill, residents were asked what improved facilities and services would most benefit them.

Around two-thirds of residents would like to see improved community facilities as part of the future plan at Central Hill (65%), while around half also felt that improved health facilities would be of benefit (49%). Over two-fifths of residents would like to see improved play areas (43%) and local shops (41%). A third or more would like to see improved local transport (37%).

Figure 2.16: Improved facilities/services

Other suggestions included:

- Leave things as they are
- Provide better parking facilities
- Better facilities for bikes/wheelchair access routes
- Provide a cinema/gym/swimming pool
- Repaired and improved maintenance of properties
- Deal with asb/security/CCTV
- Completely demolish
- More visits from landlord
2.8. Resident views

Open comments

128 tenants and 13 leaseholders made comments about their household needs or regeneration proposals for the future of the Central Hill estate.

Tenant comments

The comments from tenants can be separated into four areas: a third of tenants concentrated on improvement and repair work required on their properties (35%), two-fifths gave details of their individual requirements following regeneration (39%) and around a fifth gave their views on the regeneration proposals (19%). A small number made some negative comments were made about the Council’s approach and tenancy management issues (7%).

A summary of the comments from tenants is given in the following table. The full comments have been made available to the Council.

Figure 2.17: Open comments from 128 tenants (160 comments in total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements, repairs &amp; maintenance</th>
<th>35%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need new kitchen/bathroom/windows</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need upgraded pavements, walkways/ramps/drainage and green areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly designed housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with damp/mould/water ingress</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out proper repairs/more estate maintenance/renovation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more adaptations for disabled residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate needs fencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs dangerous – need repairing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need shower facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with asbestos in properties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better security/cctv cameras</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming measures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual requirements</th>
<th>39%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wish to remain at Central Hill</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like/need a larger property</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need ground floor accommodation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Council to take heed of health issues/moves are distressing when in ill health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide decorating for less able residents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide notices in more than one language (door entry etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need easier wheelchair access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for essential workers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to move/transfer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like one of proposed new-build properties on estate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like more social activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regeneration proposals</th>
<th>19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want the properties to be renovated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide larger properties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve but do not demolish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally support regeneration proposals with provisos</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in support of regeneration proposals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better play areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t need more properties on estate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knock the whole estate down and re-build</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should keep to their promises</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need better policing – deal with asb/drug dealing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leasehold/freehold comments

Thirteen respondents from leasehold/freehold properties commented on their future household needs or the regeneration proposals:

- Leave things as they are (3)
- Improve maintenance/refurbish (2)
- Repair and restore existing estate (1)
- Repair leaking flats (1)
- Better facilities for bikes (1)
- Car parks (1)
- Cinema (1)
• Local swimming pool (1)
• Better use and maintenance of current facilities (1)
• Estate management (dumping rubbish) (1)

Consent to link details
125 tenants in Lambeth stock and 41 residents in leasehold accommodation were happy for their comments on future facilities/services and their views on the regeneration proposals for Central Hill, to be linked by name and contact details.
3. Cressingham Gardens

The following analysis of results looks at the current demographics of Cressingham Gardens as indicated by the survey. This was the first household survey carried out and may differ slightly from an earlier interim report issued due to more postal surveys being received and input since that time.

3.1 About Cressingham Gardens

Cressingham Gardens, a housing estate in the London Borough of Lambeth, located next to Brockwell Park. The estate was built in the 1960s and contains 306 properties of mixed tenure – Lambeth owned tenanted properties, freehold properties and leasehold properties.

Out of the 306 properties on the estate, 286 were visited to carry out a face-to-face survey or to leave a survey for self-completion during February/March 2015. 50% of residents were interviewed (144) and 15% self-completed a survey, sending it in by post (25), making a total of 169 completed surveys – a 59% response rate.

Properties not included in the survey were either empty or full details of ownership were unknown.

3.2 Demographics

Age

Almost a quarter of all council tenants who were willing to give their age are over 65 years old (23%), with over half (51%) aged between 35 years and 54 years. One in six tenants are 34 years or under (17%).

Fewer residents in leasehold or freehold properties are aged 65 years or over (14%), half aged between 35 years and 54 years (50%) and almost a third (28%) aged 34 years or under.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>All residents (base 141)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 103)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 years - 24 years</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years - 34 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years - 44 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years - 54 years</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years - 64 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

The balance between male and female respondents to the survey was quite evenly split, 52% female and 48% male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>All residents (base 167)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 121)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household characteristics

The most common household type on the estate is single adults (45%)

Other households groups interviewed for this survey are listed in figure 3.3, which shows that the smallest individual group are households with three or more adults aged 16 years or over (8%).
15% of tenants interviewed had no children aged over 21 years of age, while 11% had one child over that age and 2% had two children over that age. 72% of tenants responding did not answer this question.

**Economic status**
171 of those surveyed were willing to provide details of their economic status. Of those, 48% are in employment (26% full-time, 18% part-time and 4% self-employed).

14% are retired and 22% are classed as long-term sick. 3% are in full time education and 4% are at home looking after family.

Economic status varies within different tenures as shown in the figure 3.4.

**Vehicle ownership**
Tenants were asked how many vehicles their household owned. The majority of residents do not own a vehicle at all (77%). Around a fifth have one vehicle (21%) and 2% have two vehicles.

Residents in leasehold accommodation are more likely to own one or more vehicles (36%) than tenants (18%).

11% of residents are disabled “blue” badge holders.

Only 17 residents in total advise that they currently use the underground garage facilities.

**Ethnic origin**
Around a third of residents are White British residents (33%) – with a higher percentage of in leasehold accommodation (40%) than in Lambeth tenanted properties (30%).
Of those of a different ethnicity or origin, Caribbean residents account for 24% of residents, whilst those from any other African or Black background (12%) or any other White background (11%) are the next largest ethnic groupings.

**Figure 3.5 Ethnicity or origin of resident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number residents</th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Any Other White Background</th>
<th>African Somali</th>
<th>White and Black African background</th>
<th>Caribbean</th>
<th>White and Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Any other African or Black background</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Any other Asian background</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>Any other Mixed/Multiple ethnicity</th>
<th>Any other ethnic group</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Base 165 residents)

**Main spoken language**

89% of residents use English as the main spoken language in the household. The remaining households speak a variety of different languages in the home, either European or African.

**Figure 3.6 Main language spoken in household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religion or belief**

Almost three-fifths of respondents advised that they were of a Christian faith (58%), followed another faith (12%) or were Muslim (8%). 15% advised that they had no religious persuasion.

**Figure 3.7 Religion or belief**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/belief</th>
<th>Base 169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3 Health problems**

A significant number of households reported one or more family members have a disability or medical condition that is affected by the size, location or design of the home they live in (48% - 57 households).

Six of these households have more than one member of the household with a disability.

When asked for brief details of the disability/medical condition and how this impacted on the household’s current home and future housing needs the responses covered a variety of medical ailments.

**Figure 3.8: Description of health issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General mobility problems</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues/learning difficulties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis/Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint problems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/Eczema</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Condition</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure/diabetic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipola</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Fatigue Syndrome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciatica/back problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel disease</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple sclerosis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical muscular disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs Syndrome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panic attacks/severe anxiety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aids and adaptations identified by respondents with medical needs were walk-in shower/wet room facilities (15 homes) and wheelchair access (2 homes).

For those in leasehold accommodation just 4 respondents reported having a disability. The conditions chiefly related to mobility issues due to heart disease or arthritis and the need for wheelchair accessible and level access housing.

Care and support

Three households advised that the disabled member receives an element of care - one on a paid full time basis and the others informally.

3.4. Property details

Length of time at Cressingham Gardens

Around a third of residents surveyed have been in their current property less than 5 years (29%) - this was more likely to be the case for those in leasehold/freehold accommodation (33%) than in Lambeth stock (27%).

Around a fifth of residents have been in residence for over 20 years (22%) or 10 to 14 years (19%), with slightly fewer in residence for 5 to 9 years (17%).

One in eight residents have lived on the estate for 15 to 19 years (13%).

Figure 3.9: Length of residency by tenure

Property details

The majority of completed interviews were from residents in Flats (54%), with a quarter from residents in houses (26%) and a fifth from residents in maisonettes (20%).

Figure 3.10: Property details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>All Residents (base 166)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 122)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisonette</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of bedrooms

There were properties of all bedroom sizes included in the survey as shown in the tables below. 70% of tenant respondents stated that they had the right number of bedrooms for their households, with 30% of the opposite view. 26% of tenants (31 in number) consider they are overcrowded and just 9% stated they were under-occupying (10 in number).

### Figure 3.11: Property size (LA stock)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA tenanted properties (118)</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Maisonettes</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One bed</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bed</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bed</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four bed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost four-fifths of residents in leasehold properties feel they have the right number of bedrooms (78%), with 25% (11 in number) advising they are overcrowded and 7% that they are under-occupying their property (3 in number).

### Figure 3.12: Property size (leasehold/freehold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leasehold properties (44)</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Maisonettes</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One bed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bed</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bed</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four bed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garden/balcony for private use

Around two-fifths of tenants and leaseholders have private use of a garden or balcony.

### Figure 3.13: Use of garden/balcony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All residents (base 165)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 120)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Preferred ways for Lambeth to make contact

Two-thirds of residents appear to prefer telephone calls to keep them informed (66%), followed by letters (46%). Around a fifth of residents are happy to be contacted by email (22%).

Communication by email is a higher preference among those in leasehold accommodation (36%) than those in LA properties (17%).

79 tenants provided their telephone numbers and 16 gave email addresses.

25 residents in leasehold accommodation gave their telephone numbers and 12 gave email addresses.

Aids and adaptations

Just 12 of the tenanted properties visited had been adapted in some way to assist with living requirements. For 10 of these properties this had taken the form of bathroom adaptations, usually incorporating a walk-in shower or wet room. The other two were a renovated kitchen and a stair banister rail.
3.6. Communication

Local papers

In an effort to reach as wide an audience as possible to explain the regeneration programme the Borough wished to be aware of the level of readership of local and other papers among residents on its estates.

In respect of local papers, 31% of residents read the South London Press (31%), with many fewer regularly reading the Streatham Guardian (8%).

The Brixton Bugle has a wider readership among residents in leasehold properties (32%) than in LA properties (9%).

Of other papers read in the area the most popular is the Metro (10 readers).

3.7 Local facilities and services

Thinking about the future of Cressingham Gardens, residents were asked what facilities and services would most benefit them.

Over half of residents would like to see improved community facilities as part of the future plan at Cressingham Gardens (51%), while around a third also felt that improved health facilities, play areas, local shops and local transport would be of benefit (29% to 34%).
Other suggestions included:

- Community garden areas for growing flowers/vegetables
- A family therapy centre to support facilities
- A gym
- More facilities for children and youngsters
- More policing

A few residents felt that improved housing standards were the priority and a good council that actually considers residents’ views and recommendations.

One resident felt that the regeneration plans would result in less play areas and poorer transport facilities.

3.8. Resident views

Open comments

125 residents took the opportunity to express their views on their household needs and the regeneration proposals for Cressingham Gardens.

Two-fifths of the comments (39%) related to required/outstanding property improvements, upgrades, repairs & maintenance – especially in respect of dealing with damp/mould/water ingress.

A similar percentage (38%) commented on the regeneration proposals, either in favour (with provisos), or not in favour.

A number of tenants commented on their individual requirements (16%) (size and type of property) and 6% of tenants had other general comments.

A summary of tenant comments is given in the following table. The full comments have been made available to the Council.

**Figure 7.1 Responses from 90 tenants (120 comments in total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements, repairs &amp; maintenance</th>
<th>39%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need new kitchen/bathroom/windows/heating</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need upgraded pavements, walkways/ramps/drainage and green areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with vermin/pest control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with damp/mould/water ingress</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out proper repairs/more estate maintenance/renovation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more adaptations for disabled residents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate needs fencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide shower facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better security/cctv cameras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual requirements</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wish to remain where they are, in same or same type of property</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like/need a larger property</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need ground floor accommodation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Council to take heed of health issues/moves are distressing when in ill health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regeneration proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want the properties to be renovated</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide larger properties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve but do not demolish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally concerned about proposals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in support of regeneration proposals</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally support regeneration proposals with provisos</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prefer option one</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park for local dogs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment, happy as is</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should keep to their promises</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leasehold/freehold comments

Thirty-five respondents from leasehold/freehold properties commented on their future household needs or the regeneration proposals:

- Carry out repairs/upkeep and maintain estate (11)
- Property in good condition/no need for demolition (4)
- Lived here a long time/good community spirit/don’t want to move (3)
- Better communication with Council/more information needed (2)
- Choose option 1 (2)
- Need easier access to upstairs (2)
- Will be homeless (2)
- Plans are outrageous/misguided (2)
- Only re-building completely will work (1)
- Consultation process poor/residents not listened to (1)
- Support options 4 or 5 (1)
- Need the renovation of the estate as soon as possible (1)
- Nothing to say (3)
4. Fenwick Estate

The Fenwick Estate was built in the post-war period, with further properties added in the late 1960s and 1970s. The properties are a mixture of low rise 1-2 storey blocks and medium rise 3 storey, 4 storey and 5 storey blocks, along with a well-used community centre.

4.1 About the Fenwick Estate

The Fenwick estate is located next to Clapham North underground station and is a mixed tenure estate with around 69% let to social housing tenants and 31% owned on a long lease or freehold.

The housing consists of 414 flats and maisonettes.

395 units were included in the survey, all of which initially received a survey in the post. After four weeks independent research interviewers visited the estate and called upon residents which had not returned a survey offering to carry out a face-to-face interview. At the close of the survey 124 interviews had been completed and 95 postal surveys were returned – a 55% response rate.

4.2 Demographics

Age

Around half of all residents who were willing to give their age are aged between 35 and 54 years (51%), while one in seven are aged 65 years or over (15%) and a quarter are aged 34 years or under (24%).

Fewer residents in leasehold or freehold properties are aged 65 years or over (7%) than tenants (18%), while more leasehold residents are aged under 34 years (42%) than tenants are (18%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>All residents (base 172)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 127)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 years - 24 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years - 34 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years - 44 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years - 54 years</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years - 64 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

The balance between male and female respondents to the survey showed overall a higher proportion of female residents (58%) than male (42%), which was reflective of the tenant population but not of the leaseholder population, which was more evenly split (50/50).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>All residents (base 215)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 159)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household characteristics

The most common household type on the estate is single adults (38% of tenants and 36% of leaseholders)

Other households groups providing information for this survey are listed in figure 4.3, which shows that the smallest individual group are households with three or more adults aged 16 years or over (7% tenants and 11% leaseholders).
leaseholders). There were more family households amongst tenants (28%) than those in leasehold accommodation (20%).

**Figure 4.3: Household size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household group</th>
<th>All residents (Base 216)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single adult</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults without children</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more adults, 16 or over</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adult family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic status**

Of those residents completing the survey 62% are in employment (36% full-time, 21% part-time and 5% self-employed).

16% are retired and 6% are classed as long-term sick. 3% are at home looking after family or in full time education. 14% of the resident population are unemployed.

Economic status varies within different tenures as shown in the following figure.

**Figure 4.4: Economic status by tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic status</th>
<th>All residents (base 217)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 162)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after family</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term sick/disabled</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Education</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle ownership**

Residents were asked how many vehicles their household owned. The majority of residents do not own a vehicle at all (74%). Around a quarter have one vehicle (24%), and 2% have two vehicles.

Out of 158 tenants answering, 10 advised that they are disabled “blue” badge holders, 1 leaseholder also holding a blue badge.

Only 1 resident advised that they currently use the underground garage facilities.

**Ethnic origin**

Around two-fifths of residents are White British residents (38%) – with a higher percentage in leasehold accommodation (46%) than in Lambeth tenanted properties (24%).

Of those of a different ethnicity or origin, residents with an African or Black background (20%) and residents with a Caribbean background (18%) account for the largest ethnic groupings.

**Figure 4.5 Ethnicity or origin of resident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity or origin of resident</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other White Background</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African background</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Mixed/Multiple ethnicity</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main spoken language
77% of residents use English as the main spoken language in the household. The remaining households speak a variety of different languages as shown in figure 4.6

Figure 4.6 Main language spoken in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amharic &amp; Tigrinya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujurati</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigrinya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion or belief
Three-fifths of respondents advised that they were of a Christian faith (60%), with around a quarter not following any religion (23%) and some preferring not to say (8%). A small number were of the Muslim faith (9%).

Figure 4.7 Religion or belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/belief</th>
<th>Base 210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Health problems

Around a fifth of tenants advised that a member of the household have a disability or medical condition that affects the size, location or design of the home that they live in (22%). Three of these households have more than one member with a disability.

When asked for brief details of the disability/medical condition and how this impacted on the household’s current home and future housing needs the responses covered a variety of medical ailments.

Figure 4.8: Description of health issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Base 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADHD/Autism/Asperger</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility issues (arthritis/heart disease/other medical)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues (learning difficulties/ depression/anxiety)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/Eczema</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes and associated problems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 households have adapted homes, mostly in respect of grab rails around the house and extra bathroom fittings and walk-in showers.
Care and support
A small number of tenant households advised that the disabled member receives an element of care (8) - two on a paid full time basis and the others informally by family members.

4.4. Property details

Length of residency
A third of tenants surveyed have been in their current property 20 years or more (32%). A fifth of tenants have been at Fenwick for less than five years (22%), one in six have been resident between 5 and years (17%) and one in ten resident between 10 and 14 years (10%).

Almost half of residents in leasehold/freehold accommodation have been at Fenwick for between for less than 5 years (46%).

Some 11% have been resident between 15 to 19 years or 20 years or more, 16% between 5 to 9 years and 18% between 10 and 14 years.

Figure 4.9: Length of residency by tenure

Property type
The majority of completed surveys were from residents in Flats (67%) or Maisonettes (31%), with very few from residents in houses (2%).

Figure 4.10: Property details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>All residents (base 215)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 159)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisonette</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of bedrooms
There were properties of all bedroom sizes included in the survey as shown in the table below. Almost three-quarters of tenants (71%) stated that they had the right number of bedrooms, while 28% of tenants (38 in number) consider they are overcrowded and 8% stated they were under-occupying.

Figure 4.11: Property size (LA stock)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA tenanted properties (156)</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Maisonettes</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One bed</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bed</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bed</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four bed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all residents in leasehold properties feel they have the right number of bedrooms (91%), with 8% (4 in number) advising they are overcrowded and 1 resident advising that they are currently under-occupying their property.
Aids and adaptations

Four of the leasehold/freehold properties have been upgraded with new doors/windows, internal alterations/renewals and a conservatory.

Just 13 of the tenanted properties have been adapted in some way to assist with living requirements, such as handles in the bathroom walk-in showers and a stair lift.

Garden for private use

Around three-quarters of tenants (74%) and over a half of leaseholders (54%) have private use of a garden.

Communication

Local papers

In an effort to reach as wide an audience as possible to explain the regeneration programme Lambeth Council wished to be aware of the level of readership of local and other papers among residents on the Fenwick estate.

In respect of local papers, take-up of the South London Press is by far the most popular (28%), with equal readership of the Brixton Bugle (5%) and Streatham Guardian (5%) among tenants.

Of other papers read in the area the most popular are the Metro and Evening Standard.
Social media

Less than half of tenants use social media (45%) – far fewer than leaseholders (75%). The most popular medium is Facebook for all residents (90% to 95%).

4.7 Local facilities and services

Thinking about the future of the Fenwick, estate residents were asked what improved facilities and services would most benefit them.

Over half of residents would like to see improved community facilities as part of the future plan at Fenwick (55%), while around two-fifths also felt that improved play areas (42%).

A fifth or more would like more/improved local shops and local transport (22% to 23%).

Other suggestions included:

- Better upgraded housing
- Facilities for older people
- Better estate management
- Security/cctv
- More lifts to flats
- Complete face-lift
- Secure bicycle parking
- Recycling stations
- More local schools
- More green areas/parks

4.8. Resident views

Open comments

93 tenants and 36 leaseholders made comments about their household needs or regeneration proposals for the future of the Fenwick Hill estate.
Tenant comments

The majority of comments made by tenants were around the need for improvements/upgradings, repairs and maintenance and estate maintenance (58%).

One in six tenants commented on the regeneration proposals, with slightly more in favour of regeneration (with provisos) than against.

Around one in ten tenants would like or need a larger property and one wishes to transfer (12%).

A summary of the comments from tenants is given in the following table. The full comments have been made available to the Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements, repairs &amp; maintenance</th>
<th>58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need new kitchen/bathroom/windows</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need upgraded pavements, walkways/ramps/drainage and green areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with damp/mould/water ingress</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out proper repairs/more estate maintenance/renovation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more adaptations for disabled residents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with asbestos in properties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better security/cctv cameras</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve bins/rubbish facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with vermin/pest control</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve car parking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual requirements</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would like/need a larger property</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to move/transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regeneration proposals</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want the properties to be renovated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide larger properties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve but do not demolish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Generally support regeneration proposals with provisos | 4 |
| Not in support of regeneration proposals                  | 2 |
| Provide better play areas                                  | 3 |
| Knock the whole estate down and re-build                    | 1 |
| Other                                                      | 6% |
| Other                                                      | 1 |
| Don’t know/no comment                                      | 2 |
| General positive comment, happy as is                      | 4 |

Leasehold/freehold comments

Thirty-six respondents from leasehold/freehold properties commented on their future household needs or the regeneration proposals:

- Improve estate management: bins/communal areas/environment/landscape (12)
- Provide better security/entry systems/cctv (4)
- Improve pathways (3)
- Repair leaking flats (1)
- Better facilities for bikes/cars (3)
- No need to refurbish my property (2)
- Carry out repairs (2)
- Don’t know anything about regeneration (2)
- Provide better value for money (2)
- Looking forward to new estate (1)
- Need competent management team with clear vision (1)
- Concern about proposed density levels (1)
- Provide leisure centre/youth centre (2)
- Deal with asb (1)
- Change tenure mix (1)

Consent to link details

107 tenants and 37 residents in leasehold accommodation were happy for their comments on future facilities/services and their views on the regeneration proposals for the Fenwick estate, to be linked by name and contact details.
5. South Lambeth Estate

The South Lambeth Estate – South Lambeth Estate consists of the 12 storey Wimborne House and five adjacent streets with maisonettes in the Stockwell Ward of the London Borough of Lambeth. It is located between Clapham Road and South Lambeth Road.

5.1 About South Lambert

South Lambeth estate consists of 205 households, around a third of whom are leaseholders.

The survey was a census of all households, with 205 questionnaires being sent out by post. After two weeks a reminder was sent to residents who had not yet responded and after a further two weeks independent research interviewers visited the estate and called upon residents which had not returned a survey offering to carry out a face-to-face interview. At the close of the survey 73 interviews had been completed and 60 postal surveys were returned – a total of 133 completed surveys representing a 65% response rate.

5.2 Demographics

Age
Over half of all council tenants who were willing to give their age are aged between 35 and 54 years (53%), while around a fifth are aged 65 years or over (20%), between 55 years and 64 years (18%). There are 9% of tenants aged 34 years or under.

More residents in leasehold or freehold properties are 34 years or under (28%), with under half aged between 35 years and 54 years (47%) and around a fifth aged 55 years or older (22%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>All Residents (base 111)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 79)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 years - 24 years</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years - 34 years</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years - 44 years</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 years - 54 years</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years - 64 years</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>All Residents (base 131)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 95)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 366)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household characteristics
The most common household type on the estate are one-parent families (27%), with a fifth of households being either single adults (22%) or two adults without children (20%).

Smaller numbers of households have three or more adults (15%) or are two-parent families with children (16%).
Figure 5.3: Household size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household group</th>
<th>All residents (base 129)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single adult</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults without children</td>
<td>204%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more adults, 16 or over</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adult family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 43 tenant responses, 72% of tenants had children under the age of 21 years living at home.

Economic status
Of those residents completing the survey almost three-fifths (59%) are in employment (36% full-time, 18% part-time and 5% self-employed).

A fifth (20%) are retired and 8% are classed as long-term sick. 6% are at home looking after family and 5% of the resident population are unemployed.

Economic status varies within different tenures as shown in figure 5.4.

Figure 5.4: Economic status by tenure

Vehicle ownership
Residents were asked how many vehicles their household owned. The majority of residents do not own a vehicle at all (59%). Around a third have one vehicle (37%), 2% have two vehicles and 2% have three vehicles.

Residents in leasehold accommodation are less likely to own one or more vehicles (29%) than tenants (45%).

Out of 94 tenants answering 16 advised that they are disabled “blue” badge holders, with 2 out of 34 leaseholders also holding a blue badge.

Only 3 residents in total advise that they currently use the underground garage facilities.

Ethnic origin
Around a third of residents are White British residents (34%) – with a higher percentage of in leasehold accommodation (43%) than in Lambeth tenanted properties (31%).

Of those of a different ethnicity or origin, Caribbean residents account for 25% of residents, whilst those from any other African or Black background (12%) or any other White background (12%) are the next largest ethnic groupings.

Figure 5.5 Ethnicity or origin of resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other White Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bangladeshi 1%
Chinese 3%
Caribbean background 12%
African Somalian 4%
Any other African or Black background 26%

(Base 117 residents)

Main spoken language
58% of residents use English as the main spoken language in the household. The remaining households speak a variety of different languages as shown in figure 5.6

Figure 5.6 Main language spoken in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhcik</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese/Vietnamese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ldganda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigrinya</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion or belief
More than two-thirds of respondents advised that they were of a Christian faith (68%). More than one in ten residents either had no religion (12%) or were Muslim (10%). With around a fifth not following any religion (18%) and some preferring not to say (7%). A small number were Buddhist (3%), Hindu (1%) or another religion (2%). 5% of respondents preferred not to say.

Figure 5.7 Religion or belief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/belief</th>
<th>Base 131</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Health problems
A significant number of residents reported they or a member of their household have a disability or medical condition that is affected by the size, location or design of the home they live in (34 tenants and 4 leaseholders).

Four of these households have more than one person with a disability.

When asked for brief details of the disability/medical condition and how this impacted on the household’s current home and future housing needs the responses covered a variety of medical ailments.
Figure 5.8: Description of health issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General mobility problems</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(knees/back/hips)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/Eczema</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart disease</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickle cell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aids and adaptations identified by respondents with medical needs were: ground floor accommodation or bedroom and toilet downstairs plus walk-in shower/wet room facilities.

Care and support
A small number of households advised that the disabled member receives an element of care (8).

5.3. Property details

Length of residency
A third of tenants surveyed have been in their current property for 20 years or more (33%), with a quarter having lived on the South Lambeth estate for between 5 to 9 years (23%). One in six have been tenants for less than 5 years (16%) or between 10 to 14 years (16%). A smaller number have been tenants for between 5 to 19 years (12%).

A third of residents in leasehold/freehold accommodation have also been living at South Lambeth for 20 years or more and a similar number have been in resident for less than 5 years (31%). One in six residents have been on the estate for 15 to 19 years and 14% between 5 to 9 years. Only 3% have been resident for between 10 to 14 years.

Figure 5.9: Length of residency by tenure

Property type
There was a fairly even split of completed surveys from residents in flats (49%) and maisonettes (51%).

Figure 5.10: Property details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisonette</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of bedrooms
There were properties of all bedroom sizes included in the survey as shown in the tables below. Fifty-five tenants stated that they had the right number of bedrooms for their households. Thirty two tenants consider they are overcrowded and six stated they were under-occupying.
The majority of residents in leasehold properties feel they have the right number of bedrooms (85%), with 27% (7 in number) advising they are overcrowded and 1 resident under-occupying their property.

Aids and adaptations
Eight tenanted properties have had alterations/adaptations to the bathroom and three have had a stair lift installed.

Two of the leasehold/freehold properties have had adaptations to help with mobility problems and two have upgraded their properties with new kitchen and bathroom.

Garden/Balcony for private use
More than four-fifths of tenants (85%) and two-thirds of leaseholders (65%) have private use of a garden.

5.4 Preferred ways for Lambeth to make contact
Communication in writing is most preferred methods residents would like Lambeth to use when making contact (60%)

Residents in leasehold accommodation are less interested in being contacted by telephone (19%) than tenants (44%) but find email contact more acceptable (33%) than tenants (25%).

5.5. Communication
Local papers
In an effort to reach as wide an audience as possible to explain the regeneration programme the Borough wished to be aware of the level of readership of local and other papers among residents on its estates.
In respect of local papers, two-fifths of residents read the South London Press (43%), with many fewer regularly reading the Streatham Guardian (1%) or Brixton Bugle (5%).

**Figure 2.15: Readership of local papers**

48% of tenants and 51% of leaseholders use social media. The most popular social media used by residents is Facebook (26%), followed, to a much lesser extent, by Twitter (5%).

### 5.6 Local facilities and services

Thinking about the future of South Lambeth estate, residents were asked what improved facilities and services would most benefit them.

Around two-thirds of residents would like to see improved community facilities and improved health services as part of the future plan (64%). Similar numbers were also interested in more local shops (62%).

Over half of residents would like to improved play areas (55%) and 45% would like better local transport options.

**Figure 5.16: Improved facilities/services**

- A couple of pubs
- Better resident homes
- Cycling facilities
- Lift and intercom doors for security
- Local bus stop in Dorset Road
- Schools, community indoor space
- Resident parking
- Public open green spaces
- Community gardens/allotments
- Road safety crossings
- Storage areas
5.7. Resident views

Open comments

53 tenants and 19 leaseholders made comments about their household needs or regeneration proposals for the future of the South Lambeth estate.

Tenant comments

The majority of comments made were around the improvements and repairs and maintenance that is needed (43%) and the regeneration proposals (40%), with most expressing concern and the need for more information but not totally against the idea of regeneration.

A summary of the comments from tenants is given in the following table. The full comments have been made available to the Council.

Figure 5.17: Open comments from 53 tenants (61 comments in total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements, repairs &amp; maintenance</th>
<th>43%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need new kitchen/bathroom/windows</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need upgraded pavements, walkways/ramps/drainage and green areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly designed housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with damp/mould/water ingress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out proper repairs/more estate maintenance/renovation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more adaptations for disabled residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with vermin/pest control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better security/cctv cameras</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>19%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like/need a larger property</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need ground floor accommodation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to move/transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regeneration proposals</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide larger properties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally support regeneration proposals with provisos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Generally concerned about proposals | 7 |
| Other | 13% |
| Negative comments | 1 |
| Need better policing – deal with asb/drug dealing | 1 |
| Need better policing: deal with asb/drug dealing | 1 |
| Don’t know/no comment | 2 |
| General positive comment, happy as is | 3 |

Leasehold/freehold comments

Nineteen respondents from leasehold/freehold properties commented on their future household needs or the regeneration proposals:

- Happy here, wish to stay in same location (2)
- Would like more spacious rooms (1)
- Improve pathways/lighting/security/waste disposal (3)
- Estate management: maintenance/cleaning/gardening etc. (5)
- Make proposals clear and easy to understand/keep us informed (3)
- Current home is okay (1)
- Deal with asbestos (1)
- Do not want to be moved next to a tower block (2)
- Concern about reduction of green spaces/gardens/parking (2)

Consent to link details

68 tenants in Lambeth stock and 17 residents in leasehold accommodation were happy for their comments on future facilities/services and their views on the regeneration proposals for South Lambeth, to be linked by name and contact details.
6. Westbury Estate

The Westbury Estate is located in Clapham Ward and lies between Wandsworth Road and the border with the London Borough of Wandsworth. The current estate consists of 242 properties which comprise 178 tenanted properties and 64 leasehold properties. The homes are contained in two 20-storey towers and several low rise pin-wheel blocks – surrounded by large amounts of open space.

6.1 The Westbury survey

The Westbury estate is a mixed tenure estate with social housing tenants, and leaseholders.

The survey was a census of all households, with 242 questionnaires being sent out by post. After two weeks a reminder was sent to residents who had not yet responded and after a further two weeks independent research interviewers visited the estate and called upon residents which had not returned a survey offering to carry out a face-to-face interview. At the close of the survey 52 interviews had been completed and 72 postal surveys were returned – a total of 124 completed surveys representing a 51% response rate.

6.2 Demographics

Age

Over a half of all council tenants who were willing to give their age are aged between 35 and 54 years (52%), while one in six are aged 65 years or over or 34 years or under (16%).

More residents in leasehold or freehold properties are aged 65 years or over (25%), with two-fifths aged between 35 years and 54 years (40%) and a quarter aged 34 years or under (25%).

Gender

The balance between male and female respondents to the survey showed a higher proportion of female tenants (60%) than male (40%), but a slightly higher number of male residents in leasehold accommodation (54%) than female (46%).

Household characteristics

The most common household type on the estate is single adults: 36% of tenants and 42% of leaseholders.

Other households groups providing information for this survey are listed in figure 6.3, which shows that the smallest individual group among tenants are
households with three or more adults aged 16 years or over (8%) and among leaseholders the smallest group are families with children under 16 years (12%).

**Figure 6.3: Household size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household group</th>
<th>All residents (Base 123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single adult</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults without children</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more adults, 16 or over</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adult family with child/ren at least one under 16</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve tenants have one family-dependent child over the age of 21 living with them and 3 tenants had two children in that category.

**Economic status**
Of those residents completing the survey 52% are in employment (34% full-time, 15% part-time and 2% self-employed).

18% are retired and 6% are classed as long-term sick. 4% are at home looking after family. 20% of the resident population are unemployed

Economic status varies within different tenures as shown in the following figure.

**Vehicle ownership**
Residents were asked how many vehicles their household owned. The majority of residents do not own a vehicle at all (58%). Two-fifths have one vehicle (40% - 48 in number), and 2% have two vehicles (3 in number).

Residents in leasehold accommodation are more likely to own a vehicle (67%) than tenants (33%).

9 tenants advised that they are disabled “blue” badge holders, with 2 leaseholders also holding a blue badge.

Only 6 residents in total advise that they currently use the underground garage facilities.

**Ethnic origin**
Over a quarter of residents are White British residents (28%).

Of those of a different ethnicity or origin, the two largest groups are residents with an African or Black background (22%)
and Caribbean residents (11%).

**Figure 6.5 Ethnicity or origin of resident**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Number of residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other White Background</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African background</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean background</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Somali</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other African or Black background</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Base 114 residents)*

**Main spoken language**

66% of residents use English as the main spoken language in the household. The remaining households speak a variety of different languages as shown in figure 6.6

**Figure 6.6 Main language spoken in household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigrinya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religion or belief**

Almost two-thirds of respondents advised that they were of a Christian faith (66%), with one in six not following any religion (16%) and some preferring not to say (7%). A small number were of the Muslim (8%), or Buddhist (2%) faiths or followed another religion (2%).

**Figure 6.7 Religion or belief**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/belief</th>
<th>Base 269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Health problems

Almost a quarter of tenants reported that they or a member of their household have a disability or medical condition that is affected by the size, location or design of the home they live in (23%).

One of these households have more than one person with a disability.

Just one resident in leasehold accommodation reported having a disability and a requirement for wheelchair accessible housing.

When asked for brief details of the disability/medical condition and how this impacted on the household’s current
home and future housing needs the responses from tenants covered a variety of medical ailments.

**Figure 6.8: Description of health issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility issues</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart problems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aids and adaptations identified by respondents with medical needs were: bathroom adaptations.

**Care and support**

A small number of households advised that the disabled member receives an element of care (4).

### 6.4. Property details

**Length of residency**

Around two-fifths of tenants surveyed have been living on the Westbury estate for 20 years or more (38%), with the same being the case for a quarter of those in leasehold accommodation (24%).

**Figure 6.9: Length of residency by tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All residents (base 118)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 94)</th>
<th>Leasehold (base 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.10: Property details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>All residents (base 123)</th>
<th>Tenants (base 99)</th>
<th>Leaseholders/Sub-lessees (base 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisonette</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of bedrooms**

There were properties of all bedroom sizes included in the survey as shown in the tables below. A majority of tenants (64%) stated that they had the right number of bedrooms for their households.

Over a third of tenants (36% - 28 in number) consider they are overcrowded and 12% stated they were under-occupying (8 in number).
Almost all residents in leasehold properties feel they have the right number of bedrooms (94%), with 7% (4 in number) advising they are overcrowded and 9% (5 in number) that they are under-occupying their property.

Garden/balcony for private use
Almost two-fifths of tenants (42%) and two out of seven leaseholders (29%) have private use of a garden/balcony.

6.5 Preferred ways for Lambeth to make contact
Communication by letter is the most preferred method residents would like Lambeth to use when making contact with them (60%)

Communication by email is a higher preference among those in leasehold accommodation (42%) than those in LA properties (26%), whereas contact by telephone is a higher preference for tenants (41%) than for leaseholders (21%).

6.6 Communication
Local papers
In an effort to reach as wide an audience as possible to explain the regeneration programme the Borough wished to be aware of the level of readership of local and other papers among residents on its estates.

In respect of local papers, far more residents read the South London Press (30%) than either the Streatham Guardian (4%) or the Brixton Bugle (3%)
Social media

44% of tenants and 58% of leaseholders use social media. The most popular social media used by residents is Facebook (80%), followed, to a much lesser extent, by Twitter (14%).

6.7 Local facilities and services

Thinking about the future of the Westbury estate, residents were asked what improved facilities and services would most benefit them.

Around three-fifths of residents would like to see improved community facilities as part of the future plan at Westbury (58%), while around half also felt that improved health facilities would be of benefit (49%). Two-fifths of residents would like to see improved play areas (40%) and local shops (38%). Around a quarter would like to see improved local transport (23%).

Other suggestions included:

- Better improved services from Lambeth Council
- Improved outdoor space
- Parking – cars & bicycles
- Things are good as they are
- Better security/cctv
- Sheds
- Youth centre
- Doctors surgery
- Green spaces
- Lifts in flats
- Outdoor gym equipment
- Less noise
- Schools and education
- Snr Citizens community facilities

6.8. Resident views

Open comments

69 tenants and 13 leaseholders made comments about their household needs
or regeneration proposals for the future of the Westbury.

**Tenant comments**
The comments from tenants were chiefly around individual requirements within the regeneration proposals (43%) covering their wish to remain on the estate and specifying preferred type of property. A third of the comments (36%) were around the actual proposals where there was a split between those in favour and those against the regeneration. Those who were in favour, supported regeneration with certain provisos, such as clarification on the guarantees, rents and tenancy rights.

Around a quarter of tenants commenting (23%) highlighted the need for upgrading properties, dealing with damp issues, carrying out repairs and maintenance, providing adaptations for disabled residents and improving security and car parking facilities.

A summary of the comments from tenants is given in the following table. The full comments have been made available to the Council.

**Figure 6.17: Open comments from 69 tenants (79 comments in total)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements, repairs &amp; maintenance</th>
<th>23%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need new kitchen/bathroom/windows</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly designed housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with damp/mould/water ingress</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out proper repairs/more estate maintenance/renovation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more adaptations for disabled residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better security/cctv cameras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve car parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual requirements</th>
<th>43%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wish to remain at Westbury</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like/need a larger property</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need/prefer ground floor accommodation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regeneration proposals</th>
<th>36%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want the properties to be renovated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide larger properties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve but do not demolish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally support regeneration proposals with provisos</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in support of regeneration proposals</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally concerned about proposals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knock the whole estate down and re-build</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no comment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive comment/happy as is</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leasehold/freehold comments**
Thirteen respondents from leasehold/freehold properties commented on their future household needs or the regeneration proposals:

- Leave things as they are (3)
- Improve maintenance/refurbish (2)
- Repair and restore existing estate (1)
- Repair leaking flats (1)
- Better facilities for bikes (1)
- Car parks (1)
- Cinema (1)
- Local swimming pool (1)
- Better use and maintenance of current facilities (1)
- Estate management (dumping rubbish) (1)

**Consent to link details**
47 tenants in Lambeth stock and 8 residents in leasehold accommodation were happy for their comments on future facilities/services and their views on the regeneration proposals for Westbury, to be linked by name and contact details.
Help for completing the survey

The information collected through this survey will be treated in the strictest confidence and access will be strictly limited to the Council’s regeneration team, who will use it to update their records on the community and to help inform the development of the regeneration proposals for the future of your estate.

You do not have to provide information on any questions you do not wish to answer, or complete this survey, however the information collected through this survey will help the Council to understand your needs and enable us to discuss options with you if your home is affected by the regeneration option/s.

If your home is affected by the regeneration, then it will help the Council determine the numbers and mix of replacement homes that will need to be provided.

The questionnaire asks for details of your housing needs and preferences, including the size of the property you would require and any special needs you or your family may have.

The survey should be completed by the tenant/joint tenants, the person/s that are named on the tenancy agreement, or a nominated carer if requested by the tenant/s. Please return the completed questionnaire in the freepost envelope provided by 30\textsuperscript{th} April 2015.

If you would like this survey in another language please call 0800 849 4019.

Section 1. Tenancy details

Q1. Are you the Tenant/Joint Tenant of the property – are you the named tenant/joint tenant on the tenancy agreement?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ]

Please provide details below:

Name: ___________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________

When did your tenancy start?: ________________________________

How long have you lived on your estate? ________________________________
Section 2. Household information

Q2a. The name of the main tenant on the Council’s records has been pre-printed on the first row below. Please fill in their age and gender on that row. Please then list everyone else in your household in order of age, and fill in their details in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Age or date of birth (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Gender (tick one)</th>
<th>Relationship to main tenant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2ai. How many family dependant children over the age of 21 years live with you? _____

Q2b. Are all of your family on the tenancy agreement? Yes No

Q2c. Do you or anyone in your household have a disability or medical condition that affects the size, location or design of the home that you live in? Yes No

Q2d. If ‘Yes’ to Q2c, Please could you provide details of your home: e.g. home is wheelchair accessible; has a walk-in shower; separate bedroom for carer etc:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of member of household</th>
<th>Details of the disability/medical condition and how this affects the household’s current home and future housing needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Q2e. Does anyone in the household require the services of a full-time carer? Yes No

Q2f. If ‘Yes’ to Q2e: Please provide details on the care and support that is received:

Q2g. Is a member of your family a full-time carer? Yes No

Section 3. Property details

Q3a. How many bedrooms do you have? Single bedrooms: ____ Double bedrooms: ____

Q3b. At the moment, do you consider your household...: (please tick one box per row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the right number of bedrooms?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is overcrowded?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is under-occupying?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3c. Have you had any aids or adaptations made to your home? Yes No

Q3d. If ‘Yes’ to Q3c: Please could you give details

Q3e. Is your home a... House? Flat? Maisonette? Other?

Q3f. What floor is your home on? ________________________________

Q3g. Do you have a garden/balcony for private use? Yes No

Section 4. Household requirements

Q4a. How many vehicles does your household own? None 1 2 3

Q4b. Is any member of the household a Blue Badge holder? Yes No

Q4c. Do you currently rent/park in the underground garages? Yes No

Q4d. What is your employment status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Self Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Long Term Sick</td>
<td>School/Education</td>
<td>Looking After Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (write in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lambeth Household Survey Report
Section 5. Equalities information

Q5a. What is your ethnic origin?

White or White British:
- British (English, Scottish, Welsh, Northern Irish)
- Irish
- Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- Polish
- Portuguese

Any other White background (please state) ________________________________

Mixed or multiple ethnic groups
- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian

Any other Mixed / Multiple ethnic background (please state) ________________________

Asian or Asian British
- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese

Any other Asian background (please state) _________________________________

Black / African / Caribbean / Black British
- Caribbean background
- African Somali
- Any other African or Black

Other ethnic group
- Arab
- Prefer not to say

Any other ethnic group (please state) _______________________________________

Q5b. Is English the main language spoken in your household?    Yes    No

Q5c. If ‘No’ to Q5b: What is the main language spoken? ____________________________

Q5d. What is your religion or belief?
- No religion
- Christian
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Sikh
- Prefer not to say

Any other religion (please state) _____________________________________________
**Section 6. Communication with you**

**Q6a. What is the best way to contact you?**
- Letter
- Telephone
- Email
- Other *(please state)* ___________________________

Email address/phone number: ____________________________________________

**Q6b. Which local papers do you read?**
- Brixton Bugle
- South London Press
- Streatham Guardian
- Other *(please state)* ____________________________

**Q6c. Do you use social media?**
- Yes
- No

**Q6d. If ‘Yes’ to Q6c: Which social media do you use?**
- Twitter
- Facebook
- Brixton Blogg
- Other *(please state)* ____________________________

---

**Section 7. Regeneration**

**Q7. Thinking about the future of your area, what facilities and services would benefit residents?**
*
*Please tick all that apply*

- Improved Health services
- Improved Community facilities
- Play areas
- Local shops
- Local transport
- Other *(please state)* ____________________________
Section 8. Have your say

Q8. Is there anything else you would like to say about your household needs or the regeneration proposals for the future of the estate?

Q9. The answers that you've given from Q1 through to Q6d in this questionnaire will be linked to your name and contact details in the information that Lambeth Council receive. Are you happy for your answers to Q7 and Q8 to also be linked to your contact details, or would you prefer these answers to be given anonymously to the Council?

- Happy for answers to Q7 and Q8 to be linked to my name and contact details
- Prefer my answers to Q7 and Q8 to be given anonymously to the Council

THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART IN THIS SURVEY. PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM BY 30th APRIL 2015.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The London Borough of Lambeth has committed to a programme of estate regeneration within the Borough to bring about long-term improvements to its housing stock and the quality of living for its residents.

To bring about this change the Council has been looking at viable options to refurbish and extend the lifespan of existing stock to provide good quality housing to meet the needs of residents. It has also been looking at areas within the Borough with development potential, including its own estates, to bring forward additional housing in the Borough to help meet the growing number of households wishing to live there.

As part of this programme, the Council has identified the housing stock on the South Lambeth Estate ("the site") as being in need of improvement and with the potential for delivering an up-lift in the number of homes.

Airey Miller Partnership has been commissioned to complete financial analysis of the preliminary options being considered by the Council and to report on the relative merits in financial terms of the options being explored.

The scenarios tested demonstrate how by flexing some of the key priorities underpinning regeneration on the site, the capital cost, funding requirements and level of cross-subsidy generated interlinks to bring about different outcomes and risk profiles for the Council.

The purpose of this report is therefore to provide an overview of the financial viability of the site summarising work to date and setting out a series of scenarios for consideration by the Council.

An initial viability has been carried out on two options to show a base option based on the Council’s aspirations in terms of the ability to cross subsidise the anticipated refurbishment costs, provide the requisite level of affordable housing provision and deliver any new build housing.

This base option has demonstrated that the two development options are viable, but do require modest adjustments to the Council’s principle objectives and aspirations. Consequently, further scenario testing has been undertaken to understand the effects of changes to these requirements and to present the Council with a number of options to allow it to make informed decisions on how and where there is flexibility in the proposed development strategy. These options are presented in Section 4 of this report.
1.1 Delivery from the proposed options

The Council is considering a number of development options. These options have been produced as part of the feasibility and massing exercise completed by Pollard Thomas Edwards and summarised in the Briefing Document for Lambeth Housing Delivery dated July 2015:

- **Avenue Scenario (v2) with Wimborne retained**
  This scenario proposes:
  — Retaining Wimborne House with works to improve
  — New homes, flats and houses
  — A new community and commercial space
  — Create a new landscaped Avenue park

  Details of Avenue Scenario v2
  — Provides circa 327 new homes (mix to be determined)
  — Phased redevelopment maintaining Wimborne House (104 existing homes)
  — Total homes circa 431 including Wimborne House
  — Approximate density: 209 units per hectare
  — Net gain homes 226

- **Square Scenario (v2) without Wimborne retained**
  This scenario proposes:
  — No existing homes retained
  — New homes, flats and houses
  — A new community and commercial space
  — Create a new landscaped Square

  Details of the Square Scenario v2
  — Provides circa 500 new homes (mix to be determined)
  — Creates new landscaped square, with associated community space
  — Approximate density: 247 units per hectare
  — Net gain homes 303
1.2 Delivery Aspirations
Under both base options, it is been assumed that the regeneration proposals will re-provide the existing stock as far as practicable (re-providing the equivalent unit size mix as currently exists).

It is assumed under the Avenue option that the refurbishment to Wimborne House could be partially funded by the wider development. This represents an indicative cost of work of £500k. This is included in the financial appraisal as an additional cost during the development works. Further work and cost analysis of this scenario is required.

A Right to Buy capital input is assumed against 30% of the net gain affordable housing construction costs. This assumes that the funding requirements can be satisfied by the Council.

Airey Miller is advised by the Council that it has set out clear minimum objectives for regeneration. These are:

- To re-provide homes for all those wishing to remain on an estate. For the purposes of the estate regeneration this means:
  - Re-providing existing tenants with an equivalent new home
  - Re-providing 80% of leaseholders with an equivalent new home
- To fix the rent for existing tenants to the equivalent of a social or target rent (i.e. homes at council rent levels)
- As a minimum, to ensure that the net gain additional new homes meet Council policy:
  - Planning Policy requires a minimum of 40% affordable homes
  - Council Rent requires that 1 and 2 bedroom properties be let at maximum of LHA rates and family homes (3 bedrooms and larger) be let at target rents

The Council has also declared its aspirations as set out below:

**Tenure of net gain homes**
- 40% affordable
  - made up from 100% Council Rent
- 60% private rent

**Unit Size Mix of net gain homes**
- 1 Bed – 15%
- 2 Bed – 50%
- 3 Bed – 25%
- 4 Bed – 10%

**Rents**
- Net gain affordable homes to be provided at council rent levels (otherwise known as Target Rent)
1.3 Programme and Decanting

The programme for the development options is based on a sequenced decant strategy that is aligned to the construction programme. It is acknowledged that the Council may deviate from this timeline, securing properties as and when they become available.

Broadly, development is proposed to take place in a continuous phase with site preparation concluding in the first quarter of 2017. Construction and refurbishment work will commence in the second quarter 2017 with work taking approximately 256 and 296 weeks respectively for the Avenue and the Square.

The delivery profile is illustrated below for the base options:

Avenue
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- Dwellings Constructed
Square

Delivery Profile

Programme Construction Profile

- Dwellings Constructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings Constructed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. FINANCIAL VIABILITY ANALYSIS

The purpose of this financial viability analysis is to establish whether the options proposed to bring about estate regeneration at South Lambeth are viable and deliverable, providing the Council with an acceptable risk profile and a positive net present value ("NPV")

In terms of the financial structure, it is recognised that the Council is still considering a number of different finance approaches. For the purpose of this analysis, the financial appraisal is operating a tiered funding structure. In brief, this approach enables:

- Development finance cost to be rolled-up
- Re-finance after Practical Completion. Ability to borrow more than development cost if there is sufficient headroom within LTV limit of asset.
- Tier One (Senior debt) to be re-paid as a priority before Tier Two Finance (Subordinated debt)
- Income commences upon occupation under PRS scenario. Private sales enable income to be realised earlier through off-plan sales and earlier hand-over during construction.

To demonstrate the viability of the design options being considered, a number of financial models and scenarios have been prepared and analysed to ensure that the financial parameters of the business case are satisfied within an acceptable risk profile.

The outputs are based on a notional regeneration approach and was assessed to be viable when the following criteria were achieved:

- A positive NPV greater than £0 is calculated.
- The ability of the project to be self-financing over the lifecycle of the scheme. Self-financing means having the ability to service its operating costs beyond the construction phase.

The key data inputs of the assumed scenarios are demonstrated in the outputs reported in Section 4. To ensure consistency across the analysis the following common data sets were applicable to all the scenarios tested:

- Finance Costs (annual rate)
  - Sub Debt funding 6.00%
  - Senior Debt funding 5.87%

NPV is a measure of how profitable a future cashflow is by comparing the value of a pound today to the value of that pound at a future point, taking inflation into account. If the NPV of a prospective project is positive, the project stands to provide an increased return on investment and would be considered acceptable. However, if NPV is negative, the project probably should be rejected because the cost of implementing will not be recovered in the future.
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- Private Sale
  - Open Market Value £675.00 sqft

- Assumed rents
  - Private Rent (£pw)
    Beds
    1  £348.00
    2  £446.00
    3  £595.00
    4  £744.00

  - New Build Council Rent (£pw)
    Beds
    1  £117.00
    2  £135.00
    3  £144.00
    4  £158.00
    5  £166.00

  - Replaced Council Rent (£pw)
    Beds
    1  £117.00
    2  £135.00
    3  £144.00
    4  £158.00
    5  £166.00

- Assumed number of leaseholders remaining on estate:
  - Remaining @ 80%
  - Leaseholder Buy Out @ 20.00%

- Percentage of gross rent assumed for capitalisation purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.20%</td>
<td>78.31%</td>
<td>80.19%</td>
<td>81.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Affordable|    | 68.30%| 70.69%| 71.66%| 72.95%| Gross:Net Rent
3. BASE OPTION
A base option has been considered for each development proposal. The base option takes account of the Council’s objectives and aspirations detailed earlier in this report and determines the extent to which these ambitions can be achieved.

The base option delivers the following outcomes:

**Avenue Baseline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£577m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£5.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£24.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£14,592,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£333,845,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Dec-69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Ave</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Square Baseline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>Flex – 515 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£820m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£34.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£870,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£620,356,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Sept-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Sqr</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. SCENARIO TESTING

It is recognised that it is preferable for the Council to achieve as many of its ambitions as possible, within the most acceptable risk profile.

To assess and provide visibility of some of the potential options available to the Council to secure improvements, a number of alternative development scenarios have been tested. Using the base option as the starting point, sequential alterations have been made to the principle assumptions to capture and articulate the potential scope for enhancement.

In conducting these viability scenarios, two principle assumptions have been explored. These are tenure of private net gain dwellings and level of affordable rents.

4.1 Outcomes of Scenario Testing

The outputs are summarised over the following pages.

A. Avenue – Partial Redevelopment with Refurbishment of Wimborne House

A.1 Avenue Base Option

Based on 327 dwellings and a refurbishment cost of £500k a viable scheme is achievable. The replaced affordable properties are re-provided at Council Rent levels.

This relies on a 40/60 affordable to private tenure split on the net gain element. The affordable element is provided in accordance with the Council’s Council Rent and the private net gain element is completely provided (100%) as private rent.
A.2
To establish if the scheme could deliver an enhanced level of affordable housing, the scheme has been tested by reducing the amount of private housing. In this instance, the development could support 55% affordable housing at Council Rent levels. By reducing the private element, the annual revenue reduces which increases the cost of borrowings and extends the breakeven period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 45/55 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£543m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£5.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£23.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£2,428,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£396,883,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Dec-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Ave</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.3
To enable an additional 10% affordable housing to be secured against the baseline scenario, an element of private sale can be introduced. By introducing a higher proportion of private sale will enable an earlier breakeven to be achieved and a reduce finance cost. Within the private element, the 15% private sale and 85% private rent can support the net gain element of affordable housing at Council Rent levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of dwellings proposed</th>
<th>327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 50/50 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Flex – 22:78 private sale: PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£440m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£5.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£181,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£319,211,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Dec-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Ave</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.4
To enable an earlier breakeven and to reduce finance costs the amount of private sale housing has been increased to 50%. The affordable housing element is maintained at 50%. This would deliver 180 dwellings as affordable housing at Council Rent levels.

| No. of dwellings proposed | 327 |
| No. of net gain dwellings | 226 |
| Housing Size Mix | Achieved |
| Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent | Achieved |
| Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost | Achieved |
| Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing) | Flex – 50/50 Affordable / Private |
| Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent | Achieved |
| Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent | Flex – 50:50 private sale: PRS |
| Nil pump priming investment from LBL | Achieved |
| Finance at Council Rate | Achieved |
| Grant Levels | £0 |
| Gross development value (60yr) | £364m |
| % Affordable housing on whole estate | 55% |
| Tenant and Leaseholder payments | £5.6m |
| Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs) | £16.2m |
| NPV | £20,119,722 |
| Finance Cost | £114,223,830 |
| Breakeven achieved in | Jun-60 |

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Lambeth Ave</th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.5

To enable the Council to deliver an alternative tenure split, an element of private sale instead of private rent has been tested. A 50:50 split between private sale and private rent could support the 210 dwellings as affordable housing at Council Rent levels. By introducing an element of private sale, reduces finance costs and reduces the breakeven period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of dwellings proposed</th>
<th>327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 55/45 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Flex – 50:50 private sale: PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£336m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£5.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£16.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£2,723,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£200,073,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Sept-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Ave</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A.6
With a scheme providing 100% private sale in the net gain element, it could be possible to deliver 65% affordable housing in the net gain element. It would enable this provision to be made at Council Rent levels. This would have the effect of reducing finance costs and achieving an earlier payback period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 65/35 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Flex – 100% private sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£218m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£5.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£12.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£2,196,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£90,737,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Sept-71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Lambeth Ave</th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. The Square – Comprehensive Redevelopment

B.1 Base Option
Based on 515 dwellings a viable scheme is achievable that delivers the net gain element of the scheme at 40% affordable and private tenures. The affordable housing delivery is in accordance with the Council’s Council Rent. The private element relies on 100% private rent.
B.2
Based on 508 dwellings a viable scheme is achievable if the amount of affordable housing is flexed to 35%. The replaced affordable properties are re-provided at Council Rent levels. The private net gain element is completely provided (100%) as private rent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 35/65 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£852m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£35.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£13,237,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£550,513,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Mar-72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Lambeth Sqr</th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.3
To enable the Council to deliver an alternative tenure split, an element of private sale instead of private rent has been tested. A 50:50 split between private sale and private rent could support the 210 dwellings as affordable housing at Council Rent levels. By introducing an element of private sale, reduces finance costs and reduces the breakeven period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of dwellings proposed</th>
<th>508</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 50/50 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Flex – 50:50 private sale: PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£520m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£24.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£16,297,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£229,271,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Dec-66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Sqr</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B.4
With a scheme providing 100% private sale in the net gain element, it could be possible to deliver 60% affordable housing in the net gain element. It would enable this provision to be made at Council Rent levels. This would have the effect of reducing finance costs and achieving an earlier payback period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 60/40 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Flex – 100% private sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£335m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£18.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£15,358,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£79,045,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Mar-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Lambeth Sqr</th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.5
To enable an earlier breakeven and to reduce finance costs the amount of affordable housing has been reduced to 50%. The private element is maintained as a 100% private sale in the net gain element with the affordable housing provision made at Council Rent levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of dwellings proposed</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of net gain dwellings</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Size Mix</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-provide existing homes at Target Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund £500k Refurbishment Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain homes meet Planning Policy (40% affordable housing)</td>
<td>Flex – 50/50 Affordable / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain affordable homes meet Council Rent</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain Private delivered as Private Rent</td>
<td>Flex – 100% private sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil pump priming investment from LBL</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance at Council Rate</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Levels</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value (60yr)</td>
<td>£349m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Affordable housing on whole estate</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant and Leaseholder payments</td>
<td>£8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs (exc. Construction and Tenant and Leaseholder costs)</td>
<td>£19m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>£38,741,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Cost</td>
<td>£22,411,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>Jun-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Split**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Private Rent</th>
<th>Private Sale</th>
<th>Replaced Council Rent</th>
<th>Shared Equity</th>
<th>New Build @ Council Rent</th>
<th>Commercial area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Lambeth Sqr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. SUMMARY

Through our financial analysis of the two development options, it is evident that the South Lambeth Estate is viable for regeneration.

The base options presented recognise the key objectives of delivering within the principle policy requirements of the Council.

The scenario testing then further demonstrates the scope for further refinement moving forward. Within the scenario testing reported here, it is evident that there is sufficient scope to flex the base option to achieve more of the Council’s aspirations or to achieve a greater NPV.
Notes and Exclusions
- Numerous input data remains to be refined by the client and other advisors, the current model output is therefore not representative of the final scheme position.
- Indicated finance costs will not be accurate where the scheme does not reach a positive position.
- The finance structure is indicative and will need to be agreed with the eventual funder.
- This model has been prepared at an early stage in the project development based on limited information; the results of the model may therefore change in line with scheme / financial development. A further iteration of the model will be undertaken in due course.
- The gross and net rent cashflow is intended to be indicative only. A full business plan including major repair and replacement should be produced to inform cashflow.
- Airey Miller accepts no liability for the accuracy of input data other than that provided by Airey Miller Partnership. In particular, no liability is accepted in respect of values or income or operational/management costs. At present, the model uses affordable values as advised by the Council and those set out in the Local Housing Allowance for Inner South East London, June 2015. The Open Market Sales and Rental Values reported to the Council are provided by Lambert Smith Hampton and Hamptons International. These will need to be checked for a more location specific value weightings going forward.
- Airey Miller Partnership accept no liability for user changes to the model, any proposed changes should be referred to Airey Miller Partnership for checking.
- Airey Miller Partnership has produced its own Order of Costs to inform the cost assumptions. It is intended that these OoC’s provide a consistent and up to date base date. The detail is based on the previous design work and it is assumed that the design will work around the existing infrastructure layout. If there is a need to re-route services etc. then this will incur additional cost.
- The NPV figures reported are illustrative only. Cost and values will fluctuate during the development period and it is recommended that the financial position is constantly monitored to ensure financial performance is maintained.
- There may be minor discrepancies between the figures presented owing to rounding in the calculations within the financial model.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Business activity aims and intentions

In brief explain the aims of your proposal/project/service, why is it needed? Who is it aimed at? What is the intended outcome? What are the links to the political vision, and outcomes?

What are the aims of your proposal?

Our ambition is to ensure that every resident in Lambeth has the opportunity to live in a good quality home that is affordable and suitable for their needs.

The Council is committed to delivering 1,000 extra homes at council rent levels to deliver a new generation of homes for Lambeth’s residents. These new homes will be delivered over the next 4 years through a combination of initiatives, including estate regeneration, small sites development and specific housing projects. The Council also needs to look forward to future demand beyond this time horizon, where it is predicted that the Council will need to enable and deliver more than 1,559 new homes per annum until 2025.

The council’s Estate Regeneration programme focusses on estates where:

- the current condition of a number of properties is poor
- the costs of delivering the Lambeth Housing Standard means it is unaffordable
- refurbishment works themselves would not resolve the main problems with the condition of the properties; and
- there is the potential for wider regeneration benefits, including delivery of additional new homes.

South Lambeth estate was included in the Estates Regeneration Programme in December 2014. The principal reason for inclusion of the estate in the programme is that represents an opportunity to build a significant number of additional homes. Given its location and public transport accessibility levels, there is scope for a significant increase in the number of homes.

South Lambeth currently has 205 properties; these include 142 tenanted and 63 leasehold.

Note that there are 3 regeneration scenarios for South Lambeth estate regeneration. Two of which include retaining the 12 storey Wimborne
House (104 households) whilst one includes redevelopment of the entire estate. The current preferred option is to retain Wimborne House which will significantly reduce the number of people directly affected.

Why is it needed?

Lambeth, similar to other London boroughs, continues to face massive housing challenges, and a shortage of housing has resulted in an increase in house prices and rent levels. Over the last decade house prices have more than doubled - in 2005, the average house price in the borough was £256,000, today it is over £500,000. The average rent for a two bed Lambeth flat is now around £345 per week. This level of rent compares with gross monthly incomes (based on 40 hour working weeks) of around £260 per week at the national minimum wage and about £360 on the London Living Wage.

All this leads to huge demands being placed on the Council for affordable housing – there are currently in excess of 21,000 households on the housing register. Nearly 2,000 join the register each year and Lambeth rehoused fewer than 1200 from that list in 2014/15. There are approximately 2,000 households currently residing in temporary accommodation.

In addition to increasing the supply of genuinely affordable housing, the condition of many of the homes on the estate is poor and there is not funding available through the Housing Revenue Account to bring the homes up to the Lambeth Housing Standard.

What is the intended outcome?

Following the estate regeneration programme, South Lambeth will be a mixed tenure estate. All the new homes will be built to modern design and energy efficiency standards and a number of these1 will be at Council rent levels.

- The existing homes will be replaced, with existing tenants re-housed in homes provided at council rents and existing resident homeowners will be offered options to enable them to remain on the estate including shared equity, shared ownership (or other) offers. The difference between shared equity and shared ownership is that with shared ownership you pay rent on the proportion of the home that you do not own. With shared equity there is no rent to pay.

Options are being provided to ensure that all residents that want to can continue living on the estate. A summary of the ‘Offers’ made to tenants and leaseholders is below:-

**Council Tenants**

- Council tenants on South Lambeth who have to move because of a decision to demolish and rebuild will be offered a new lifetime home on the estate at Council rent levels

---

1 Figure yet to be confirmed and is dependent on scheme viability.
• Residents choosing to move elsewhere will be given Band A, which is the highest priority to bid for an alternative property under the Council’s Allocations Scheme
• If the Council pursues building new homes through a Special Purpose Vehicle the affected homes will be rented at Council rent levels, but with a lifetime assured tenancy, rather than a secure tenancy. A key difference between the two forms of tenancy is that the Right to Buy is not available with a lifetime assured tenancy
• Homes will meet housing needs – overcrowded households will move into larger properties. and those who need a smaller home will move to one

Homeowners (both Freeholders and Leaseholders)
• Resident homeowners wishing to sell their property would be offered market value plus 10% homeloss (the latter capped at £53,000 in line with Government guidance) and reasonable disturbance costs
• Non-resident homeowners would be offered market value + 7.5% (capped at £75,000 in line with Government guidance). These are the legal requirements set by government when undertaking compulsory purchase and are based on the principle of ‘equivalence’. That is, compensated parties should be no better or worse off after the purchase.
• Going beyond the Council’s legal requirements, resident homeowners wishing to stay on the estate would also be offered shared equity of a new home on South Lambeth subject to their ability to port their mortgage and having suitable equity. Those with less than 50% equity can carry on living on the estate on a shared ownership basis. At the time of writing, there are 41 homeowners in blocks that would be demolished.

The Council will work with all affected residents individually (tenants and homeowners), and in particular with those who are vulnerable. All residents living on the estate will have access to individual independent advice throughout the process, funded by the Council and sufficient to enable them to make informed choices regarding the offers available. Lastly the Council will give those tenants who will be moving to alternative new build properties within the regeneration area opportunities to be involved in the design of their properties and offer individual choices in relation to the finishes in their properties where this is feasible.

The redevelopment of South Lambeth forms part of a wider estates regeneration programme in Lambeth comprising of the following estates: Central Hill, Fenwick, Knight’s Walk, Westbury and Cressingham Gardens.

2.0 Analysing your equalities evidence
2.1 Evidence
Any proposed business activity, new policy or strategy, service change, or procurement must be informed by carrying out an assessment of the likely impact that it may have. In this section please include both data and analysis which shows that you understand how this decision is likely to affect residents that fall under the protected characteristics enshrined in law and the local characteristics which we consider to be important in Lambeth (language, health and socio-economic factors). Please check the council’s equality and monitoring policy and your division’s self assessment. Each division in 2012 reviewed its equality data and
completed a self assessment about what equality data is relevant and available.

Protected characteristics and local equality characteristics

Impact analysis
For each characteristic please indicate the type of impact (i.e. positive, negative, positive and negative, none, or unknown), and:

Please explain how you justify your claims around impacts.
Please include any data and evidence that you have collected including from surveys, performance data or complaints to support your proposed changes.

Please indicate sources of data and the date it relates to/was produced (e.g. ‘Residents Survey, wave 10, April 12’ or ‘Lambeth Business Survey 2012’ etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>South Lambeth tenants</th>
<th>South Lambeth leaseholders / sub lessees</th>
<th>Overall Lambeth Tenant Population</th>
<th>London Borough of Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29% (10.5% white other)</td>
<td>64%: 33% White British, 31% White Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Impact on Existing Tenants

The majority of South Lambeth Estate’s tenants are of black background (46%) of which approximately 50% of these are of Black African background. This reflects the percentage of Black tenants in Lambeth’s stock as a whole and there are a number of Somali and Eritrean households on the estate.

There are 66 tenants and 13 leaseholders who describe themselves as either Black, Black African, Black Caribbean or Black Other. This comprises 32% and 6% of the estate population as a whole. As a diverse estate, South Lambeth
also has a significant other white population which includes a number of Portuguese households (South Lambeth Estate is located between Stockwell, Clapham North and Vauxhall, an area with a large concentration of Portuguese residents).

The impact is predicted to be largely positive given the high levels of BME households currently residing on the estate with a better designed environment, a warm and dry home that would be beneficial in reducing fuel poverty, reduction in overcrowding, and generally improving the quality of life of residents in the long term.

There are a number of overcrowded households on the estate. A Household Needs Survey undertaken in March 2015 identified 33 households that stated they are currently living in overcrowded accommodation. 90% of these are from BME backgrounds; 60% of overcrowded families are Black African households. Given that one of the intentions of regeneration is to address overcrowding and ensuring that an adequate number of larger homes are provided across the programme, regeneration will have a positive impact on these groups.

In the short term it is likely that there will be a negative impact on BME households due to the disruption caused by the estate regeneration programme. To mitigate this, the Council will provide a comprehensive package of rehousing assistance and support to minimise the disturbance experienced by residents including compensation of £5,300 in addition to any moving costs to cover any inconvenience. There will be an enhanced package of assistance available for all residents – including help with removals, disconnection and reconnection of services etc - throughout the moving process and wherever possible, the Council will minimise the number of times that people need to move (with the majority of tenants only having to move once). The Council will potentially need to input extra resources into making sure that the nature of the proposals are understood by BME households and to ensure that they receive adequate support through the re-housing process; this will be monitored as the project progresses to ensure that suitable support is being provided. We have also identified interpreter support for Portuguese, Spanish and Tigrinya (Eritrean) residents to help them through the process.

**Impact on New Tenants**

Whilst overcrowding is experienced by all races, according to the Housing Register, BME households make up over two thirds of all overcrowded households. 66% of new tenants come from BME background and will be the main beneficiaries of the new social housing being provided.

Priority for housing is based mainly on housing need and because BME households tend to have higher levels of housing need, a disproportionate amount of social housing is allocated to these groups. 59% of those allocated housing are from Black British: Caribbean and African households, and only 10% to White British. The over-representation of BME groups is a national trend and may be due to a number of social-economic factors, including
lower incomes, higher unemployment and poor health, which increase dependence on social housing.

**Impact on Leaseholders**

Equality data on leaseholders is far sparser than for tenants. When properties are re-sold, equality questions are not asked as part of the conveyancing process. Some limited information is available from the Household Needs Survey carried out on the estate. It shows that White British people are more likely to be homeowners.

**Impact on Sub-Lessees**

The council’s stock database (Northgate) indicates that 22 out of the 63 leaseholders on the estate currently sub-let their properties although this data is not very robust and relies on leaseholders voluntarily telling the Council as homeowners are not required to inform the Council. The Council does not hold any equality information on residents who sub-let from leaseholders; this is a private contract between the leaseholder and their tenant that the council is not party to.

The needs survey on South Lambeth identified 11 of the 22 sublet households who identified as being private tenants of whom there were:

- 1 Black Carribbean
- 1 Chinese
- 3 White British
- 6 White Other (including 4 Portuguese and 1 South American, nationality not stated)

Although a small sample size, the data suggests different ethnicities being affected disproportionally. Private renters may be able to rent one of the new properties from the regeneration or will be supported by the council with advice to access private rented accommodation elsewhere in the borough.

**Summary**

Whilst all households on the estate will be impacted, the largest group to be impacted is BME as they are the larger proportion of tenants on the estate. Because there is a greater representation of BME across the estate than other ethnicities, then the outcome of the proposals would positively benefit a larger number and proportion of households falling within the BME category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Impact: Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Lambeth tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Impact on Tenants**

The gender split on South Lambeth Estate has a slightly lower proportion of female headed households in this type of tenure. However, there are more female headed households than male headed households (57% : 43%).

We recognise that there will be a short-term negative impact during the rehousing and construction periods for this project due to the inevitable disruption it will cause. The council is therefore developing a detailed rehousing policy as well as the formal offers to tenants and homeowners to help reduce uncertainty. The phasing of the construction and site management will also consider safe access across the estate and to local facilities.

Improving the condition and standard and supply of the Council housing stock through the estate regeneration programme is a key outcome of this project. The impact of the estate regeneration programme at South Lambeth will be positive as there will be improvement of the level of decency for both male and female residents.

The estate regeneration programme aims to not only improve the condition of housing for existing residents but to provide additional homes at Council rent and generally affordable levels that will house the people of Lambeth. Increasing the number of homes at council rent levels in equality terms will mean that those in housing need on the Housing Register (the majority of whom are women) are key beneficiaries of the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households housed in 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source - Northgate April 2015*

**Impact on Leaseholders and Future Homeowners**
The gender records of leaseholds from the household survey show a marginally higher proportion of male headed leasehold properties.
Gender re-assignment

Impact: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Lambeth</th>
<th>Lambeth Tenants</th>
<th>Lambeth Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born different gender</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although very limited data there is no disproportionate impact identified.

Equality and Human Rights Commission guidance on this protected characteristic is to collect data where relevant. Gender re-assignment is not relevant to the majority of housing services, with the exception of tackling harassment. The new place will be secure by design to improve safety and reduce opportunities for crime.

Disability

Impact: Both

The most recent and reliable information on this characteristic was recorded in the South Lambeth Estate Household Needs Survey, undertaken in March 2015. A total of 29 tenants stated that they or a household member had a disability or impairment. A breakdown of this information is provided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified disability</th>
<th>Number of residents affected (of 146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General mobility problems</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues/learning difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis/Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/Eczema</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure/diabetic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Fatigue Syndrome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciatica/back problems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart problems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cancer 2
TOTAL 33

*(Please note that some households listed more than one disability or physical impairment)*

The Household Needs survey highlighted that a significant number (20%) of tenant respondents reported that they or a member of their household have a disability or medical conditions that is affected by the size, location or design of the home they live in. For leaseholders the figure was approximately 8%.

For both of these headline figures some caution needs to be taken, many of the responses, particularly those where conditions are ‘unspecifed’ in that they may not be relevant to their housing need.

The survey also indicated that 8 tenanted households had the need for a full time carer although details on current care arrangement were very sparse and does not suggest that 8 households are currently receiving full time care. Also, 7 households stated they required a carer but not on a full-time basis.

According to the “State of the Borough 2014” report about 37,000 people, 11.9% of the population of Lambeth, say their day-to-day activities are limited by a long term illness or disability of which around 46% (17,000) people stated that their activities are limited a lot and 56% (20,000) limited a little. This figure is substantially lower than that suggested above for South Lambeth tenants.

**Impact on Existing Tenants**

The estate regeneration programme overall will have a positive impact on disabled tenants living in South Lambeth as all new homes will meet the Lifetime Homes standard, which will make their new homes more accessible than the existing homes on the estate, and over time will allow residents to stay in their own homes for longer, reduce the need for home adaptations and give greater choice to disabled people who cannot achieve independent living due to lack of suitable housing in our housing stock.

However in the short term, tenants with disabilities may be adversely affected due to the disturbance of moving home. As part of the estate regeneration programme, a comprehensive package of assistance will be provided to assist this group in preparing to move and moving to their new home with intensive, personalised support provided to ensure that medical and disability needs are carefully addressed and support networks maintained. The Rehousing team will work closely with Adult Services and will either use Council Occuptational Therapy services, or appoint an independent OT to ensure the service is available when required, as well as access to mental health services as required.
Tenants who require adaptations will have them provided in their new homes with rehousing officers working closely with the occupational therapy team to carry out assessments as required and provide advice on the design, layout and adaptation of new homes as appropriate. A budget will be made available for aids and adaptations so that these can be carried out in a timely manner.

The new buildings and spaces will comply with current standards of accessibility to improve accessibility for wheelchair users, people with visual impairment etc.

This group will be prioritised for one move only.

**Impact on Existing Leaseholders**

Albeit there is a much smaller proportion of leaseholders who may be disabled, the Council will extend the same package of measures to these leaseholders to help them remain on the estate, should they wish to do so, and to help ensure that their future homes are adequately adapted to meet their needs.

**Impact on New tenants**

The impact for new tenants with disabilities will be positive. The proposals for the development of new homes on South Lambeth are intended to increase the options for people with disabilities, both for existing and new residents. There are 194 households currently registered on the Housing Register with a known disability, with a severe shortage of accessible housing in Lambeth. All properties on South Lambeth will be built to the Lifetime Homes design standards – the main features include a level approach/entrance and wider doorways. Many existing homes in Lambeth housing stock are not wheelchair accessible and often have to go through expensive adaptations to ensure accessibility.

**Impact: Both**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>South Lambeth tenants</th>
<th>Lambeth Council tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Northgate August 2015*
**Household Composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 parent family (one child under 16)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 adults (no children under 16)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 adults (no children under 16)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single adult (no child under 16)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family (at least one child under 19)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family (at least one child under 16)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source – South Lambeth Estate Household Needs Survey (March 2015)

**Impact on Existing Tenants**

The proportion of older people living on South Lambeth is broadly the same as the borough tenant average. The positives, negative and mitigating actions are broadly the same as those described above under the disability section.

Older people have generally been living on the estate for a longer period of time than other residents, likely to be more settled and require more support when moving.

The regeneration project provides an opportunity to increase the supply of Lifetime Homes which are designed to be easily adapted as people’s needs change.

The number of children and young people is likely to increase with the provision of new and additional homes and a number of issues need to be considered in order to mitigate the impact of the project on this group. For existing residents, an amount of play and amenity space should be maintained throughout the construction period. New, high-quality spaces that cater for all age groups will be required as part of the masterplanning brief. Children and young people should also be encouraged to participate in consultation as the project develops to ensure they have the opportunity to shape the detailed proposals.

We recognise that there may be disruption to accessing existing services and agencies such as school, childcare, etc for various ages during the decant and construction programme. The decant programme will mean residents moving once only into their new home wherever possible. If a tenant chooses to move permanently elsewhere, we will work
with them to minimise the impact.

Access around the estate and to childcare, nurseries, crèches and schools will also be considered during the masterplanning stage of the project on order to keep disruption to attendance to a minimum.

**Impact on Future Tenants**

Lambeth’s older population (aged 60+) is projected to grow by 27% by 2024, compared to an 11% growth across the whole population. However, there are substantial differences between ethnic groups. For example, whilst the 60+ population is projected to grow by 27% overall, the black Caribbean 60+ populations are projected to grow by 38%, from around 5,000 to 6,700. This is compared to an all-age decrease in the black Caribbean population of 4.6%, from 28,600 to 27,000. However, the number of people identifying themselves as ‘Black British’ is increasing.

Similarly, the black African population is projected to grow by 10.9% overall, but the 60+ population is projected to increase by 82% (albeit from a smaller base line – from 2,400 to 4,500). The white population is projected to grow less.

The supply of additional homes will benefit an ageing future population.

**Impact on Existing Homeowners**

Fewer residents in leasehold properties are over 65 (14%) with just under half aged between 35-65 and a third aged under 35.

Older leaseholders are less likely to be in work or be able to take on new mortgages. However, they are also more likely to have a higher level of equity in their properties and will be more able to take a shared equity arrangement to continue living on the estate at no additional cost.

As the project proceeds, the Council will need carefully to monitor how the proposals affect this older leaseholders. The range of options available to leaseholders (shared equity, shared ownership, rental properties) should ensure that anyone wishing to remain on the estate, regardless of age, would be able to continue to do so.

**Impact on Future Homeowners and Private Tenants**

It is not possible to determine at this time the potential differential impact across ages, beyond stating that the provision of new housing should benefit all age groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Although very limited data there is no disproportionate impact identified. Equality and Human Rights Commission guidance on this protected characteristic is to collect data where relevant. Sexuality is not relevant to the majority of housing services, with the exception of tackling harassment. The design of the new homes and spaces will create a place which is secure by design and can be policed more easily. The public realm will offer a greater level of security to all which may be relevant to LGBT residents who are more likely to be subject to hate crime and harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and belief</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Four-fifths of residents follow a religious faith - Christian (66%) and Muslim (10%) being the commonly observed faiths. Just less than one in seven residents do not follow a religion (13%) and 5% preferred not to say. (Source: Housing Need Survey, South Lambeth Estate, March 2015). 4 Buddhists – 3% 90 Christians – 66% 13 Muslim – 10% 1 Hindu - &lt;1% 17 No religion – 13% 7 Prefer not to say – 5% 2 Any other religion (unspecified) – 1% The Council will give consideration to people’s ability to practice their faith through the different stages of the project. The rehousing team will ask people about their use of places of worship to see the extent to which disruption to their lives can be minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and maternity</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>There will be disruption during the construction period and the council will consider access across the estate during this time. The design and layout of the new homes will consider access, lift and stairs so that larger family homes are either</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accessible by lift or not above four storeys high without a lift. The design of the public realm will consider accessibility for people moving around the estate, pushing buggies etc.

Any affected tenants who are pregnant at the time of re-housing may be entitled to a larger property as per our allocations policy.

The design will meet modern space standards with provision for buggy storage at ground floor level in blocks with no lift.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriage and civil partnership</th>
<th>Impact: None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no specific / indirect impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic factors</th>
<th>Impact: Positive and Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of housing benefit claiming tenants in South Lambeth Estate can be used to provide an indication of the socio-economic profile of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Lambeth Estate</th>
<th>Lambeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those in receipt of full HB</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those in receipt of partial HB</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not receiving HB</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Northgate August 2015*
This shows that South Lambeth Estate has a high number of lower income households. Approximately 1/3 do not receive any Housing Benefit, roughly in line with the borough average. However a greater number are in receipt of partial Housing Benefit than the borough as a whole with fewer claiming full Housing Benefit.

36% of South Lambeth Estate’s total respondents stated that they are in full time employment. This is set against a borough average of 46.5% (source: Census, 2011). The levels of employment are higher in leasehold properties – 50% - than tenanted (30%). There is also a relatively high number of retired residents in both tenures; 20% of respondent are retired set against a borough average of 5.6%.
Employment status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenants</th>
<th>Leaseholders</th>
<th>Total residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time employed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time employed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term sick</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% of South Lambeth Estate’s total respondents stated that they are in full time employment. This is set against a borough average of 46.5% (source: Census, 2011). The levels of employment are higher in leasehold properties – 50% - than tenanted (30%). There is also a relatively high number of retired residents in both tenures; 20% of
respondent are retired set against a borough average of 5.6%.

Impact on tenants in the borough

The acute shortage of homes and rising population is adding extra pressure on the need to provide affordable and social rented homes in the Borough. Private sector rents and house prices are going beyond the means of many Lambeth residents. The map below shows the average cost of a 2 bedroom household in the borough (with Stockwell Ward highlighted). Regeneration of an estate and increasing supply of council housing stock will benefit the increasing number of Lambeth’s residents who cannot afford to buy or rent in the private sector.

Source: GLA (www.london.gov.uk – accessed August 2015)
However in the short term, the existing estate residents would be affected through some negative impacts due to having to move home. The council will provide compensation to residents if their homes are demolished as part of the regeneration proposal. The statutory amount currently stands at £5,300.

**Impact on Existing Tenants**

All the current council tenants that are affected by the demolition proposal would be guaranteed a new home and financially compensated through a statutory home loss payment and payment of removal and other disturbance costs. The new home guarantee would enable them, if they wish, to remain on the estate or to move elsewhere in the Borough. Whilst it may lead to short-term disruption, it also provides choices and opportunities for them that they would not otherwise have had (for example, being able to move closer to work).

Council rent levels are set using a Government formula. The value of the home makes up part of this calculation and can mean that rents for new homes are higher than current council rent. To lessen the impact it is proposed that any rent increases will be done gradually and phased over five years.

Council Tax is calculated with reference to the value of the new home and may increase due to the regeneration project. Currently the Council Tax bands for the Estate are as follows:

- Broadstone House – C
- Sturminster House – C
- Osmington House – C
- Swanage House – C
- Verwood House – A
- Wimborne House B and C (approximately 10% of Wimborne House’s properties are in Band C)

An increase from Council Tax Band A to B would mean a rise of approximately £140 per year. There would be a similar annual increase if moving from Band B to Band C.

Service charges could increase with improved provision of services such as lifts etc. The Council will assess service charge costs in parallel with developing the design etc of the new homes so that service charges remain affordable. In contrast, utilities bills can be expected to reduce.

As designs for the redeveloped estate are progressed, the Council will need to pay close attention to the future overall cost of living on the estate to make sure that this remains as affordable as possible for tenants.

Tenants wishing to move to a new home on the estate will not have the Right to Buy under the assured lifetime
However, thinking about income levels and benefit take up on South Lambeth, the cost of new properties are likely to be unattainable even with the substantial discount now prescribed by government. Tenants wishing to keep the Right to Buy can choose to move to a Council home elsewhere and retain a secure tenancy.

**Impact on homeowners**

So that resident homeowners whose homes would be demolished can stay on the estate, the Council will offer options as follows:

- Open market purchase
- Leasehold swap – or swap from freehold to leasehold
- Leasehold swap with shared equity
- Shared ownership

Resident homeowners would be compensated by offering market value plus 10% home loss for their current home. Disturbance costs including reasonable legal and valuation costs will also be paid.

For resident homeowners wishing to remain on the estate, it is recognised that the value of similar size new homes would be more than their current home and therefore it could be difficult for them to buy a new home on the estate outright.

The council is offering a shared equity scheme, where the homeowner can purchase a share of the equity in a new home and is not required to pay any rent on the share they do not own, enabling the existing homeowner to remain on the estate. There is also recognition that a homeowner may have difficulty in securing a new mortgage and the council will need to work with the homeowner and lenders to help secure a new mortgage should they wish to remain on the estate as described previously.

It is recognised that there may be some leaseholders who may have remortgaged their homes, spent the money from equity release and may also be unemployed. In these circumstances it may be difficult for leaseholders to either remain on the estate or buy elsewhere. The shared ownership option should cater for these circumstances, but if not the Council will provide support to these households to access private rented accommodation following the purchase of their home at market value plus 10%.

As described above, the Council will need carefully to monitor how the proposals affect this older leaseholders.

For non-resident homeowners, the council will offer market value plus 7.5%. Tenants of private landlords on the
estate are not the responsibility of the Council and will not be compensated for loss of their home but support will be provided to find alternative accommodation. As part of its estate regeneration programme and direct housing delivery, the Council is building council owned market rent housing that could provide opportunities for the tenants of private landlords.

Homeowners will have access to independent advice and the council will fund reasonable costs for this service.

Service charges will be carefully considered by the Council as above to mitigate the impact of any increase.

It is not possible to determine the exact effect on individual homeowners at this stage. Their outcomes will depend on their current financial situation, how much equity they have in the property, and whether they wish to continue living on the estate.

As described above, all leaseholders are provided with options to allow them to stay on the estate and, whilst the Council is unable to make absolute guarantees to leaseholders (in the manner given to tenants), the Council will work towards making sure that those who wish to remain on the estate have the opportunity to do so.

**Impact on Future Homeowners and Private Tenants**

The Council has ambitions towards creating council-owned market rent housing, which will be able to help provide additional homes within the private rented market. Furthermore such homes can be provided over longer term tenures (for example, 5 years) thereby providing additional stability for those renting properties.

There are positive socio-economic impacts as any development will provide employment and training opportunities for residents as part of the construction programme and to be delivered by Council agencies. The project will meet the council’s procurement and local plan targets as appropriate.

The new population, including private renters and home owners, will change the employment profile of the estate and increase the number of economically active people.

**Impact: Negative**

The number of tenants who speak / do not speak English as their main language at home is almost evenly split. 51% respondents stated that they do speak English as their main language compared to 49% who spoke another language; other commonly spoken languages on the estate are Portuguese, Spanish, Polish and Tigrinya (Eritrean).

For Leasehold properties the number of English speakers is considerably higher – 74% that speak English as opposed
to 26% that do not.

For those residents where English is not their main language, the Council will ensure that literature and information about the programmes is available in the appropriate formats and languages where required. We have already engaged with community based organisations who have provided interpretation at public events including the provision of Portuguese and Spanish translators. We are also hoping to work closely with the Eritrean Community Centre in providing language support where necessary.

(Source: Household Needs Survey, South Lambeth Estate, March 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Impact: Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEE ALSO DISABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The regeneration project is likely to have both positive and negative implications for people’s health and wellbeing. This will affect households equally across the estate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are likely to be some negative health and wellbeing impacts in the short-term associated with the disruption of moving home and uncertainty about the future. The Council will need to work closely with residents to help provide as much clarity as possible about the future of the estate and about the process involved in regeneration, to give people as much certainty as possible to mitigate potential stress about moving home, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the longer term, positive impacts can be expected from providing much better quality homes and reducing overcrowding. It means more homes will become available for those households that need them. The project would provide the opportunity to build better quality homes designed according to best practice in urban design, producing a high quality home and urban environment and a safe and secure new neighbourhood, contributing positively to quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding is one of several aspects of housing conditions that studies have been found to be related to poor outcomes in health, education and childhood growth and development (DCLG, 2004).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative health and well-being outcomes would be associated with disruptions to existing households on the estate and the inevitable stress this causes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care will be undertaken when managing the rehousing process to ensure that residents are supported. Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs Assessments will be carried out where required and dedicated rehousing support provided by the Council including access to mental health support.

Furthermore the construction programme should be effectively managed so that disturbance can be kept to a minimum.

The data provided so far, from the Council’s Housing IT system and the South Lambeth Housing Needs Survey provides an overview of equality information.

There is little data currently for homeowners and their sub-lessees.

As the project progresses, the Council will build up a much more detailed picture of the circumstances of all the households across the estate and this will enable the Council to begin to develop bespoke solutions to cater for the needs for different households and the people within this. This information will then enable more detail to be layered onto the development strategy for the estate, such as the detailed design and configuration of the new homes, the proportion of homes requiring adaptation for disabilities, etc. and the type of assistance that will be required to help people to move and settle into their new homes.

### 3.0 Consultation, Involvement and Coproduction

#### 3.1 Coproduction, involvement and consultation

As of August 20th 2015, approximately 163 households on the estate have been engaged with the consultation process. This figure constitutes 80% of the total households on South Lambeth Estate.

The Council established a Resident Engagement Panel which includes a number of representatives from the 6 blocks on the estate (which meets monthly); assisted with re-establishing Wimborne House TRA; conducted a number of visits to properties across the estate (visited 35 households in total); undertaken 3 rounds of drop-in sessions at a nearby community centre which is fully accessible; provided interpretation or translation when requested (Portuguese, Bengali and Spanish).

Lambeth will also be looking to appoint an independent resident advisor to work with the resident engagement group and support them through the process. Weekly surgeries shall be commencing on the estate in September 2015.

*What difference did this make?*
More people have been able to share their concerns about the estate as is and what they would like to see as part of the regeneration programme. Building up a good working relationship with a core of residents has also enabled us to visit homes to examine the internal condition. Many of the residents that we spoke to have reaffirmed our decision to identify South Lambeth for regeneration.

The consultation reaffirmed the fact that many households on this estate are living in poor quality homes. This has been due to the historical underinvestment in the stock and there is an urgent need to respond to this.

Residents have been involved in the development of the draft offer documents for tenants and homeowners, particularly to secure confirmation that the Council will provide options for all residents to remain on the estate. The draft offer documents have provided clarity on how individual residents will be affected by the proposal.

Generally, residents are quite supportive of the Key Guarantees provided by the Council as part of the regeneration proposal and these have been further developed in response to consultation to improve for example the offer to homeowners to better reflect the current leasehold terms, and to request that play opportunities are provided through the construction programme. However there are strong vocal groups who are against change and would only want to see refurbishment of the estate which is not feasible due to lack of funding available and does nothing to increase the supply of much needed homes.

### 3.2 Gaps in coproduction, consultation and involvement

**What gaps in consultation and involvement and coproduction have you identified (set out any gaps as they relate to specific equality groups)? Please describe where more consultation, involvement and/or coproduction is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification.**

The consultation with residents will be on-going and support will be provided to residents to fully participate in the process. The Key Guarantees to residents will be further promoted and discussed.

The notes and outputs from the engagement activities will continue to be published on the dedicated blog and posted on notice boards, newsletters by the Regeneration Team and consultant team to allow all residents to have access to information.

The next stage of the project is the detailed masterplanning to allow a planning application to be made for the project. The Resident Engagement Panel will continue to operate throughout this period alongside a programme of consultation activities to develop a masterplan for the estate. We recognise that involvement in a formal resident engagement panel will not appeal or be appropriate to some groups of residents and so this will happen alongside more targeted and nuanced involvement mechanisms.

Training and capacity building for residents will be provided as required to enable full participation. The Council will continue to fund the independent resident adviser.
The Council will continue to offer accessible information and events to encourage wide participation. The Council will also ensure that the roles of local organisations and the project steering group are clear so that residents can engage fully. There will be dedicated council officers available to respond to resident issues.

4.0 Conclusions, justification and action

4.1 Conclusions and justification

What are the main conclusions of this EIA? What, if any, disproportionate negative or positive equality impacts did you identify at 2.1? On what grounds do you justify them and how will they be mitigated?

The impact of the estate regeneration project at South Lambeth will be positive overall in the long term with no disproportionate negative impacts on particular protected groups, although officers recognise that there are risks around socio-economic equality for existing homeowners if due regard is not paid as the project is delivered.

There is negative impact for many vulnerable groups during the construction process due mainly to the decant process. We have a number of actions in place to mitigate this impact

4.2 Equality Action plan

Please list the equality issue/s identified through the evidence and the mitigating action to be taken. Please also detail the date when the action will be taken and the name and job title of the responsible officer. LIKEWISE WITH THE ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Issue</th>
<th>Mitigating actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Disruption caused by major redevelopment programme               | • Dedicated rehousing support to be provided. Decant Policy to be agreed and implemented.  
  Compensation to be provided to tenants and homeowners through Home Loss and disturbance payments, with up to £1,000 payable early to allow residents to prepare to move. Single move direct to new home to be made wherever possible, and single move to be prioritised for disabled, older and other vulnerable resident groups. Options for all Council tenants and homeowners to remain on South Lambeth if they wish.  
  • Rehousing team to understand equalities issues for individual households (access to place of worship, schools, nurseries, day centres, support groups, health etc.), so that as far as possible these can be supported through the move process.  
  • Effective management of phased construction programme to ensure safe places and routes on the estate while building work takes place. Considerate Contractors Scheme to be adopted. Areas of play and amenity space to be maintained where possible during construction.  
  • Bespoke support to be developed and private to particularly vulnerable and less engaged individuals and households. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaging all groups through the development of proposals</th>
<th>Communication with residents will seek to reduce stress and provide as much certainty as possible about both the process of regeneration and the final outcome, with access to appropriate advice and support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with residents will be on-going and support will be provided to residents to fully participate in the process. The notes and outputs from the engagement activities will continue to be published on the dedicated blog and posted on notice boards, newsletters by the Regeneration Team and consultant team to allow all residents to have access to information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The next stage of the project is the detailed masterplanning to allow a planning application to be made for the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Resident Engagement Panel will continue to operate throughout this period alongside a programme of consultation activities to develop a masterplan for the estate. We recognise that involvement in a formal resident engagement panel will not appeal or be appropriate to some groups of residents and so this will happen alongside more targeted and nuanced involvement mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and capacity building for residents will be provided as required to enable full participation. The Council will continue to fund the independent resident adviser.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be dedicated council officers available to respond to resident issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners having difficulty in accessing finance (Elderly and low income households)</td>
<td>• Formal offer to Homeowners sets out Council commitments to homeowners affected by redevelopment, including options to remain on South Lambeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council to facilitate access to independent advice. Rehousing team to ensure early engagement with homeowners to identify those households that may have difficulty with funding the purchase or part-purchase of a new home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council to advocate for homeowners with lending institutions where necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rehousing team to support homeowners as required to find a private rented home or apply for social housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council to consider further whether it might need to help broker lending to homeowners, if lending institutions prove unsupportive of the circumstances of leaseholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decant Process – addressing medical and disability needs</td>
<td>• Further detailed Housing Needs Assessments will be made of all tenanted households in line with Council policy. The Rehousing team will arrange for Occupational Therapy and Medical Needs Assessments as necessary and in advance so that the new home can be designed and allocated to meet the needs of the household.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential for increased housing costs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | • If the Council rent (set according to Government formula) for a new home is higher than the current rent for a tenant, the Council will implement the rent increase gradually over 5 years.  
|   | • Service charges will be considered throughout design development and respond to resident priorities so that they remain as affordable as possible.  
|   | • New homes to be designed to good modern standards of energy efficiency to enable reduced costs in use for residents.  
|   | • Council Tax is calculated with reference to the value of the new home and may increase due to the regeneration project. The impact on Council Tax liability will be kept under review and officers will work with the Valuation Office to mitigate increases where possible.  
|   | • As designs for the redeveloped estate are progressed, the Council will need to pay close attention to the future overall cost of living on the estate to make sure that this remains as affordable as possible for tenants. |

Analysing the impact

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It will only be possible to analyse the actual effect on different group once the regeneration is underway and residents make their choices. This will happen at regular intervals as information becomes available and will be part of the July 2016 review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Publishing your results

The results of your EIA must be published. Once the business activity has been implemented the EIA must be periodically reviewed to ensure your decision/change had the anticipated impact and the actions set out at 4.2 are still appropriate.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIA publishing date</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA review date</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All completed and signed-off EIAs must be submitted to for publication on Lambeth’s website. Where possible, please anonymise your EIAs prior to submission (i.e. please remove any references to an officers’ name, email and phone number).
South Lambeth Estate
Masterplan Objectives for South Lambeth Estate
FINAL 23 September 2015
PTE was appointed by Lambeth in December 2014 to provide resident engagement and urban design services for the South Lambeth Estate, as detailed in the South Lambeth Estate Briefing Document, September 2015.

The Briefing Document sets out the initial Lambeth Council brief and a review of the existing estate; the resident engagement carried out to date and initial design scenarios for providing additional homes on the estate.

This document summarises the Masterplan Objectives for the South Lambeth Estate. The masterplan objectives have been prepared to inform the development management led team, appointed by Lambeth Council to work with residents and stakeholders to deliver the proposals.
2.0 **Background to the Masterplan Objectives**

A full summary of the resident engagement process is covered in Section 2 of the Briefing Document. It highlights both the positive and negative aspects of living on the estate, the responses and feedback to the regeneration scenarios and how those scenarios developed in response to this process.

It is very clear, from the resident engagement and the relationships we have built with many individuals on the estate, that the majority of residents enjoy living on the South Lambeth Estate. For those who do not feel that way, it is generally because the accommodation does not suit their needs, or that there are problems with the ageing building fabric.

The constraints and opportunities of the existing estate and the good practice design principles for the future masterplan are covered in Section 3 of the Briefing Document.

This Masterplan Objectives document identifies those key objectives for the future masterplan and the successful regeneration of the South Lambeth Estate. The Objectives ensure that the positive aspects of the estate and those opportunities identified are reflected by the future design proposals.

These Objectives will form the benchmarks for the masterplan going forward, as the design emerges with continued engagement resident and key stakeholders.

In achieving these Masterplan Objectives the future development will deliver additional new homes and new replacement homes in a successful and sustainable development.

The new proposals enable those residents who wish to remain in the estate the possibility to do so. In doing so, residents should be clearly explained the financial and other consequences of this.

The proposals as much as possible should allow for residents of current blocks to stay close together as the strongest social networks are currently mainly within blocks. This is particularly important since a lot of people on the estate are in ill-health and reliant on their current immediate support network.

New proposals should avoid the segregation of residents and aim for a real mixed community where everyone’s new homes are given the same consideration regardless of their age, family size, background, health and economic means.
3.0 Project Objectives

The regeneration of the South Lambeth Estate is part of a wider programme of estate regeneration being progressed by Lambeth. There are various programme level objectives that have been defined through Lambeth’s Cabinet Decisions, which are applicable to all estate regeneration projects. These provide the context in which Masterplan Objectives for individual estates are formulated.

These apply to the South Lambeth Estate as set out below.

The changes that are being made to Lambeth’s estates through this programme need to seek to create places that are sustainable:

- that create desirable, high quality residential neighbourhoods that provide a good quality of life for residents and enable the formation and continuation of cohesive and supportive communities;
- that are cost effective to manage and maintain into the future, that enable the formation of mixed communities with a variety of income profiles; and
- that provide good quality environments, are resource efficient and provide good local amenity

These strategic aspirations can be interpreted on individual projects as follows:

- to achieve the best possible viable balance of tenures for the additional new homes, with an aspiration to secure up to 60% homes for council rent and 40% private sale/private rent;
- to harness the process of estate regeneration to deliver positive benefits to the local area; and
- to seek to minimise the disruption caused to existing residents during both the decant and construction processes.

In working together with residents to seek to achieve these objectives, it has to be recognised that design proposals for projects must adhere to the following constraints:

- Development strategies for estate regeneration projects must be both viable and practicably deliverable. They must be feasible.
- Projects must deliver the re-provision of existing homes in line with the Key Guarantees to residents.
- Projects must meet as a minimum Council planning policy and Council tenancy strategy on affordable housing for the net additional new homes.

In parallel with the feasibility work on estates within the estate regeneration programme, Lambeth has been developing its own Lambeth Design Standards that will apply to all new homes within the programme. The Council will be consulting more widely with residents on these new Standards in parallel with early work on masterplanning of estates.

In addition to the project level objectives noted above, Lambeth has made commitments to residents through its Key Guarantees:

- The Council will make every effort to ensure that people only have to move once by phasing development so that some new homes are built before existing homes are demolished.
- Those households, who require adaptations to their property due to their disability or to the disability of a family member, will have this carried out before they are required to move into a new property. Any necessary adaptations will be carried out in consultation with the user and with relevant professionals e.g. Occupational Therapists or Social Workers

The Council has further developed consultation principles, which will guide the process by which the Council engages with residents on the development of masterplans for each estate. These are:

- Keep uncertainty for residents to a minimum;
- Ensure residents have an understanding of the bigger picture;
- Make it clear to residents that their voices have been heard by decision makers; and
- Ensure that residents have the information they need to make the best choices about their families’ futures.
Existing South Lambeth Estate

- Shops
- Access through estate
- Traffic
- Vulnerable backs to homes
- Parking areas
- Grass areas
- Gardens
- Estate boundary
- Conservation areas
- Estate buildings
## 4.0 Masterplan Objectives

### The key masterplan objectives for the South Lambeth Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOMES</th>
<th>NEIGHBOURHOOD</th>
<th>OPEN SPACES</th>
<th>COMMUNITY USES</th>
<th>WORKING TOGETHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retain Wimborne House and redevelop the five low-rise Houses - Osmington, Sturminster,Broadstone, Verwood and Swanage (totalling 101 homes to be redeveloped)</td>
<td>4. Create a masterplan with a distinctive character which responds to the existing local context of Albert Square, Bolney Meadow, Dorset and Clapham Roads</td>
<td>7. Provide safe and overlooked open spaces creating landscapes for a variety of outdoor activities such as a tree lined park extending to Clapham Road and a new London square</td>
<td>8. Provide an accessible Community Space for South Lambeth residents adjacent to one of the open space</td>
<td>10. Work closely and communicate clearly with the South Lambeth residents and stakeholders on their aspirations for future proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Re-provide those 101 homes plus the addition of a minimum of 220 new homes</td>
<td>5. Create a safe and neighbourly environment (streets with front doors and an easily located address). Provide clearly defined pedestrian routes through from Clapham Road to Kibworth Street and Dorset Road</td>
<td>9. Provide new retail units onto Dorset Road, closer to Clapham Road</td>
<td>11. Work with those resident groups with specific housing needs such as the elderly residents, or those with disabilities and ensure the proposals going forward reflect these needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide new homes which are energy efficient (cheaper to run), meet current space and design standards and which will age well, with limited maintenance</td>
<td>6. Provide a neighbourhood which is not dominated by vehicular routes or parking, only re-providing resident parking in defined areas, and dedicated wheelchair user parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key masterplan objectives for the South Lambeth Estate
Objectives for South Lambeth Estate

- Grass areas
- Gardens
- Estate boundary
- Conservation areas
- Estate buildings
- Shops
- Proposed Buildings
- Traffic
- Access through estate
- Parking areas
HOMES

1. Retain Wimborne House and redevelop the five low-rise Houses - Osmington, Sturminster, Broadstone, Verwood and Swanage (totalling 101 homes to be redeveloped)
2. Re-provide those 101 homes plus the addition of a minimum 220 new homes

There are currently 205 homes on the estate and Objectives 1 and 2 will increase the numbers of homes to a minimum of 425. The scenarios which have emerged, and have been shared and discussed with residents, can deliver this increase which is not considered excessive in terms of density and are able to respect the local context, maintain scale, and create character.

3. Provide new homes which are energy efficient (cheaper to run), meet current space and design standards and which will age well, with limited maintenance

Standards have changed since the homes on the South Lambeth Estate were conceived. The new homes will benefit from increased space standards in terms of room sizes, stair and corridor widths, larger bathrooms and wcs.

The energy efficient construction of the new homes will result in lower fuel bills for residents, less water consumption and improved levels of daylight.

The new buildings must work well for the occupants and also for those who maintain them.

Resident comments

‘Yes to new high quality homes...’
‘Too many 2 bedroom homes at present...’
‘I need more storage...’
‘My bathroom and toilet are too small...’
‘I have large fuel bills...’
‘I like living on the estate...’
4. Create a masterplan with a distinctive character which responds to the existing local context of Albert Square, Bolney Meadow, Dorset and Clapham Roads
The new development needs to create its own sense of place, creating a heart and a focus. The open spaces will form a natural focus for the neighbourhood and form part of a more conventional London streetscape that is accessible and easy to navigate. It must ensure there is no negative impact on the local conservation areas, or the adjacent homes and gardens and should bring value to those ‘fringes’ of the estate. The masterplan must have distinct areas, clearly defined ownership and use and, unlike the existing estate, must not have ‘left over’ forgotten landscape and paving.

5. Create a safe and neighbourly environment (streets with front doors and an easily located address). Provide clearly defined pedestrian routes through from Clapham Road to Kibworth Street and Dorset Road
Residents generally are happy living on the estate but it does suffer from some anti-social behaviour. It has been heard that there are some areas on the estate that residents tend to avoid, areas that are not overlooked, where people feel vulnerable. The current layout is responsible for several unresolved corners, recesses, poorly lit areas and a new development must address all of these safety concerns. The pedestrian routes must be safe, and well lit, the homes must overlook the streets the design must encourage social interaction between neighbours.

6. Provide a neighbourhood which is not dominated by vehicular routes or parking, only re-providing resident parking in defined areas, and dedicated wheelchair user parking adjacent to the homes which require it
The strategy for roads, parking, deliveries, refuse, fire and wheelchair parking has to ensure that vehicles do not dominate. The roads where possible should be shared surfaces with a pedestrian priority and which utilise traffic calming techniques to reduce vehicle speed and increase safety.

Resident comments
‘Must not be too congested...’
‘I like traditional streets...’
‘Front gardens not concrete...’
‘No road through to Clapham Road...’
‘Don’t lose too many trees...’
‘I like living on the ground floor with a garden...’
7. Provide safe and overlooked open spaces creating a variety of landscaped spaces and outdoor activities such as a tree lined park extending to Clapham Road and a new London square.

The existing landscape is dominated by spaces without a function and a proliferation of barriers. Every area of grass, play or planting is surrounded by railings, with limited gate access. This has resulted in much of the open space being underused by residents and some areas being used by dog owners, from on and off the estate, to exercise their dogs, sometimes in an unsupervised fashion.

The masterplan needs to provide a variety of purposeful open space, whether it be for play, ball games, edible planting, seasonal planting, grassed areas, or specific dog walking areas. The resident’s are best placed to advise on the design and arrangement of these uses, and that will be part of the masterplan design engagement process.

The scenarios have demonstrated that, even with the increase in household numbers, there will be the opportunity to create large areas of open space - long parks, connecting to landscaped squares, and that a green route is possible from Kibworth street/Dorset Road, through to Clapham Road.

Resident comments

‘Lots of green space please...’
‘Safer play area for small children...’
‘Large open spaces...’
‘Landscape needs to be expanded and improved...’
‘Needs to safe with lights at night...’
‘I like looking out onto open space...’
8. Provide an accessible Community Space for South Lambeth residents adjacent to one of the open space
Currently the Wimborne House TRA share the caretaker’s facility under Wimborne House. This small space has no outlook, no relationship with the landscape and is not fully accessible.

The brief for a new community space needs to be developed with residents, with the intention that it could be used by a wide ranging number of users, from toddler groups, to TRA meetings, to estate based events and community activities, without overlapping with the local Community Centre at Bolney Meadow.

9. Provide new retail units onto Dorset Road, closer to Clapham Road

There are four existing lease-holding retailers under Broadstone house, on Dorset Road. These are convenient neighbourhood shops: a Portuguese delicatessen, a grocery shop, a takeaway and a hair salon. Some of the shops currently have rear access and storage accessed from Kibworth Street.

The masterplan will provide retail spaces along Dorset Road to maintain this neighbourhood facility. These retail spaces will be accessed and serviced from the front, from Dorset Road.

Resident comments
‘The local shops are useful...’
‘Maybe a cafe?...’
‘We have no proper space to meet at the moment...’
‘Would be nice for toddler groups...’
‘For all the residents...’
10. Work closely and communicate clearly with the South Lambeth residents and stakeholders on their aspirations for future proposals
Since December 2014 there has been engagement with over 80% of the households on the estate. This needs to continue to ensure that the masterplan reflects the needs and aspirations of those residents, and a creates successful homes and a new environment for all residents.

11. Work with those resident groups with specific housing needs such as the elderly residents, or those with disabilities and ensure the proposals going forward reflect these needs
The resident engagement to date, supported by the Household Needs Survey, has identified that there are a considerable number of elderly and vulnerable residents on the estate.
There are many residents living in accommodation that is not suited to their needs, some due to ageing and limited mobility, and some due to their physical and/or mental health needs.
All residents on the estate will be having one to one meetings in the coming months and this will help in addressing the needs of those residents which are not currently being met.

There are four purpose built homes on the ground floor of Wimborne House for households who have a disabled family member. Whilst the proposal is that Wimborne House will be retained discussion need to be had with these households because of the proximity of future building works, maintaining access, and minimising impact of these works.
Several elderly residents have already suggested that they would like to stay together, with their established support network, and downsize from their maisonettes which are proving inaccessible to them. The masterplan needs to look at the possibility of creating homes for this neighbourhood group of elderly residents, in accessible and future-proofed homes.

Resident comments
‘A trip to another estate is a good idea...’
‘Will we have choices...’
‘I like the part of the estate I live in - it is quiet’...
‘I am older and need a home without stairs...’
‘My mother never goes outside...’
“A major estate regeneration project. By the end of the third phase, a profound relationship of good will and mutual respect had been established. One of the resident coordinators exclaimed about life in her new home “It’s like waking up everyday and thinking you must be on holiday.”

Olive Bailey
Resident
Lefevre Walk, a PTE project
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RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT PANEL : XXXXXXX ESTATE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. **Purpose of the Resident Engagement Panel**
   Resident Engagement Panels are an important part of how Lambeth Council engages with residents affected by the estates regeneration programme. Each Resident Engagement Panel will be different depending on the each estate; however there are common factors that apply to all which are set out below. The specific details for the estate in the above title are set out on Page 7.

2. **Objectives of Resident Engagement Panel**
   Panel objectives are:
   
   - That the Council can give information to the Panel to enable them to understand the background to regeneration options – subject to data-protection and Freedom of Information restrictions.
   - To empower residents to have their say at every step of the process.
   - To act as a sounding board for Council officers and Council Members so they can understand issues from a resident perspective.
   - To provide feedback and where possible documented feedback from a resident prospective regarding the Council’s proposals and engagement activities.
   - To question the Council on its proposals, analysing all relevant documents and testing whether courses of action have been explored, providing new ideas, alternatives, plans and projects that could be considered.
   - To advise on how best to engage with residents generally and with different resident groups.
   - To ensure that the rights of the different groups of residents on the estate tenants, leaseholders and homeowners and potentially the more vulnerable resident groups are considered.
   - To highlight issues and sensitivities arising from a resident’s perspective.
   - To help to identify how residents can influence processes and proposals.
   - To comment on and monitor the design process from RIBA Stage A to RIBA Stage L.

   The panels are not decision-making bodies within the Council structure. Nevertheless, they have an important role to play in relation to resident engagement.
   While individual members of the panels may not always agree with formal Council decisions to regenerate an estate, the role of the Panel is to consider how those decisions have been properly reached and how they will be executed in the best interests of current and future residents.

   Panel meetings should provide a positive environment, which encourages attendance and participation at meetings, and promotes discussion by all its members. This does not preclude members from disagreeing with issues, but it does require that discussions (particularly controversial ones) be conducted in manner so that members feel comfortable presenting a different view to the group.
Appendix 1
MEMBERSHIP & ROLES

1. Membership of the panels will vary for different estates. However, the following principles should apply to membership of all Panels:

- Membership of the Panel should be representative of the different groups living on an estate (tenants, resident leaseholders and resident freeholders) and, where applicable, any other major group of residents.
- The Panel should be represented in proportion to the different tenure groups on the estate; and where a number of representatives of tenants and leaseholders has been agreed, any vacant positions must be filled by a resident from that tenure – ensuring that both tenant and leasehold interests are considered.
- Panels will also consist of Councillors and Council officers, including officers from the estate regeneration team and housing management.
- The Chair of the panel can be selected by majority election from the members of the panel and could be a resident, a Council Officer, a Council Member or an independent person - so long as they have a recognisable interest in the local area.
- Panels should identify a normal deputy for the Chair, on occasions when the elected Chair is unable to be present.
- If the Panel identify issues affecting a particular group of residents, the Panel may form sub-groups, with all the interests represented, and invite other residents to participate in such sub-groups. These subgroups should be formed in agreement with all the members of the Panel. Invitations for other attendees should be agreed with Panel members at a prior meeting.
- Other attendees will be invited to participate in Panel meetings from time-to-time, including consultants working for the Council, other local stakeholders and external advisors in order to make meetings more productive. Invitations for other attendees should be agreed with Panel members at a prior meeting.
- Panel members may nominate a stand-in for themselves, on the following conditions:
  - they notify the Chair and Council officers administrating the Panel at least a week in advance of a meeting;
  - they notify their stand-in of this Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct; and,
  - any breach of the Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct by the stand-in will reflect on themselves.

2. Role and Responsibility of the Chair and Panel Members

2.1 The Role and Responsibilities of the Chair are as follows:

- To act in an open and impartial manner, ensuring that the principles of the Code of Conduct (Appendix 2) are met at all times.
- To attend the Panel meetings, where failure to attend three in a row will result in an election of a new Chair.
- To ensure the Council organises the meeting for the day chosen by the Panel on the previous meeting.
To be involved in the preparation of the Minutes and the Agenda for the next meeting.
To conduct the business of the meeting in a fair, open and transparent manner and to encourage a forum that allows members to speak without criticism or judgement.
To represent the Panel on other bodies as agreed by the panel as a whole.
As appropriate, to liaise with Council officers to ensure the panel meetings are able to function and meet the overall purpose of the project.
To ensure that members of the Panel keep to an agenda and only considering new items if they are deemed to be urgent.
To ensure all the actions and resolutions agreed during the meeting are fulfilled inside the given period of time. (Where this hasn’t been possible formal notification and reasons have to be given for any delay).
To ensure all the documents requested are provided to the Panel in the agreed timeframe.
Wherever possible, to ensure that each discussion has an end-point – whether it be a resolution; a commitment to undertake; or a deferral to a subsequent meeting; or the like.
To ensure the meeting runs to time and to provide a reasonable amount of time for the discussion of items identified on the agenda (generally 10 to 15 minutes per item).
To extend the meeting time if important subjects are still being considered or have yet not being discussed, subject to representation from different interests being available.
To allow speakers to read reports, address matters arising, or new business in full, without interjection from the floor, unless otherwise sought by the speaker.

2.2 The Role and Responsibilities of Panel Members are as follows:
To attend or to nominate another to attend (see nomination criteria above) the Panel group meetings and associated meetings as agreed by the Panel, where failure to attend three panel meetings in a row may result in membership being withdrawn and invitations for a replacement member to be requested.
To represent the Panel on other bodies as agreed by the Panel.
To act as impartial and objective resident representatives, recognising that those who they represent will not all be in the same circumstances nor be of the same opinion.
To feedback to other residents, presenting factual and accurate information.

3. Organisation and Administration of Meetings
The organisation and administration of the meetings will be carried out by the Council.
The Council will:

Before the meeting:
Make sure the meeting has a clear purpose/aim and arrange the meeting at a time that is convenient to as many people as possible.
Organise the meeting on the day the Panel has agreed and liaise with the Chair to prepare the Agenda and Minutes.
Give suitable period of notice and inform people of the agenda.
RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT PANEL – TERMS OF REFERENCE
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• Arrange a comfortable, accessible venue.
• Try not to change the date, but advise everyone if a change is necessary.
• To provide refreshments, if required.

At the meeting:
• Help to make sure the meeting is chaired properly and advise attendees of ground rules, the code of conduct or rules for meetings.
• Record minutes of the meeting, ensuring in particular that the following are recorded:
  – Panel-wide observations or where there is no agreement setting out the different opinions;
  – votes on general issues (whether by show of hands or secret ballot);
  – agreed actions;
  – agreed recommendations.
• Record important questions and answers
• Provide documents requested by the panel within a 14 day timeframe. Where this will not be possible, the Council and/or Residents should explain why.
• Agree a date and time for the next meeting.

After the meeting:
• The Council will take the formal minutes of the meeting recording the general Panel positions, outcome and agreed action points – these are not a verbatim record of the meeting and but will recall relevant points of a discussion, statements and, information exchanged. The minutes recorded by the Council must be agreed at the next Panel meeting. Circulate draft minutes to everyone who attended within agreed timescales and make them available to other panel members who did not attend.
• Review how the meeting went and raise any issues and concerns to members.
• Consider items to be discussed at future meetings.

Once minutes have been approved by the Panel at a subsequent meeting, then they will be publicised and posted on the project website.

4. Training of Panel Members
The Council will also identify with the Residents what skills Panel members would like to develop to enable them to contribute better to Panel meetings and help to make this happen, whether it be through training, mentoring, shadowing or on-going support to build their capacity.
A Code of Conduct has been developed under the Lambeth Residents Compact, (agreed by Tenant and Leaseholder Councils) which details the standards expected of residents, officers, councillors and anyone else that attends meetings or otherwise take part in resident involvement. The Code of Conduct is as follows:

Attendees MUST:
- attend panel meetings;
- act in a courteous manner, maintain a balance of mutual respect and act in a way that is fair and unbiased;
- ensure that other attendees can take part without interruption or intimidation and treat all other group members equally;
- ensure that no discrimination of any kind takes place within the rules laid down in the constitution, where one is provided;
- be clear and honest about whether they are giving a personal view or the views of the organisation or wider group that they represent; and,
- declare any conflicts of interest.

Attendees MUST NOT:
- act or speak in a way that may be perceived as bullying, abusive or derogatory;
- discuss identifiable individuals, individual circumstances or disclose confidential information regarding individual and/or personal cases;
- prevent anyone getting information that they are entitled to;
- attempt to dominate the meetings for their purpose or the purpose of other groups or organisations they are representing;
- speak or write on behalf of the panel without the prior agreement of the group;
- any correspondence sent on behalf of the panel should be agreed in advance by the panel and copies provided to all panel Members; and,
- make audio and visual recordings of meetings without the consent of all present.

Failure to work within the principles of the Code of Conduct is considered under item 7 below.

In addition to the above, panel members MUST:
- adhere to Councils commitment to equality and diversity; and
- not attribute (verbally, in writing or on social media) the specific comments made by panel Members to any others outside the panel, other than those comments that are formally recorded in the official minutes of the meeting.

Raising Issues and Concerns
Below is a process by which concerns can be considered if a panel member’s behaviour has compromised the principles of the Code of Conduct - above.

- In the first instance, it is recommended that any cause for concern is raised informally and verbally with the Chair and/or Council officers (or Councillor, as appropriate).
The complainant can then raise the concern/complaint in writing, outlining the reasons and examples of the basis of the issue.

The written concern or complaint is then formally presented to the Chair and Council officers.

The Chair and/or Council officers will discuss the issue with the individual(s), against whom the complaint is made, in order to reach a resolution.

If it is not possible to reach a resolution the individual may be asked to resign from the panel.

The panel will be asked to consider withdrawal of membership.
Panel Constitution:

- (Independent) Chair
- X Resident Tenants
- X Resident Leaseholders
- X Resident Freeholders
- Ward Councillors
- Council Officers:
- Consultants:
- Independent Resident Advisers

Panel - September 2015

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
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Date:
Overview:

• For any project to proceed, it must be both financially viable and deliverable.

• To determine whether the regeneration of the South Lambeth Estate is financially viable, the Council commissioned a viability assessment of the design options that have been produced as part of the feasibility work.

• Viability is measured by working out the total ‘development value’ for a project minus the total cost of developing the project, for example the construction costs and the cost of borrowing money to build the project.

• This creates for a project what is called Net Present Value, of NPV for short.

• Both scenarios, which were assessed, were concluded to be financially viable.

• More detailed information can be found in the Viability Report by Airey Miller.

Introduction

This note provides a summary of the financial assessment of the regeneration proposals for the South Lambeth estate. This is produced as part of the Council’s commitment to be transparent about the process of regeneration and explain decision-making to residents.

For any project to proceed, it must be both financially viable and deliverable. To determine whether the regeneration of the South Lambeth Estate is financially viable the Council employed Airey Miller Partnership. As can be seen in their Viability Report for the project, a variety of financial scenarios have been considered for each design option in order to test that design option and identify the number of new homes could potentially be built for council rent.
**How is viability measured?**

Viability is measured by working out the total ‘development value’ for a project (for example, in a private sector development adding up the sales values of all the new homes) minus the total cost of developing the project, for example the construction costs and the cost of borrowing money to build the project.

When working out the ‘development cost’ normally there would be two other factors to consider, profit margin (normally 20% of the total development cost) and the value of the land. When the Council is building on its own land this can be ignored. In addition in the case of the profit margin, the Council is committed to use any potential surplus to increase the proportion of homes for council rent.

In the case of estate regeneration, calculating the total development value is worked out by considering the income generated through rents over a long time period.

With this information you are able to work out whether a scheme is viable by creating what is called ‘net present value’ or NPV for short. This represents the total cumulative income minus the total cumulative cost over the 60-year period. When working this out income and cost are discounted by inflation.

For estate regeneration projects the key factors that determine whether a project is going to be financially viable are:

- The number of additional homes that can be built;
- The proportion of new homes that are to be let at council rent levels;
- Whether any of the net additional homes are sold or used for market rent; and
- The interest rate at which the Council is able to borrow for the construction work.
What restrictions are there on the financial options?
In addition to viability and deliverability, the Council has applied additional minimum objectives that must be achieved for a design option to be considered possible.

These are:

- To re-provide homes for all those wishing to remain on an estate.
- For existing tenants, the new homes to be let at council rent levels
- To ensure that the net gain new homes meet Council policy of:
  - A minimum of 40% affordable homes
  - 1 and 2 bedroom properties have a maximum rent set at local housing allowance levels (but preferably at council rent levels)
  - family homes (3 bedrooms and larger) be let at council rent levels

The design options

Airey Miller reviewed the two design options that the Council is currently considering:

The “Avenue”:

This would see Wimborne House retained and improved with the other homes being demolished and replaced by a new landscaped Avenue park. 327 new homes would be built with a gain of over 220 additional homes.

The “Square”:

This would see all homes demolished and a new landscaped square created providing 500 new homes built with a gain of some 303 additional homes.
Are these design scenarios financially viable?

Based on these design options, Airey Miller concluded both are financially viable as the NPV number was above zero inside the 60 year time limit. In addition each delivered the key objectives of delivering within the principle policy requirements of the Council. Further information on this can be found on the full Airey Miller report.

**Avenue – with Wimborne House retained – base scenario:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes</th>
<th>327</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional homes</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value over 60 years</td>
<td>£577m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing on the whole estate (all to be let at council rent levels)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net present value (NPV)</td>
<td>£11,485,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>March 2071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Square – without Wimborne House – base scenario**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of homes</th>
<th>515</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional homes</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross development value over 60 years</td>
<td>£820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing on the whole estate (all to be let at council rent levels)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net present value (NPV)</td>
<td>£500,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakeven achieved in</td>
<td>December 2075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key points:

• For any project to proceed, it must be both financially viable and deliverable.
• Viability is measured by working out the total ‘development value’ for a project minus the total cost of developing the project, for example the construction costs and the cost of borrowing money to build the project.
• This creates for a project what is called Net Present Value, of NPV for short.
• The “Avenue” scenario would see Wimborne House retained and improved with the other homes being demolished and replaced by a new landscaped Avenue park. 327 new homes would be built with a gain of over 220 additional homes.
• The “Square” scenario would see all homes demolished and a new landscaped square created providing 500 new homes built with a gain of some 303 additional homes.
• Based on these design options, Airey Miller concluded both are financially viable as the NPV number was above zero inside the 60 year time limit.

For additional information on this and other Estate Regeneration projects please visit estateregeneration.lambeth.gov.uk
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Introduction

There are simply not enough homes to accommodate London’s growing population. As a result people are being priced out of homes (whether to buy or to rent) and there are not enough affordable homes for those who cannot afford market prices.

In Lambeth there are over 21,000 people on our housing waiting list, 1,800 families in temporary accommodation and 1,300 families living in severely overcrowded conditions. ‘Right to Buy’ has made it harder for Lambeth to respond with over 11,000 council homes lost since 1980. In addition the number of new social rented homes being built in the Lambeth has fallen dramatically.
More and Better Homes in Lambeth

However, Lambeth is tackling this challenge head on with a commitment to build 1,000 new homes at council-rent levels by 2019 and facilitate the building another 1,500 homes a year to 2025. To do this Lambeth is working on projects across the Borough ranging from small schemes to redeveloping whole estates.

Lambeth has to do this as land is in short supply - there are no large tracts of unused or derelict land. We have to make better use of land that is already being used. This means looking at pockets of land around our housing estates.

This also involves looking at whole estates to consider whether these whole estates should be considered for redevelopment to provide more and better homes.
South Lambeth Estate

In a Cabinet Decision in December 2014, the Council decided to include South Lambeth estate within its estate regeneration programme.

The initiated feasibility work, which followed this decision, has involved intensive engagement with residents over a 9-month period.
“Through this engagement we have had input from 163 of the 205 households”

Through this engagement we (Council officers and our consultants) have had input from 163 of the 205 households on the estate. The Council originally considered that there would be scope to deliver significant new homes through regeneration at South Lambeth estate.

Through the work carried out by PTE that accompanied the wider feasibility process, this has proven correct.

It has been shown that partial redevelopment of the estate could deliver over 220 additional new homes.

This Cabinet Decision

For all those residents on estates within its estate regeneration programme, the Council has made a commitment to provide as much certainty as possible. This requires drawing to a close this feasibility period and coming to a clear decision on how to progress regeneration of the South Lambeth estate, in particular making it clear to residents which homes will be retained and which homes can be replaced to enable redevelopment.

The recommendation in this Cabinet Report is for:

• The partial redevelopment of the South Lambeth estate.
• This would involve the demolition and replacement of all the low-rise properties on the South Lambeth estate.
• The names of the blocks which would be demolished and replaced are:
  o Broadstone House
  o Sturminster House
  o Swanage House
  o Verwood House
  o Osmington House
• Wimborne House would be retained and refurbished.

This means that:

• All existing tenants and resident leaseholders in the low-rise buildings will be able to move into new high quality homes in a well-designed new neighbourhood.
There will be improvements to the neighborhood and local area around the South Lambeth estate.

Tenants in Wimborne House, who are over-crowded, will have the opportunity to move into new properties on the estate.

This partial redevelopment solution should enable the council to build over 100 new homes for council rent on the South Lambeth estate.

If this recommendation is confirmed we will appoint a ‘design team’. This team will progress the master planning of the estate. In doing this they would involve local residents in what the new estate would look like. Construction of the first new buildings would likely commence during 2017. In addition masterplan objectives for the future regeneration of the South Lambeth estate would be adopted by this process. These are set out in more detail in a separate report prepared by PTE architects.

Guarantees Key
If this recommendation is accepted the Council would implement its Key Guarantees for existing residents on the estate. These have been previously communicated to residents. The principles behind these Key Guarantees are that:

- All existing tenants, whose homes will be replaced as part of regeneration, will be provided a new home at a size that meets their housing need on the estate where they live.
- All existing resident leaseholders will have an opportunity to remain on the estate where they live and will be provided with various options that will enable them to do so.

Activities as a consequence of these recommendations
These are the immediate activities that residents will notice, if these recommendations are adopted:

- **Communication**: Letter announcing the recommendation to residents, setting out what this will mean for them (this will be tailored to different residents).
- **Engagement**: Council officers are now holding weekly drop-in sessions on the estate, available to any resident to drop by and ask questions. These will continue as a permanent fixture.
- **Resident Engagement Panel**: The current Resident Engagement Panel at South Lambeth covers the whole estate. If the recommendations in this report are adopted, then the
membership of this Panel will need to be re-visited to make sure that there is appropriate representation amongst residents from the low-rise buildings, who will be most affected by the proposed regeneration strategy.

- **Independent Resident Adviser:** A panel of Independent Resident Advisers has been established and, during October, residents at South Lambeth will be able to interview and select an Independent Resident Advisor from this panel.

- **Procurement:** Progression of the procurement of the development management team to completion. This process has already started and will continue as follows:
  - selection of resident representatives to be on the interview panel;
  - capacity building training for the selected resident representatives (and any others who want to participate);
  - exhibition of the bidders for the development management role;
  - interviews with the bidders;
  - announcement of the successful bidder; and
  - event – “meet the development management team”.

- **Key Guarantees:** Commencement of implementation of Key Guarantees, including:
  - notification to residents on what the Council’s offers mean to them;
  - details of the process involved in different options under the Key Guarantees;
  - description of the “Resident Journey” from current home to new home; and
  - formal buy-back of leaseholds (where desired by residents) will likely commence at the beginning of 2016.

- **Household Needs:** Council starting to gather detailed household needs information from tenants.

- **Masterplanning:** Early work of the selected development management team, including setting out for residents what the masterplanning process will involve.

- **Other:** Further meetings with landowners and retailers affected by the recommendations to consider their options.
Key points:

- There are over 21,000 people on our housing waiting list.
- ‘Right to Buy’ has made it harder for Lambeth to respond.
- The number of new social rented homes being built in the Lambeth has fallen dramatically.
- Lambeth is commitment to build 1,000 new homes at council-rent levels by 2019 and facilitate the building another 1,500 homes a year to 2025.
- Council officers and consultants have had input from 163 of the 205 households on the estate.
- This cabinet report recommends the partial redevelopment of the South Lambeth estate which would involve the demolition and replacement of all the low-rise properties on the South Lambeth estate and the retentions of refurbishment of Wimborne House.
- All existing tenants and resident leaseholders in the low-rise buildings to move into new high quality homes in a well-designed new neighbourhood.
- It is predicted that this partial redevelopment solution should enable the council to build over 100 new homes for council rent on the South Lambeth estate.

For additional information on this and other Estate Regeneration projects please visit estateregeneration.lambeth.gov.uk
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Report summary

Lambeth is in the grip of a severe housing crisis. 60 to 80 families a week join the waiting list for social housing, but only 20 to 40 homes are available. 21000 people are now on the waiting list for social housing in Lambeth. Over 1850 homeless families, the vast majority with children, are now in temporary accommodation and, across the borough some 1300 families are severely overcrowded. Families in high priority on the waiting list, many with disabled children, are waiting years to secure a suitable home.

Families are insecurely housed in the private rented sector and the combination of low wages, benefit cuts and soaring rents in the private sector is seeing more families made homeless or having to move away from Lambeth.

The private market is not building enough of the homes that Lambeth needs and Housing Associations have found their financial situation undermined by recent changes in legislation, which has seen some Housing Associations announce that they will no longer build homes for social or affordable rent.

This council's administration was elected on a pledge to build 1000 extra homes for council rent and to fulfil this pledge the council will establish Homes for Lambeth. Homes for Lambeth will be a 100% council-owned company to enable the council to access finance and to build the homes we need to house the people of Lambeth where the private market is failing to do so. By establishing Homes for Lambeth the council will be able to prevent the normal 15-20% development surplus going to private developers and can instead invest this money in building more homes for local people.

The need for high-quality secure homes in Lambeth goes far beyond council-rent homes. In order to meet the full range of need in the borough the council needs to provide homes at council rent levels, at intermediate (sub-market) rent for families in low-paid work, and homes at market rent for families who can’t yet afford to buy a home of their own but want a more secure, long-term home, than the current private rented market can offer.
Building on the vision of a mixed-income development at Somerleyton Road at Brixton, *Homes for Lambeth*, a new special purpose vehicle for housing and regeneration delivery, will allow the council to build homes for council rent, intermediate rent and private rent, all with long tenancies and rent stability. Council-rent properties will be let with lifetime tenancies matching, as closely as possible, existing council tenancy rights with rents set in the same way as for existing council properties, at about a third of market rent.

Subject to the requisite approvals, the first phase of schemes proposed will support the development of 511 homes by September 2018, of which 301 homes are at social rent levels. Over the coming years the council will be able to have much greater control over the pace and type of house building in the borough, so that the delivery of homes in Lambeth meets the needs and aspirations of local families.

**Finance summary**

*Homes for Lambeth* will allow the Council to undertake housing and commercial developments and to reinvest the development surpluses generated (which can typically account for 15% to 20% of the Gross Development Value) for the benefit of Lambeth’s residents, rather than seeing them go to private developers, thereby enabling the Council to invest more in the creation of the new homes that residents need.

The Council will have first option to provide loans and investments as required to *Homes for Lambeth* on market standard terms, subject to this meeting both the Council’s and *Homes for Lambeth*’s respective requirements to obtain best value. *Homes for Lambeth* also enables the Council to look to the open market and institutional investors to secure the best value funding for each development.

Financial modelling for an initial, illustrative development portfolio is being developed to support and illustrate the business case for *Homes for Lambeth*. This will process will support the development of key business planning tools to inform the delivery of new schemes (subject to a formal approval process) and effective long-term planning. At this stage, there is no immediate financial implications from the proposal.

**Recommendations**

1. To note the business case and key benefits identified for establishing Homes for Lambeth, a Special Purpose Vehicle for housing and regeneration delivery.

2. To approve the proposed strategy for the formation and mobilisation of the primary group of companies that make up Homes for Lambeth and to delegate authority to Officers to set up these companies.

3. To delegate authority to Officers (and subsequently the Board of the Special Purpose Vehicle) to proceed to develop the 60-month, Rolling Business Plan for the Special Purpose Vehicle and Scheme-Level Business Plans for each development scheme proposed. These documents will inform the formal Business Case to be considered by the Council prior to it granting approval for each respective scheme to be delivered.

4. To agree in principle to grant a long-lease to the Special Purpose Vehicle for the delivery of new homes on the Lollard, Fenwick & Westbury (Phase 1) schemes within 6 months of the formation of the Special Purpose Vehicle, subject to the formal agreement of business plans and the agreement of transfer arrangements for each of these schemes.
1. **Context**

1.1 The Council recognises the importance of good quality homes in Lambeth and the role that housing plays in not only improving the lives of those who live in it but also in making Lambeth a great place to live, work and visit. ‘More opportunities for better quality homes’ is a key outcome in Lambeth’s Community plan 2013-16 and the vision set out in the Lambeth Housing Strategy 2012-16 is that all Lambeth residents ‘live in a home they can afford, that is safe and well managed and in a neighbourhood they are proud to live in’.

1.2 The people of Lambeth need homes, with security to put down roots, that people from a range of incomes can afford. Lambeth is at its best when its communities are genuinely mixed and diverse. This means building more social homes, but also homes at below market rent for families in low pay, secure market rent for those unable to buy but who need longer term tenancies to build a stable home in the borough, and affordable home ownership for those who can afford it. Our ambitions as a Labour council are not limited to any one subsection of our local community – but to work for the benefit, security and aspirations of the people of Lambeth.

1.3 We aim to ensure that every resident in Lambeth has the opportunity to live in a good quality home that is affordable and suitable for their needs. Recognising that good quality housing is a key priority for achieving our community outcomes, we intend to target our resources and use our influence to make sure residents have a range of housing options available to them.

1.4 In December 2014 the report Building the homes we need to house the people of Lambeth (108/14-15) set out an ambitious programme of Council led housing delivery that will provide more opportunities for more and better quality homes in Lambeth, including the Council’s commitment to 1000 extra homes at Council rent levels and recommended that estate regeneration forms an important part of the strategy to achieve this. Furthermore, in order to meet future housing demands from a growing population the council will need to enable and deliver more than 1559 new homes per annum until 2025.

1.5 One of the key recommendations receiving Cabinet approval from the December 2014 report was the recommendation that Officers further examine and develop the business case for the creation of a new housing and regeneration venture (the Special Purpose Vehicle), which may include the creation of one or more Special Purpose Vehicles to facilitate investment and development in new housing that meets the needs of Lambeth’s current and future residents.

1.6 This report to Cabinet has been produced to address this requirement. It considers potential delivery options, presents the outline business case for such a venture and makes proposals for the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle to develop and deliver housing & regeneration - Homes for Lambeth. Homes for Lambeth will be a new commercial venture that will effectively support the Council to take much greater control over the pace and focus of delivering more and better homes in Lambeth as well as regeneration in the borough, thereby supporting the fulfilment of the Council’s objectives to meet both the housing and wider needs of Lambeth’s residents, through the delivery of new housing across a range of tenures and complementary developments that support local growth. This may also include undertaking
commercial developments for investment purposes, in order to generate investment returns into the General Fund.

**The Need for More and Better Accessible Housing Across Tenures in Lambeth**

1.7 Housing is rising up the political agenda and was more prominent in the election campaign than it has been for many years. There is widespread acknowledgement that we are facing a national housing crisis with demand greatly outstripping supply, resulting in rapidly increasing house prices particularly across London and the South East.

1.8 In Lambeth the impact of this housing crisis is pricing people out of the housing market (renting and buying) and there are similar increases in retail rentals that are changing the nature of the borough. Historically lower prices and rents relative to other parts of London mean the issues are more acute in Lambeth (whereas other areas have been unaffordable for many years already):

- Lambeth, similar to other London boroughs, continues to face massive housing challenges, and a shortage of housing has resulted in an increase of house prices and rent levels. Over the last decade house prices have more than doubled - in 2005, the average house price in the borough was £256k, today it is £535k. Households who might have saved a deposit and bought a home in previous years are renting longer. With less disposable income to accumulate a deposit many face diminishing prospects of buying a home in London. Private renting is getting more expensive with more competition in the market and properties becoming unaffordable for those with modest incomes.

- While all tenures will make an important contribution to meeting housing need, there is an urgent need for more affordable housing in the borough, especially for families. The Housing Needs Assessment 2012 (HNA) identifies an overall housing requirement across all tenures of 23,900 homes over the next 20 years, of which 70 per cent was a need for affordable housing.

- There were just over 17,000 households on the housing register at the end of May 2015 - up by 12% when compared to the same date last year. Nearly 2,000 joined the register each year and Lambeth rehoused fewer than 900 from that list in 2014/15.

- Difficulties accessing the Private Rental Sector due to increased competition, a reduction of social rented lets available and changes to the allocations policy where households who work with us to prevent their homelessness are given additional priority has led to an increase in Temporary Accommodation occupation. This is a major barrier to increasing homelessness prevention activity and reducing the number of households in Temporary Accommodation.

- Faced with 20 times as many people on our housing waiting list as we have homes available each year, and with 1900 homeless families in temporary accommodation, the council has a moral and political imperative to build homes ourselves.

- Maintaining current stock levels in the face of the Right to Buy (RTB) - Lambeth has lost 251 council homes through RTB in the past year and the pace of council
RTB sales is likely to continue to outstrip the new supply of council housing in Lambeth. The council is making use of the ‘One for One’ (1-4-1) RTB receipts in order to support replacement, but the challenge is that 70% match funding is required, and this cannot continue to come directly from the council.

1.9 We will invest £490 million pounds over the next five years to bring our housing stock up to the Lambeth Housing Standard: this will include the biggest estate regeneration programme in the Borough’s history. We will work with those estates that most need rebuilding and/or upgrading or where there is space for new homes, with a focus on environmental improvements, tackling overcrowding and building additional good quality homes that last for generations. This work will happen despite a £150 million cut in Government funding, which left a £56 million shortfall in monies for refurbishment.

1.10 It is expected that Central Government’s programme of cuts in funding to local authorities will continue and will deepen. The Council therefore needs to think radically in order to identify new ways to protect its resilience in the face of these cuts and to protect its abilities to deliver the high quality assets and services that Lambeth’s residents need and deserve.

1.11 The Council has made good progress in bringing forward a number of sites that have been identified as requiring renewal or which offer potential to support new housing delivery as part of the Small Sites and Estates Regeneration Programmes. As such, a strategy for how these sites will be progressed from planning to delivery is both timely and necessary for the fulfilment of Lambeth’s housing objectives. A number of these sites have been considered as part of an example Initial Development Portfolio to support and inform the development of the business case for the Special Purpose Vehicle that is proposed in this paper.

1.12 The new Lambeth Local Plan sets out how we can improve the quality of the local environment, as well as the quality of people’s lives through development in the borough. Our priorities for regeneration, infrastructure and growth are very much at the heart of the Plan and Homes for Lambeth will directly support the Council to take an active role in delivering against these priorities by being proactive in development.

Key Principles for Homes for Lambeth

1.13 In recognition of LB Lambeth’s strategic aspirations for housing and regeneration, the political and economic context and the known limitations of ‘self delivery’ (considered in detail in the appended paper ‘appendix B’ to this report), the following key principles underpin the appraisal of possible options and the business case for Homes for Lambeth.

1.14 Homes for Lambeth must:

- Support the Council to take greater control over the pace, quality and volume of new housing delivery in Lambeth across a range of tenures, in order to address market failures, better meet the needs of current and future residents and to support the Council’s growth agenda. The proposed approach must present the Council with a new platform for delivery that can grow in scope and scale in order to remain fit for purpose over the short, medium and long-term;
Support the Council to take an active role in delivering complementary regeneration, commercial and infrastructure developments in addition to new housing, thereby delivering developments that effectively support local growth and prioritise residents' needs and interests;

Support the Council to access funding from a variety of public and private sources in order to support its aspirations for housing deliver and regeneration by acting in a truly commercial way, minimising profit leakage to the private sector and generating income and development surpluses through housing and other development that will be re-invested to deliver new housing for residents;

Support the Council in its commitment to be the Co-operative Council, protecting and cultivating the Council’s key relationships with its tenants and Lambeth’s communities through the approach to delivering and operating new developments, by prioritising the needs of current and future residents, promoting direct resident involvement and social value and by providing greater long-term certainty over the availability of accessible, high quality housing in Lambeth across a range of tenures;

Support the Council to realise its strategies for housing, community benefit and growth by complementing and adding-to the Council’s abilities to realise the outcomes that it has agreed with residents and for residents, subject to a full business case being agreed to proceed in this fashion;

Support the Council to also undertake investment and developments which are intended to generate an investment return, to protect its resilience and future abilities to deliver the services that Lambeth’s residents need;

Provide the Council with a flexible platform that can grow and evolve to support it to realise new strategic delivery opportunities, including opportunities to partner with other public bodies for new asset and service delivery models; and

Effectively manage the Council’s overall exposure to the risks of development, whilst enabling it to fully harness the economic potential of Lambeth’s property sector for the benefit of all Lambeth’s residents and communities.

**Alignment With Policy Objectives & Preceding Cabinet Decisions**

1.15 The key principles and short, medium and long-term priorities for establishing a Special Purpose Vehicle for housing and regeneration as part of Lambeth’s wider strategic responses to housing and regeneration are closely aligned with the Council’s priorities also contained within the Community Plan 2013-16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Short term priority</th>
<th>Long term priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. More jobs and sustainable growth</strong></td>
<td>• Enable residents to remain in the borough and benefit from its growth; and,</td>
<td>• Increase the supply of housing which is affordable to our citizens; and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide opportunities for new jobs.</td>
<td>• Reduce fuel poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. People achieve financial security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Lambeth plays a strong role in the local community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. People have the skills to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
find work; and,
• People live in, work in and visit our vibrant and creative town centres.

2. Communities feel safer and stronger
• People are healthier, for longer Crime reduces;
• Older, disabled and vulnerable people can live independently and have control over their lives;
• All Lambeth communities feel they are valued and are part of their neighbourhoods;
• Lambeth residents have more opportunities for better quality homes; and,
• All young people have opportunities to achieve their ambitions.

• Greater local control through the housing strategy proposed and local lettings policies; and,
• Targeted training and employment programmes.

• Create safer neighbourhoods through good design, active spaces and strong communities; and,
• Provision of new specialist housing such as extra care.

3. Cleaner streets and greener neighbourhoods
• People lead environmentally sustainable lives; and,
• People take greater responsibility for their neighborhood.

• Invest in challenging neighbourhoods, raising their profile and making them attractive places to live, work and visit.

• High quality homes which are more energy efficient and cheaper to run.

Examination & Appraisal of Strategic Options

1.16 Although every local area has different needs, characteristics and strategic drivers, many local authorities now find themselves in a similar position to LB Lambeth and are actively developing Special Purpose Vehicles to secure much greater direct control over housing delivery, not only to mitigate the limitations of self delivery but also to secure new opportunities that are made possible by the powers granted to them in the Localism Act 2011.

1.17 A review of such approaches and the key lessons that can be learned from what others are doing (or planning), has actively informed development of the strategic proposals for Lambeth’s Special Purpose Vehicle. Initiatives reviewed are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority &amp; Structure Description</th>
<th>Identified Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB Ealing: Broadway Living</td>
<td>• Avoid the limitations of the HRA borrowing cap;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UAC Thurrock: Gloriana</strong></td>
<td>A wholly owned subsidiary created to enable direct development of mixed tenure housing. Control over delivery; Flexibility regarding tenures, partners etc.; Enable the Council to achieve its stated aim of 1000 new homes in borough over 5 years; Enable the Council intervention when the housing development market was weak; Isolate sales risk (Council could purchase sale units through HRA); and, Complement on-going HRA activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Lewisham</strong></td>
<td>A borough wide vehicle intended to encompass a number of diverse sites and opportunities. Potential to create multi layered legal structure with individual SPVs sitting underneath an operating company. To leverage the Council's existing asset base; To generate an additional £9.5 million per annum in net revenue, two thirds of which needs to come from new income streams; To deliver Lewisham's Regeneration Strategy; To retain Council assets and protect investment in assets; and, The urgent delivery of the New Cross Gate site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Enfield: Enfield Innovations Ltd</strong></td>
<td>Vehicle to invest in the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in the borough, initial through the Small Housing Sites project but potentially more widely. To act as an investor in PRS; To avoid leakage of profit to the private sector; and, To enable delivery of mixed tenure housing through a vehicle owned as part of the General Fund, avoiding the borrowing cap in the HRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Wandsworth</strong></td>
<td>Vehicle to invest in PRS across the borough. To maximise potential to realise values in an area and at a time when land prices are steadily increasing; To enable delivery of PRS housing through the General Fund, avoiding the borrowing cap in the HRA – re-word; and, To enable the Council to act as an investor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Southwark</strong></td>
<td>Wholly owned company to deliver Council homes. Deliver stated aim of 11000 new Council homes by 2043: increase speed and flexibility to enable delivery on huge scale; Control over quality of delivery; Complement the Council's powers as planning authority to enable development on appropriate sites at scale; Control over long term management; and, Avoid the limitations of the HRA borrowing cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Barking &amp; Dagenham</strong></td>
<td>Council granted long lease of site to fund which developed units and underlet site to Council's wholly owned company. Quasi PFI solution: company's rental income stream enabled it to repay fund over agreed long term period. Retain ownership of assets; Retain all management and nomination; Ability to sell assets; Ability to charge varying rents of 50-80% OMR; Flexibility to offset finance risk by altering rents on a discretionary basis; Retention of all profits by providing LA guarantee &quot;wrap&quot;; Nil cash funding requirement; and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LB Lambeth: Somerleyton Road</strong></td>
<td>• Funding assurances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **(for comparison & potential integration)** Vehicle to purchase completed development from Council: intention to own asset for the long term. | • Control over delivery;  
• Minimise leakage of profit to private sector;  
• Avoid the limitations of the HRA borrowing cap;  
• To ring-fence receipts and surplus from the scheme for reinvestment in this or other identified housing and regeneration projects; and,  
• Up skill Council officers. |

| **Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea** | • Provide good quality, well managed mixed tenure homes to complement the Council’s housing provision;  
• Support the Council’s strategic objectives to deliver better quality homes, improved community facilities, well designed public realm, increased mix of uses, and diversified tenure in order to contribute towards better health outcomes, higher educational attainment, more job opportunities, enhanced feelings of safety and reduced crime;  
• Support the Council in the regeneration of its estates, which would act as a catalyst for wider regeneration of the most deprived parts of the borough;  
• Provide homes at a range of rent levels and tenures, including target rents;  
• Facilitate decanting existing residents to unlock estate regeneration, and a range of other tenures to satisfy demand and financial viability, including the delivery of much needed intermediate housing to diversify tenure;  
• Support the Council in becoming an established developer;  
• Be a financially robust company;  
• Allow a commercial focus to the portfolio of newly developed housing;  
• Secure investment from the public or private sectors;  
• Deliver a financial return to the Council on its assets and investment; and,  
• Allow the Council to retain ownership of its land assets. |

| **MB Gateshead LABV** | • Leverage private sector investment;  
• Utilisation of under-used sites held in Gateshead’s General Fund;  
• Ensure quality of delivery across all sites regardless of viability/attractiveness; and,  
• Ring-fence risk, receipts and surplus within a stand-alone business. |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| **A Local Asset Backed Vehicle (LABV), which is a 50/50 joint venture vehicle with private sector partner. The intention is to cross-subsidise between different types of sites and deliver 2500 new homes.** | • Delivery of affordable housing;  
• Minimise leakage of profit to private sector; and,  
• Create viable investment for Pension Fund. |

| **Greater Manchester Pension Fund** | • Control over delivery;  
• Minimise leakage of profit to private sector; and,  
• Create viable investment for Pension Fund. |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| **Council to act as developer, commissioning building contractors to deliver mixed tenure housing, with investment from the Council’s Pension Fund.** | • Provide good quality, well managed mixed tenure homes to complement the Council’s housing provision;  
• Support the Council’s strategic objectives to deliver better quality homes, improved community facilities, well designed public realm, increased mix of uses, and diversified tenure in order to contribute towards better health outcomes, higher educational attainment, more job opportunities, enhanced feelings of safety and reduced crime;  
• Support the Council in the regeneration of its estates, which would act as a catalyst for wider regeneration of the most deprived parts of the borough;  
• Provide homes at a range of rent levels and tenures, including target rents;  
• Facilitate decanting existing residents to unlock estate regeneration, and a range of other tenures to satisfy demand and financial viability, including the delivery of much needed intermediate housing to diversify tenure;  
• Support the Council in becoming an established developer;  
• Be a financially robust company;  
• Allow a commercial focus to the portfolio of newly developed housing;  
• Secure investment from the public or private sectors;  
• Deliver a financial return to the Council on its assets and investment; and,  
• Allow the Council to retain ownership of its land assets. |
1.18 The following key conclusions were drawn from the review, which directly informed the development of the options considered for further appraisal:

1.18.1 The case studies available were limited as the creation of Wholly Owned Companies (WOCs) is a relatively recent development, spurred on by the HRA settlement in 2011/12; the surge in Council tenants exercising their right to buy; the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) Right to Buy 1-4-1 receipts settlement; and the burgeoning housing market.

1.18.2 Local authorities are using (or planning to use) WOC's for a variety of reasons including: to kick-start housing delivery (affordable or otherwise), to facilitate investment into the private rented sector (PRS), to create mixed tenure schemes and to minimise leakage of profit to the private sector. There must be other strategic drivers (as identified above), which underpin the strategic case for this approach.

1.18.3 Clearly where a WOC is used, a local authority retains 100% of the control, and 100% of the returns, but also 100% of the risk in a scheme. It is possible to mitigate this risk by buying in appropriate expertise: for example, this has been done at Somerleyton Road by appointing Igloo Regeneration Limited to act as developer manager.

1.18.4 Joint Ventures can leverage private sector funding via a Local Asset Backed Vehicle (LABV), such as Gateshead for example; or through institutional investment, as at Barking and Dagenham. However this inevitably results in a loss of control for the authority.

1.18.5 It is widely acknowledged that progress in relation to LABVs that have been created around the country in the last 5-10 years or so has been patchy. The Croydon Council Urban Regeneration Vehicle (CCURV) has delivered its first two projects (including a new Council building), but other LABVs have been slower to get off the ground. Whilst it might be thought that this is due to delays in agreeing matters in a joint venture arrangement, it is equally arguable that this is due to the fact that these joint ventures have only been created where the relevant projects were exceptionally complex and as such the delay may simply be attributable to this.

1.18.6 Notwithstanding the above it seems clear that if a local authority has sole control over delivery then it can move as quickly or as slowly as its own constraints allow, and need not be further delayed by third party discussions.

1.18.7 The Council has previously indicated its willingness to borrow prudentially in order to fund development. As such, the right approach for Lambeth may not be predicated on securing a third party funding partner. However, the ability to attract and secure funding from a variety of sources should remain a strategic option available to the Council in order to safeguard its future flexibility to determine its financial strategy and to respond to new opportunities that arise. New strategic approaches to financing emerging and will continue to do so. For example, investment by a Council's own pension fund (as per the example of Manchester City Council), is a relatively new and innovative solution to
facilitating equity injection that has been adopted in response to changes in policy and market conditions.

1.19 Drawing upon the analysis of approaches adopted by other public bodies and further examination of Lambeth’s principles, needs and objectives, the following alternative options for the delivery of housing and regeneration have been identified and appraised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Option</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
<th>Key Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Divested Delivery of Social Homes</td>
<td>Enables the total pool of housing available at social rent levels to be increased in Lambeth without impacting on the Council’s HRA headroom. The Council would progress each site through planning and lead tenant and stakeholder engagement activities through this key phase. The Council may use 1-4-1 receipts to fund RP development through social housing grant (NB only for affordable housing - this can include 80% market rent) but the Government prohibits aggregating multiple public sector funding streams so the 1-4-1 receipts would need to be the only social housing grant, with the RP finding the other 70% of its build costs. State aid issues would not arise if only social housing is being delivered, as there is a general exemption for social housing although further legal examination of any detailed proposals should be undertaken.</td>
<td>Limited control over the pace, volume and mix of development delivered – this model would not address the breadth of local need. Limited ability to recover costs or share in and re-cycle the development value created, which would impact upon the volumes of homes that could be delivered. Uncertainty over the capacity or appetite of RPs to undertake their proposed role. RPs likely to seek to implement their own tenant management strategies. Limited capacity to participate in commercial development for investment purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Joint Venture</td>
<td>The Council can harness the expertise and resources of suitably qualified external bodies. Opportunities to share risk and resource exposure. Opportunities for cost</td>
<td>Shared control of the venture and therefore limited control over the pace, volume and mix of development delivered. Market appetite for less commercial elements of the regeneration will be muted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council would progress each site through Planning and would divest development opportunities in which it would not retain an ongoing interest other than the freehold of its land.

This may include ‘gifting’ land to Registered Providers with the condition that the Council would retain nomination rights for social rent properties, which would be owned by these RPs.
- Integrated Investor, developer and contractor;
- Registered Provider; and,
- Other local authorities.

recovery and share of development surpluses, which may be recycled to deliver new homes within the framework of JV’s objects.

Offers new investment opportunities for the Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Minority Participation Joint Venture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers the same benefits as a Joint Venture, but with the additional benefit of enabling the Council to utilise 1-4-1 Right to Buy receipts if certain conditions are satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As for Joint Venture, but offers the Council less effective control and influence over the actions of the venture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Wholly Owned Company With Differentiated Subsidiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council would retain significant levels of control and influence over the group by virtue of its shareholding, thus enabling it to determine the pace, volume and mix of development delivered and to place resident and tenants' interests at the heart of the venture’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to operate in a truly commercial way, to minimise profit leakage out of the borough and to generate development surpluses that can be re-cycled and reinvested within the venture for new housing delivery and commercial development for investment returns because of the WOC parent company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of WOCs is a relatively new strategic option for local authorities and therefore little by way of market precedents of delivery via such companies. As the sole shareholder, the Council would need the capacity to act in a truly commercial manner, whilst also respecting the need for it to differentiate its interests as a local authority and as a shareholder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In exchange for greater returns, the Council is also taking on greater levels of risk and responsibility than in other partnered approaches. The multi-tier corporate structure and establishment of a number of companies will bring with it additional administrative and audit requirements and costs over and above simpler approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of a minority interest subsidiary does introduce a level of shared control for a limited element of delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Industrial &amp; Provident Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council would retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the Council would not be a shareholder in the IPS, it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlikely to be able to utilise Right to Buy 1-4-1 receipts.

An extensive procurement process may be required because of the scope of the requirement, which would affect programme delivery.
Creation of a new, not for profit entity of which the Council will not be a shareholder.

The Council would transfer Council-owned land into the IPS at a low or nil value, to enable it to manage-down development costs, thereby enabling the IPS to increase the number of affordable homes provided, particularly increasing the number of those at social/target rent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100% nomination rights and the objects of the IPS would be focused in local social benefits.</th>
<th>Able to utilise Right to Buy 1-4-1 receipts.</th>
<th>There will be a charge at the land registry on the properties transferred would make the Council a secured creditor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2 Proposal and Reasons

2.1 The approach proposed for Homes for Lambeth is Option 4 (Wholly Owned Company With Differentiated Subsidiaries), as this option offers the strongest blend of key strengths and strategic advantages to LB Lambeth overall when appraised against the key principles for the Special Purpose Vehicle and LB Lambeth's broader strategic objectives. The key conclusions from the appraisal of options are summarised below and are articulated further to present the business case for Homes for Lambeth.

2.2 The preferred approach enables the Council to act in a truly commercial way under the powers granted to it under the Localism Act 2011. The Council will effectively act as a property developer, thereby removing the potential leakage of development profit to the private sector, which typically falls within a range of 15 to 20% and may be higher. Homes for Lambeth enables the Council to retain and reinvest the surpluses generated for the benefit of Lambeth residents.

2.3 A key priority will be to reinvest surpluses to build more and better homes for residents at Council rent levels. This will include surpluses generated though delivering developments targeted at private markets, which offer higher potential returns that then can be re-invested to subsidise and increase the overall volume of affordable housing that can be viably delivered.

2.4 The alternative options considered effectively limit the Council's ability to directly harness the full economic potential of the local property market for the benefit of Lambeth's residents. Furthermore, if the Council were carrying out these activities without the structure proposed, all surplus generated would be absorbed into the General Fund, which could mean that the funding may not effectively support the delivery of new homes. Given the implications of the HRA ring-fence, budget cuts imposed by Central Government and the HRA borrowing cap, the Council currently has a limited ability to transfer such funds from the General Fund into the HRA for Council house building activities.
2.5 This approach will enable the Council to access and deploy funding from a variety of public and private sources, which could include for example, money secured and loaned in by the Council at a commercially equivalent rate, third party investment or funding available for the re-provision of homes for social or affordable rent (such as 1-4-1 RTB receipts). This benefit is not unique to this option however, but the structure and funding strategy proposed for Homes for Lambeth has been designed to optimise potential access to funding. Homes for Lambeth will enable the Council to directly invest in meeting its housing priorities and will also enable appropriate funding to be harnessed to optimise the provision of affordable housing that will be offered across a range of tenures.

2.6 Strategic control is only shared where absolutely necessary. For example a wholly owned company which is a Registered Provider within the Special Purpose Vehicle structure will receive S.106 receipts and will provide new homes at Council rent levels for existing Council tenants that choose to take up these new homes. A Joint Venture company within the structure which is also a Registered Provider will enable the Council to secure additional investment to deliver new homes at Council rent levels for new tenants. As such, the preferred approach presents LB Lambeth with the highest level of direct influence in terms of addressing market failures and meeting the needs of current and future residents. Through Homes for Lambeth, the Council can exert significant, direct influence over the pace, quality and quantity of new housing and regeneration delivered in Lambeth:

- The preferred option provides an effective platform for the Council to implement the principles of the Cooperative Council. Residents will be supported to have an active voice in shaping the delivery of new housing and Homes for Lambeth will commit to maximising the social value it can generate in Lambeth and for Lambeth, through its approach to delivering and operating new developments. Furthermore, each scheme committed for delivery via Homes for Lambeth will be subject to the formal agreement of the Business Case to Proceed, including the production of a business plan, development appraisal and cash flow model in order to demonstrate the viability and value of the proposals for each respective scheme.

- Options considered with greater levels of private sector participation at the shareholder level may not be able to fully meet the Council’s socially-oriented objectives for housing delivery and regeneration, whilst options that are principally or exclusively for a social purpose may be less able to support delivery at scale or across tenures/property types.

2.7 Lambeth’s housing estates are the Council’s largest land asset and in order to tackle the housing crisis we need to use that land to deliver benefit to as many residents as possible. The preferred option enables the Council to retain the freehold to its sites as the transfer of land is effected on a long-lease basis, which therefore enables the Council to protect the assets in its ownership.

2.8 The preferred option provides a robust platform that can grow and evolve over time in order to enable the Council to directly realise new opportunities and new strategies developed with and for residents over the long-term. Other approaches in which the Council is able to exert less control may not serve to be as flexible in practice and the
risk that other stakeholders may not support new proposals is greater in these circumstances.

2.9 Lambeth has also lost 11,579 council homes since 1980. The Right to Buy directly applies to social homes delivered in the HRA, which means that the medium to long-term availability of the housing stock delivered in this way is somewhat uncertain, which ultimately jeopardises the Council’s ability to meet the housing needs of current and future residents. As Homes for Lambeth will not deliver homes in this way, there will be greater certainty about long-term availability of new homes delivered.

2.10 The activities of Homes for Lambeth will have a managed impact on the Council’s Housing Revenue Account, thereby protecting the Council’s ability to meet its obligations to maintaining its HRA properties within the limitations prescribed for the HRA.

2.11 Homes for Lambeth will also be able to deliver commercial development and infrastructure that supports local communities and is more sensitive to local needs. These types of developments are essential to providing local communities with access to the services and amenities they need and may also generate development surpluses that will be reinvested by Homes for Lambeth towards more socially oriented aims.

2.12 The proposed group structure effectively manages the Council’s overall exposure to the risks of development, whist enabling it to effectively harness the benefits of participating in this sector for the benefit of Lambeth’s residents and communities. The ability to ring-fence development risk through the group structure is a key consideration as the Council will be undertaking activities that are (in recent years) novel, relatively specialist and outside its core areas of operation.

2.13 The key disadvantage of this approach is that as a separate company, there will be corporation tax and VAT implications to factor in, as well as additional costs for external audit, IT provision, final accounts and administrative costs. Arguably, many of these costs would be incurred by the Council if the Council decided to build new homes through the HRA or General Fund and other options considered are also subject to this disadvantage. In development of the proposed structure for Homes for Lambeth, the Council has sought technical advice to support it to optimise the tax position of Homes for Lambeth, in order to maximise the availability of resources for delivering new housing and complementary developments.

2.14 It is therefore proposed that Cabinet recommends that the Council should form Homes for Lambeth, a Special Purpose Vehicle for housing and regeneration delivery and development, which will both complement and add to the Council’s existing abilities to deliver its strategies for housing, growth and community benefit.

Tenant & Resident Considerations

2.15 In keeping with its key Cooperative Council commitments and closely the Council’s priorities also contained within the Community Plan 2013-16, residents’ needs and active co-production are very much at the heart of the Council’s proposals for Homes for Lambeth:
2.16 **This approach will deliver additional housing stock across a range of tenures and mixed communities that is essential to the needs of current and future residents**

The homes Lambeth needs will not be delivered by the market and LB Lambeth cannot deliver these within the constraints of its abilities without a Special Purpose Vehicle. We will deliver new housing across a range of tenures, which includes additional homes at Council rent levels, which are vital to the mix we need but hard to secure through other means.

2.17 **Through its involvement and by design, Homes for Lambeth effectively supports the Council to realise its long-term strategic commitments for housing, regeneration and community benefit**

Through its shareholding, the composition of the Board and robust processes governing the development and delivery of new projects, Homes for Lambeth enables the Council to act in a truly commercial way that benefits residents and upholds the strategic commitment it has made to be a Cooperative Council.

2.18 **The Council will retain control and will undertake direct resident involvement throughout the process of planning, developing and operating new homes**

The Council will directly lead all stakeholder engagement undertaken prior to the transfer of assets, which includes working with residents and stakeholders to develop Masterplans for each scheme, undertaking land assembly, which includes offering suitable alternative accommodation for Council tenants and leaseholder buyouts the Council will lead the stakeholder engagement activities to inform the plans for new development and will retain responsibility for the key stages that impact upon tenants’ lives in the development process, including site assembly, decant and/or relocation.

**While Lambeth has to tackle the housing crisis head on for future generations of Lambeth residents it also has to do its best for its current residents.**

No one at Lambeth underestimates the uncertainty, distress and dislocation that regeneration will cause, and we will do all that we can to mitigate this.

Our goal when engaging with current Lambeth residents is to ensure that we will:

- Keep uncertainty for residents to a minimum;
- Residents to have an understand of the bigger picture why Lambeth is proposing changes to their homes and communities;
- Residents to have their voices heard by the decision makers; and,
- Residents to have the information and support that will allow them to make the best choices about their families’ futures.

And that Lambeth will do this by providing to residents:

- Clear information on how the whole engagement process will work right from the very first leaflet to the last residents moving into the estate;
- An explanation to residents how specific parts of the engagement processes fit together;
- Information on who is making decisions when they are doing this and on what basis they will be making that decision;
- Information, so they can understand on what we are engaging them on and what we are not;
- A clear view to residents how engagement can change the outcome;
- Communications about the regeneration process are clearly labeled as such; and,
- Timely feedback on questions to residents.
In addition, we want all residents of a regenerated estate to benefit from better homes and an improved neighbourhood. And we want them to be involved in the design of the new estates and their own homes.

2.19 **A new form of tenancy offer will be offered to Council tenants transferring to new properties, who will also have the option to transfer to suitable alternative Council accommodation if this does not meet their needs**

As set out in a report to Cabinet in July of 2015, legal drafting has been undertaken for a Lifetime Assured Tenancy Agreement, which represents the tenant offer of equivalence to the Council’s current form of Secure Tenancy it offers to its tenants, but with the intention that the Right to Buy is removed from this offer. This is to help safeguard the long-term availability of homes that meet local needs (the draft agreement is included in appendix A to this report). Accordingly, existing secure tenants would be invited to become assured tenants, losing their existing status, as *Homes for Lambeth* will not satisfy the "landlord condition" under the Housing Act 1985. However, the Council proposes to offer such tenants an enhanced form of assured tenancy, incorporating some of the rights that a secure tenant would have (and an assured tenant typically wouldn't).

2.20 **The Council will directly deliver tenant management services for Council tenants transferring into the new housing under Life Assured Tenancy Agreements**

This means that Council tenants transferring into new homes under this agreement will benefit from the same level of tenant management services as Council tenants.

2.21 **Homes for Lambeth's approach both supports and delivers the Council's commitment to securing social value for Lambeth's communities from its investments and expenditure**

*Homes for Lambeth* will directly support the Council to address the five social value priorities which are driven by our Community Outcomes through its approach to shaping and delivering new development:

**Cleaner Streets and Greener Neighbourhoods (Environmental)**

New homes and assets delivered will be designed to have a lower environmental impact and carbon footprint than the properties being replaced. This will deliver efficiency savings to the Council and the residents on each scheme. The Masterplans developed for each respective scheme will also prioritise the introduction of enhanced greening within the urban realm.

**Safer and Stronger Communities (Social)**

The provision of safe, high quality housing is recognised to make a positive contribution to the improved wellbeing of residents in a wider sense. Therefore, by increasing the provision of accessible housing, Homes for Lambeth will directly support Lambeth’s communities to become safer and stronger. The Council will lead the stakeholder engagement for each scheme and will ensure that residents have both an active involvement and influence over how each new development is planned and operated.

**More Jobs (Economic)**

Homes for Lambeth will procure services and construction supply chains in order to develop new housing and commercial projects. It will also let out operational contracts for service requirements post construction completion. These key areas of activity
present significant opportunities for the creation of local economic opportunities for Lambeth’s residents, which will be realised by Homes for Lambeth through its objects, business planning approach and approach to procurement. Key local socioeconomic impacts that can be created in this way will include:

- Construction Employment opportunities for local people;
- Apprenticeships for local people;
- Training;
- Education to employment-type initiatives (links with schools and colleges, lesson plans, work tasters, careers talks, etc.);
- Supply chain opportunities for local businesses; and,
- Wider community engagement and community benefit activities and CSR.

2.22 Homes for Lambeth will deliver complementary development in a way that empowers residents and recognises community needs

Through its approach to delivering development, Homes for Lambeth will prioritise residents’ interests though consideration of community needs in determining the assets to be provided and through securing local employment, training and supply chain aligned to the construction and operation of new assets. To articulate this, the Council will establish a considered strategy for stakeholder engagement as part of its approach to all New Projects Delivery activities undertaken prior to transfer alongside Homes for Lambeth.

2.23 The articles and governance arrangements for Homes for Lambeth will safeguard the Council’s long-term commitment to prioritising the needs of Lambeth’s communities

The Council will require that any proposed divestment of its shareholdings in Homes for Lambeth and any of its companies will be subject to a ‘triple lock’ of approvals, including:

- A unanimous vote of full Cabinet; and,
- a 2/3rds vote of full Council approval; and,
- a unanimous agreement of the Homes for Lambeth Board.

In addition the Council will deploy a robust approach to governing the actions of Homes for Lambeth to ensure that it remains fully committed to its objectives to support Lambeth’s communities.

The Development Portfolio

2.24 Over the medium to long-term Homes for Lambeth will enable the Council to develop a broad range of its own sites (including HRA and non-HRA sites), and potentially sites outside of the Council’s ownership. For example, these sites could include housing, mixed-use and commercial sites.

2.25 Homes for Lambeth will play a key role in supporting the Council to realise its long-term strategic objectives for delivering estates renewal, developing small sites and other developments, which may include schools, community resources, commercial projects and wider infrastructure for example. Over the medium-term, the Council will also look to explore opportunities to work with other public bodies to progress strategies for asset and service development, where these offer clear benefits for Lambeth’s communities.
2.26 A portfolio of housing sites has been proposed as the Initial Development Portfolio for potential delivery via *Homes for Lambeth* and commercial opportunities will be added into this portfolio in due course.

2.27 The table below summarises the schemes that are proposed for inclusion in the Initial Development Portfolio as a first phase of schemes, as per the recommendation to Cabinet. Collectively, the first phase will support the development of 511 homes of which 310 homes are at social rent levels. It should be noted that this report does not make a decision on the inclusion of the homes at Somerleyton Road. Further work is being done and a recommendation will come back to Cabinet in the future on whether or not the homes at Somerleyton Road will be included as part of *Homes for Lambeth*.

### The Initial Development Portfolio Considered for Delivery via Homes for Lambeth in the First Phase of Schemes (01/01/2016 to 01/09/2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Total New Homes Delivered</th>
<th>Homes At Council Rent Levels</th>
<th>Funding Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lollard</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100% funded by S.106 contributions &amp; Profit on Private Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenwick</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100% funded by S.106 contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury Phase 1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100% funded by S.106 contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerleyton Road</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1-4-1 RTB receipts and PWLB borrowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.28 It is envisaged that *Homes for Lambeth* will progress rapidly to support the delivery of further housing development and estates regeneration schemes, soon after the initial phase. Whilst the precise details of these schemes are still to be determined through stakeholder engagement processes that are already underway. It is anticipated that housing-led schemes delivered via *Homes for Lambeth* will include the following:

- South Lambeth;
- Westbury (Wider regeneration scheme);
- Cressingham Gardens; and,
- Knights Walk.

Opportunities for the potential development of the following regeneration sites will also be explored:

- Minet Library site; and,
- Larkhall Road depot site.

2.29 This course of action is subject to stakeholder engagement and full business planning and formal agreement of the Business Case to proceed.

2.30 Further schemes that present commercial development opportunities may also be identified in addition to these schemes and it should be noted that the Council’s proposals for the development of each of these schemes will also be subject to all requisite stakeholder engagement and due processes that the Council has committed to undertake.
3. **Finance**

3.1 The Special Purpose Vehicle proposed will create an opportunity for the Council to undertake commercial development and to generate and reinvest surpluses (which can typically account for 15-20% or more of the Gross Development Value), for the benefit of Lambeth’s residents, thereby enabling the Council to invest in the creation of the new homes that residents need.

3.2 The Council will have first option to provide loans and investments as required to Homes for Lambeth on market standard terms, subject to this meeting both the Council’s and the venture’s respective requirements to obtain best value. *Homes for Lambeth* also enables the Council to look to the open market and institutional investors to secure the best value funding for each development.

3.3 Work to establish the funding structure of Homes for Lambeth will continue to be developed. As identified above, *Homes for Lambeth* could secure funding from the Council or a Third Party Investor, or could adopt a blended approach. The nature and terms of funding to be secured by *Homes for Lambeth* will be assessed on an estate and or combined estate regeneration basis and formal authority to enter in to any funding agreements will be sought from the Council at the appropriate time. In order to comply with State Aid legislation, any funding provided by the Council will be at market rates.

3.4 A financial model, for an initial illustrative development portfolio has been developed to support and illustrate the business case for *Homes for Lambeth*. This will support the development of the key business planning tools that will support the delivery of new schemes (subject to a formal approval process) and effective long-term planning:

- *Homes for Lambeth* will use financial modelling to inform and establish a viable Business Case and Business Plan for each development scheme it undertakes. A detailed financial model will be prepared for each estate, as well as for a number of developments, which are addressed collectively as a phase.

- The Business Plan for each scheme will clearly set out a strategy for this development to be self financing over its lifecycle, or for Homes for Lambeth to cross-subsidise delivery, whereby this presents a robust and viable approach. The income streams from the Initial Development Portfolio could be directly reinvested via Homes for Lambeth to support the delivery of new homes in subsequent phases subject to tax implications.

- A Rolling, 60 Month Business Plan will be prepared, to support the business planning over a medium-long term scenario and to assist the Council to consider and plan strategies for cross-subsidy between schemes (as identified above).

3.5 A series of illustrative scenarios have been developed to test the resilience of the approach and these will also be integrated into the formal business planning approach for each scheme. These scenarios include:

- The impact of the removal of units and or estates;
- Increases in finance costs;
- Increases in capital costs;
3.6 As part of a New Projects Development (NPD) process, Homes for Lambeth will work with the Council to prepare a finance and viability model to inform and agree an implementable Masterplan for each scheme. Input from Homes for Lambeth will inform key aspects including but not limited to: design, mix of uses, house types, tenure mix and landscaping.

3.7 Homes for Lambeth will develop a specification of requirements for each of the tenures it will provide. In developing this specification, Homes for Lambeth will consider whole life costs and cost in use, enabling it to secure value for money on its Capital Expenditure (CapEx) and Operational Expenditure (OpEx).

3.8 There are likely to be significant tax implications from the proposed structures and these will be considered in detail as part of the business planning development. The additional administrative costs arising from operating via the new arrangements will also be modelled.

4. Legal and Democracy

4.1 Section 1 of the Homelessness Act 2002 requires the Council to formulate a Homelessness Strategy for amongst other matters preventing homelessness in their district and for securing that sufficient accommodation is and will be available for people in their district who are or may become homeless.

4.2 Section 32 of the Housing Act 1985 empowers the Council to dispose of land held for the purposes of part 2 of that Act. The disposal can be in any manner the Council determines, however no disposal can be effected without the Secretary of State’s consent.

4.3 The Secretary of State has issued some general consents in 2013. Paragraph 3.2 of General Consent A permits the Council to dispose of vacant land at any price determined by the Council. “Vacant Land” for the purposes of the is consent means land where no dwelling-houses have been built or where dwelling-houses have been built, such dwelling-houses have been demolished or are no longer capable of human habitation and are due be demolished.

4.4 Section 24 of the Local Government Act 1988 provides that subject to section 25, the Council has power to provide any person with financial assistance for the purposes of, or in connection with, the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, improvement, maintenance or management (whether by that person or by another) of any property which is or is intended to be privately let as housing accommodation.

4.5 For the purposes of this section and section 25 below a local authority provide a person with financial assistance if they do or agree to do any of the following, that is to say:

(a) make a grant or loan to that person;
(b) guarantee or join in guaranteeing the performance of any obligation owed to or by that person;
(c) indemnify or join in indemnifying that person in respect of any liabilities, loss or damage; or,
(d) if that person is a body corporate, acquire share or loan capital in that person.

4.6 For the purposes of this section property is privately let as housing accommodation at any time when:

(a) it is occupied as housing accommodation in pursuance of a lease or licence of any description or under a statutory tenancy; and,
(b) the immediate landlord of the occupier of the property is a person other than a local authority.

4.7 Section 25 of the Act provides that a local authority cannot either:

(a) exercise the power conferred by section 24 above; nor,
(b) so exercise any other power whether conferred before or after the passing of that Act as to provide any person, for the purposes of or in connection with the matters referred to above, with any financial assistance or with any gratuitous benefit, except under and in accordance with a consent given by the Secretary of State.

4.8 Pursuant to section 26 of the Act the Secretary of State has issued some general consents in 2014. General consent AA1 provides that a local authority may provide any person, or body for the purposes of or in connection with the matters mentioned in section 24(1) of the 1988 Act, with any financial assistance or any gratuitous benefit consisting of amongst other matters the disposal to that person or body of Housing Revenue Account land for the development as housing accommodation or as housing accommodation and other facilities which are intended to benefit mainly the occupiers of the housing accommodation.

4.9 The above consent is conditional on:

(a) any housing accommodation on the land being vacant, or will not be used again as housing accommodation;
(b) the disposal is either freehold or by a lease of at least 99 years;
(c) the housing accommodation will constructed within 3 years of the disposal;
(d) the housing accommodation will be privately let; and,
(e) the Council are not, under any agreement or other arrangement made on or before the disposal, entitled to manage or maintain any of the housing accommodation to be developed on the land.

4.10 No further consent of the Secretary of State to a disposal under the above consent AA1 is required by virtue of section 32(2) or 43(1) of the Housing Act 1985.

4.11 Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that without prejudice to any powers exercisable apart from that section but subject to the provisions of that Act and any other enactment passed before or after this Act, a local authority shall have power to do any thing (whether or not involving the expenditure, borrowing or lending of money or the acquisition or disposal of any property or rights) which is calculated to
facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of their functions.

4.12 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 provides the council with a general power of competence to do (subject to any other statutory restriction) anything that individuals generally may do, in any way whatever, including the power to do it for a commercial purpose or otherwise for a charge, or without charge, and the power to do it for, or otherwise than for, the benefit of the authority, its area or persons resident or present in its area.

4.13 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 places a duty on the Council to, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and,
(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

4.14 Section 105 of the 1985 Housing Act requires the Council to maintain such arrangements as it considers appropriate to enable those of its secure tenants who are likely to be substantially affected by a matter of housing management, including a new programme of maintenance, improvement or demolition:

(a) to be informed of the authority's proposals in respect of the matter; and,
(b) to make their views known to the authority within a specified period.

The Council is required, before making any decision on the matter, to consider any representations made to it in accordance with those arrangements.

4.15 The Supreme Court in Mosley –v- L.B. Haringey endorsed the principles for fair consultation expoused in R v Brent London Borough Council ex p. Gunning that the basic requirements that are essential if the consultation process is to have a sensible content are that:

(a) consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
(b) the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response;
(c) adequate time must be given for consideration and response; and,
(d) the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposals.

4.16 When deciding whether to adopt the recommendations of this report, officers will be exercising a discretion within the constraints of the duties referred to above and should therefore have in mind the following principles of administrative law:

- a decision must be within the Council’s powers;
- all relevant information and consideration, including the Council’s fiduciary duty to the Council Tax payer, must be taken into account; and,
- all irrelevant considerations, including unauthorised purposes, must be ignored.
4.17 In declaring a decision unlawful because it is unreasonable, the Courts would need to decide that the decision is so outrageous in its defiance of logic or accepted moral standards it is a decision that no sensible authority which had applied its mind to the decision could have arrived at it.

4.18 The provision by the Council of financial support to third party may raise questions of state aid under Article 87 of the EC Treaty and the Council must be satisfied that the proposed actions are lawful. The specific ingredients of state aid under Article 87 are:
(i) aid; (ii) granted by a Member State or through State resources; (iii) favouring certain undertakings; (iv) distorting or threatening to distort competition; and (v) affecting inter-State trade. An "aid" comprises any form of intervention which has the same or similar effects to a subsidy. There are various exemptions that have been granted such as the provision of social housing.

4.19 This proposed key decision was entered in the Forward Plan on 03 September 2015, having subsumed a previous edition of estate regeneration reports, and the necessary 28 clear days’ notice has been given. In addition, the Council’s Constitution requires the report to be published on the website for five clear days before the proposed decision is approved by the Cabinet Member. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the decision-maker before the decision is taken. A further period of five clear days - the call-in period – must then elapse before the decision is enacted. If the decision is called-in during this period, it cannot be enacted until the call-in has been considered and resolved.

5. Consultation and co-production

5.1 Officers have worked with Members to develop the proposals set out in this report, which includes on-going consultation with the Cabinet member housing.

5.2 Local Ward Councillors will be consulted at the point that a development site within their ward is identified for development via Homes for Lambeth.

5.3 Individual developments will require significant engagement with the local community. This is already apparent on the estate regeneration programme and on housing projects such as Somerleyton Road.

6. Risk management

6.1 A project team is in place and a risk register is maintained. Key risks and mitigations are noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing Nothing</td>
<td>The risks and limitations of such an approach are clearly presented in this paper and a number of strategic approaches have been examined and tested as alternatives to the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through its Estates Regeneration Programme, the Council is already progressing sites through the Masterplanning process in the recognition that it must be proactive in order to fulfill housing or growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments.</td>
<td>Failure to Effectively Engage Lambeth’s Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of current and future residents will be met.</td>
<td>The Council’s standards and commitments to its tenants and residents sit at the heart of the proposals for Homes for Lambeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council retains significant control and direct involvement throughout the key processes of engaging residents in Masterplanning each scheme and making choices about their housing needs.</td>
<td>The Council will retain a direct role in managing the tenancies of homes at Council rent levels and arrangements will be made to effectively empower residents in the way their estates are managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council retains greater levels of overall shareholder control than the alternative models considered.</td>
<td>Effective governance arrangements and processes around business planning and the delivery of new projects enable the Council to manage down the risk of strategic divergence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The medium to long-term business plans of Homes for Lambeth will be effectively informed by the Council’s key metrics and strategies for local housing need, growth and regeneration.</td>
<td>Developments progressed by Homes for Lambeth will be subject to the Council’s formal pathways for planning, housing, regeneration and investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed New Projects Delivery Process and supporting resources will enable the Council and Homes for Lambeth to work effectively to progress each scheme against a clear strategic pathway with appropriate checks and balances.</td>
<td>The Council retains a leading role in resident engagement throughout this process and proposes to embark upon a full communications strategy to explain its rationale and approach to residents, which will include details of its housing offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active business planning and modelling is undertaken using dynamic models and forecasts for the short, medium and long-term, which enables effective plans to be produced that respond to changes to the programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Change in Law Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk that further changes to Central Government policies (such as the proposed Housing Bill) and changes in law impede the legality or viability of the strategy proposed.</td>
<td>The proposed approach meets LBL’s strategic objectives and has been reviewed for legal compliance. The legal drafting of key agreements governing the dissolution of the corporate structure, funding and assets will include appropriate stipulations to determining the repatriation of assets to the Council, thereby safeguarding future flexibility to respond to this outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Development &amp; Delivery Risk</strong></td>
<td>The legal structure proposed limits the exposure of the Council to commercial risk. The group structure also enables a level of ring fencing of risks to be achieved with regard to managing the potential risk contagion between development types. Much of the Council’s investment into Homes for Lambeth will be structured as loans on market terms, which provides a level of protection over this investment. Through securing appropriate resources and deploying effective strategic planning, Homes for Lambeth will be able to identify and respond to potential commercial risks. For example, homes delivered for private rent could be used in other ways should the conditions of market demand for this type of product change adversely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failure to secure an appropriate partner for the Minority Interest Joint Venture (JVCo.)</strong></td>
<td>The proposed approach of securing and deploying funding alongside an equity-holding partner is believed to be potentially attractive to a range of investors. The proposed group structure separates out this activity into its own discrete subsidiary company, thereby mitigating the potential risk exposure within the group and enabling this element to be planned further and mobilised when ready without impacting upon the wider mobilisation of the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Equalities Impact Assessment**

7.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) has or will be carried out to as part of the stakeholder engagement approach undertaken to prepare the Masterplans for each estate development. Each EIA will be based on the information available at the time of the key decisions for progressing each estate. Information used to undertake an EIA typically comprises:

- Local and Borough-wide Demographic Data;
- Information held by Lambeth Living;
- Consultation work across the estate over the last 2 years;
- Household Needs Survey (carried out in February/March 2015); and
- Test of Opinion Survey (carried out in May/June 2015).
7.2 As each development scheme is progressed, more information will be obtained over time regarding the residents on the estate and the communities in the areas surrounding the estate. This will allow more detailed equalities assessments to be undertaken to support more detailed decisions on design, phasing and general development strategy.

8. Community safety
8.1 *Homes for Lambeth* will contribute positively to community safety by ensuring that each scheme delivered involves the removal of areas that attract anti-social behaviour and providing more passive surveillance of streets and spaces. The wider regeneration initiatives will promote estate pride and actively design out the potential for crime as part of the development process.

8.2 As outlined above, *Homes for Lambeth* will also contribute towards the delivery of safer and stronger communities. The provision of safe, high quality housing is recognised to make a positive contribution to the improved wellbeing of residents. Therefore, by increasing the provision of accessible housing, *Homes for Lambeth* will directly support Lambeth’s communities to become safer and stronger. The Council will lead the stakeholder engagement for each scheme and will ensure that residents have both an active involvement and influence over how each new development is planned and operated.

9. Organisational implications
9.1 Environmental
Environmental sustainability will be a key consideration for any proposed interventions and the Council will seek the highest possible standards with the resources available.

9.2 Staffing and accommodation
The programme will be resource appropriately and this may provide opportunities for internal secondments and professional development. Over the medium to long-term there may be an opportunity for staff to be transferred into *Homes for Lambeth*, subject to the business case for this being agreed by Cabinet and a fully compliant TUPE process being successfully undertaken. The governance proposals *Homes for Lambeth* will create new; un-remunerated directorship roles for Council Officers and an appropriate level of support will be provided to assist Officers in these new roles.

9.3 Procurement
There are no immediate procurement considerations arising from this report. However, it should be noted that the Council is currently undertaking an OJEU-compliant procurement process (using the Homes and Communities Agency’s Multi-disciplinary Panel) to appoint development managers to support it to progress each the preparation of viable Masterplans for key sites in the borough. It is also intended that direct engagement with Procurement Officers will be undertaken to support the process of forming and mobilising *Homes for Lambeth* and that suitably robust and legally compliant procurement policies and practices will be put into to guide the activities of *Homes for Lambeth*.

9.4 Health
The delivery of additional safe, warm and affordable new homes across a range of tenures, together with the delivery of safer and stronger communities that are designed with and for Lambeth’s communities will directly support the health and wellbeing of residents. Homes for Lambeth will also make investments to generate income for the General Fund that will support the Council to sustain the delivery of vital services that residents need in the face of sustained Central Government cuts. The Council’s Social Value principles are also embedded within Homes for Lambeth’s approach, which will result in new economic and learning opportunities for residents.

10. **Timetable for implementation**

10.1 The legal registration of the headline company and its subsidiaries will be undertaken within 2 months of Cabinet’s decision.

10.2 The preparation of the full legal suite of documents to support the governance and activities of the new companies formed will be undertaken within 6 months of incorporation.

10.3 During this period, the newly appointed Board will be convened and will be supported to become effective in its role (this may require capacity-building support and secretariat support).

10.4 Further strategic development work will be required to identify and appoint a suitable shareholder (or shareholders) to share equity in a Joint Venture company within the Special Purpose Vehicle, which is expected to take up to 6 months.

10.5 In order to operate as Registered Providers, subsidiary companies will require registration with the Homes & Communities Agency as Registered Providers, this process may take up to 9 months from the date of legal registration (for the Joint Venture company this is subject to identifying and appointing a suitable shareholder).

10.6 The Council will continue to progress its strategies for undertaking stakeholder engagement to develop Masterplans and to progress schemes for transfer, alongside the formation and mobilisation of Homes for Lambeth.

10.7 The development of the initial Business Plans for Homes for Lambeth (i.e. the ‘Rolling Business Plan’ and Scheme Business Plans for the initial schemes) and any other control documents that sit outside the legal framework set out above will be undertaken as part of the mobilisation process. In addition to the Initial Development Portfolio of housing schemes, this will include the identification of a number of commercial and/or regeneration development opportunities.

10.8 Funding arrangements must be fully developed to meet the working capital requirement for an initial 60 month period.

10.9 Arrangements for key appointments for the services and human resources required for both the Council and Homes for Lambeth to fulfil their proposed roles will be put in place within 1 month of the registration of the Homes for Lambeth group of companies.

10.10 A formal communications strategy for Homes for Lambeth will be launched immediately following the Cabinet approval to set up Homes for Lambeth.
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Tenancy Agreement

This Tenancy Agreement is made on the date hereof:

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
(insert date)

and made between:

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
(insert name of landlord)
(I the "Landlord")

and

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
(insert name of tenant(s))
(I the "Tenant")

The following special conditions shall apply to this Tenancy Agreement:

1. The initial rent (excluding Other Charges) is £------------------ (insert initial rent)

[2. The initial total of Other Charges is £------------------- (insert initial other charges)]
SECTION A: INTRODUCTION TO YOUR TENANCY AGREEMENT

This is your Tenancy Agreement. It is a legally binding document which sets out your rights and responsibilities as one of our assured tenants. It has been produced with the aim of having a set of conditions which are clear and easy to understand.

It is an important legal document and should be kept in a safe place. This Tenancy Agreement defines your obligations and responsibilities as a tenant for an assured tenancy.

This Tenancy Agreement is not an assured shorthold tenancy under the Housing Act 1988. The Landlord intends to grant an assured tenancy within the meaning of that Act. This form of Tenancy Agreement is an enhanced form of assured tenancy, as it incorporates some of the rights which a secure tenant of a local authority would also be entitled to.

Please read this Tenancy Agreement carefully. If you do not understand any of the conditions or you need more information, please contact [your Housing Office], a solicitor, a Law Centre, the Citizens Advice Bureau, a Housing Advice Centre or Shelter for help.

1 Definitions

1.1 The following words and phrases have specific meanings when used in these tenancy conditions, unless the context requires otherwise:

- 'we', 'us', 'our' or 'the Landlord' means the landlord of your property from time to time or the Management Agent.
- 'You' or 'your' means the Tenant.
- 'Tenant' means the person/s or people to whom we have granted the Tenancy, or who have since been assigned or succeeded to the Tenancy.
- 'Assured Tenancy' and 'Assured Tenant' have the same meanings given to them in the Housing Act 1988 (as amended from time to time).
- ['Demoted Tenancy' means a tenancy created when a Court makes a Demotion Order against an Assured Tenant, as set out in the Housing Act 1988].
- 'Management Agent' means [ ]
- 'Your Property', 'the Property' and 'your Home' mean the property to which the Tenancy relates.
- 'Your Household' and 'the Household' means everyone living in your home.
- 'Housing Management' means a matter if, in the opinion of the Landlord, relates to:
  - (a) the management, maintenance, improvement or demolition of one of our houses (or part of a house) let under an Assured Tenancy or
  - (b) the provision of services or amenities in connection with such Assured Tenancy

(but not so far as it relates to rent payable or charges for services or facilities provided to our tenants) and which, in the opinion of the Landlord, represent either a new programme of maintenance, improvement or demolition or a change in the practice or policy of the Landlord and which in both cases are likely to substantially affect either its Assured Tenants as a whole or a group of them who form a distinct social group or occupy our houses (or part of a
house) which constitute a distinct class (whether by reference to the kind of house or the housing estate or other larger area in which they are situated).

- 'Communal Areas’ means the shared entrances, halls, stairways, passages, balconies, yards, lifts, fire escapes, roads and paths leading to or from the Property, grassed, cultivated, drying and play areas, forecourts and other shared areas within estate and block boundaries.

- ['Other Charges' means charges for heating, hot water and the use of a shed, garage or an allocated parking bay.]

- 'Fixtures and Fittings' include:
  > Installations for supplying or using gas, electricity and water.
  > Basins, sinks, baths and toilets.
  > Pipes, ducts, tanks, wires, cables, switches, boilers and storage heaters.
  > Fixed wall, floor or ceiling coverings, other than carpet and laminate or wood flooring.

- ['Housing Office’ means the area housing offices, or equivalent, or the Landlord’s Customer Service Centres.]

1.2 All expressions in the singular also carry the plural meaning, unless the context requires otherwise.

2 **Your Tenancy**

2.1 By signing a Tenancy Agreement document you have agreed to enter into a legal contract with the Landlord.

2.2 Your Tenancy Agreement document says who the tenants are. All tenants are equally responsible for complying with all of these tenancy conditions – even those who are no longer residing at the Property – until the Tenancy is brought to an end. [See your Tenant's Handbook for further details.]

2.3 [You can get further copies of the Tenancy Agreement from your Housing Office [or through the local authority website www.lambeth.gov.uk].

2.4 [There are two types of tenancy which are covered by these tenancy conditions:

  > Assured Tenancy
  > Demoted Tenancy

In addition, the terms of this Tenancy Agreement apply in part to tenancies which have ceased to be Assured or Demoted Tenancies.]

[Note: Your secure tenancy can be demoted where there has been anti-social behaviour. Depending on the identity of the new landlord, this Tenancy Agreement may also be demoted, where there has been anti-social behaviour.]

2.5 The type of tenancy you have is decided by statutory rules. Tenants who have certain types of tenancies have certain statutory rights. Where there is any conflict between the statutory rules or rights and this Tenancy Agreement, the statute will prevail. The Landlord has also incorporated into this Tenancy Agreement some of the benefits which would be available to a secure tenant of a local authority. If you are in any doubt as to the terms of this Tenancy Agreement you can ask your Housing Office.
2.6 [Some additional conditions may apply to particular properties, or types of properties, from time to time. These will form part of your Tenancy Agreement. If you are offered a property where such conditions apply you will be informed of these additional conditions before you sign your Tenancy Agreement. By signing a Tenancy Agreement you also agree to comply with these additional conditions and you acknowledge that they have been drawn to your attention.]

2.7 If either party, Landlord or Tenant, breaks the terms of this Tenancy Agreement and we cannot solve the problem together, the other party may be able to go to court to deal with the matter. If you do not keep to your Tenancy Agreement you could lose your home.

2.8 [In addition your Tenant’s Handbook contains further explanation of your rights and responsibilities as a tenant.]

[Note: It is currently intended that a Tenant's Handbook will be prepared and issued to tenants, to accompany this Tenancy Agreement. It will detail those matters referred to in here as being set out in the Tenant's Handbook and will also explain some of the tenant’s rights and responsibilities under this Tenancy Agreement.]

Changing this agreement

2.9 Not Used.

Serving notices or letters

2.10 You agree that any notice or letter that is addressed to you, has been properly served on you if it has been:

> posted or hand delivered to, or fixed to, your Property, or
> handed to you in person, or
> posted or hand-delivered to or fixed to your last known address.

2.11 In addition the provisions of section 196 of the Law of Property Act 1925 (which provide for other forms of valid service) are incorporated into this Tenancy Agreement.

2.12 If you want to give us notice, you must write to [the Executive Director of Housing, Regeneration and Environment via your housing office.]

Access to information

2.13 [Details of our policy for allocating housing and housing transfers are available from [your housing office] [and on the local authority website at www.lambeth.gov.uk.]

2.14 You have the right to see your personal records in accordance with the Access to Personal Files (Housing) Regulations 1989. You also have the right to see information in accordance with the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act, but we may charge a fee for this.

Where to go for advice

2.15 If you would like more information about your rights you should contact your housing office or any of the following:
> [Options & Advice Centre] [(See details in the Tenant's Handbook)]
> A solicitor or local law centre
> Citizens’ Advice Bureau
> Your local councillor (details of how to contact your local councillor are available from your housing office, [the Council website], your local library or the Town Hall).
> Your local residents’ association.

Complaints Procedure

2.16 If we do not meet our responsibilities under the Tenancy Agreement, you can do the following:

> Contact your housing office to make a complaint.
> Use our complaints procedure (you can get details of complaints procedure from your housing office, or from the Landlord's website).
> Speak to your local councillor, MP or tenant panel.

[If you are dissatisfied with the Complaints Procedure, you can contact the Housing Ombudsman. The Ombudsman would normally expect a complainant to have exhausted the Complaints Procedure before getting involved.]

[Note: Secure tenants are entitled to refer complaints to the Local Government Ombudsman. Depending on the identity of the landlord, this may change to the Housing Ombudsman.]

2.17 In some circumstances you may be able to take us to court (a list of advice agencies is given in [the Tenant's Handbook]).

Data Protection Act 1998

2.18 The management of the Landlord's housing stock involves the processing of personal data of tenants, for example, for the purposes of allocation or determining a tenant’s rights, and sometimes also of sensitive personal data such as ethnicity or gender. By signing this you will also be giving your consent to the legitimate processing of such data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

2.19 The data held by the Landlord in respect of your Tenancy Agreement will be used for crossmatching and cross-authority comparison purposes for the prevention and detection of fraud.

Photographs for all new tenants

2.20 We will take photographs of all new tenants as and when they come in to sign their Tenancy Agreement or as soon as is reasonably practical thereafter. Where a sole tenancy changes to a joint tenancy, or there is a succession or assignment of a tenancy, the photograph of the new joint tenant / succeeding tenant will also be required. The photographs will be retained electronically and stored safely. We will not disclose these to any third parties unless we are required to do so by law, and they will be kept securely.

2.21 Photographs held will be used to help us identify people living in our properties without our
permission and tenants who have sublet their homes illegally. They will solely be used for the prevention of fraud / criminal behaviour.
SECTION B: YOUR RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

YOUR RENT

3 Your duty to pay rent and Other Charges

3.1 One of the most important responsibilities is to pay your rent and Other Charges. You must pay these a week in advance from the date your tenancy starts. You may be able to get help with paying your rent by claiming housing benefit. [Your Housing Officer] will help you to make a claim when you sign up.

3.2 You must pay your [weekly] rent on Monday each week for the week to come. The total payments you owe will include Other Charges as set out in your Tenancy Agreement.

3.3 [We set out the amount of rent that you must pay from the start of the Tenancy in your Tenancy Agreement document, as well as the amount of any Other Charges [(which we treat as part of the rent)] that you must pay - for example heating, hot water, and any water and sewerage charges we collect for the water company. You may also have a separate agreement for a particular service (for example a garage), which may require you to pay further charges a week in advance.]

   [Note: The Council currently charges a service charge, which is included as part of your rent. The service charge is an amount payable for items such as repairs, improvements, maintenance and insurance. We recognise that service charge levels are important to you and that these need to be affordable and we are currently undertaking an assessment of the service charges that are likely to be charged to assured tenants of new estates.]

3.4 We are entitled to change the rent and Other Charges but must give you written notice before we do so. [Details are set out in the Tenant's Handbook.]

   [Note: The Council currently sets and reviews rents for its secure tenants. As a consequence of the change in landlord, the rent review process is likely to change. With regard to the level of the rent, we recognise that rent levels are very significant to tenants and we are currently undertaking an assessment of rent, reviews and affordability for new estates in the future. That said, it is the Council’s clear intention to continue charging council rents to existing secure tenants, however, as the new housing will not be available for some years, it is not possible to provide a precise indication of rent levels at this stage.]

3.5 Any payments that you make to us will be applied firstly to any arrears owed to us and starting with the oldest arrears shown on the rent account, unless we expressly notify you otherwise in writing.

3.6 If you live in a property for which we supply heating and hot water and there is a supply failure during the agreed heating supply times, you can sometimes get a refund. [Your Tenant's Handbook has more details about this.]
PROPERTY REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE, IMPROVEMENTS & ACCESS

You must tell us as soon as possible of any damage to the Property, or any repairs that are needed that are our responsibility. You should report this to your housing office.

4 Your responsibility for repairs

4.1 You are responsible for maintaining and replacing the entire inside of the Property except for those parts which these tenancy conditions or any statute specifies that we are responsible for. These are set out in Clause 5 below and you can see more details in your Tenant’s Handbook.

4.2 You are responsible for repairing or replacing any Fixtures and Fittings if you have put them in without our written permission, or if we gave you written permission but told you that we would not be responsible for repairing or replacing them.

4.3 You are also responsible for any repairs, or repairing or replacing any damage if the damage is caused deliberately or carelessly by you, your pet, a member of your household, your lodger, subtenant or a visitor to your Property or their pets. This also applies to damage caused to Communal Areas or other residents’ homes by washing machine and dishwasher installations in your Property.

4.4 If it is your responsibility to carry out a repair and you do not do it, we will tell you in writing of the repair and the time you should do it in. If you don’t do the repair within this time, we can enter your Property, do the work and charge you for the work (including our administrative costs).

5 Our responsibility for repairs

5.1 We will maintain the structure and outside of your Property.

5.2 We will maintain your Property’s drains, stack pipes, gutters and outside pipes.

5.3 We will keep in proper working order any fittings for supplying water, gas or electricity, toilet facilities and non-temporary space and water heating inside your Property which we provided, or that you have provided with our permission. If we decide the repair is not possible then we will replace the fittings.

5.4 For further details on our responsibilities concerning repairs, please see your [Tenant’s Handbook].

[Note: The Council is currently required to carry out certain repairs for its secure tenants within specific timescales. This is known as the “Right to Repair Scheme” and landlords other than local authorities are not obliged to comply. However, the new Tenant’s Handbook for this Tenancy Agreement will make clear that the landlord will also comply with the Right to Repair Scheme.]

6 Your responsibility for decorations

6.1 You must keep the inside of your Property reasonably well decorated.

7 Our responsibility for decorations

7.1 We will decorate the outside of your Property and Communal Areas of flats and maisonettes from time to time. You can only decorate the outside of your Property with our written permission. When asking for permission you must give us a plan of how you wish to decorate.
7.2 We will also do any decorating which is needed because we have carried out repairs which are our responsibility, or improvements. If we decide to do so, we may give you a reasonable allowance to do it instead. This does not apply where the works were necessary because you had breached your tenancy obligations.

7.3 If you are elderly aged 70 and over, or have a disability or other special reasons, living alone, and there is no other member of your household or family who can help, we will decorate a number of rooms in your home under a planned programme.

8 **Your responsibility for cleaning**

8.1 You must keep your Property clean and tidy. If it becomes infested with pests or vermin because of your failure to keep it clean we will charge you for the cost of disinfecting it and any other costs of cleaning your Property.

8.2 You must keep any garden, yard, window box or balcony that forms part of your Property tidy and free of rubbish.

8.3 If you live in a self-contained flat in a street property with a shared entrance or hallway, you and the other tenants of that street property are responsible for keeping the shared entrance or hallway clean and tidy.

8.4 If you live in a block of flats with a balcony entry in front of your flat, you are responsible for keeping the doorwell in front of your flat clean, tidy and clear of obstructions.

8.5 You must not block, obstruct, create or leave any hazard on landing, corridor, stairwell, lift, refuse chute, access way, fire escape or any other communal area or wedge open fire door or security door if you live in a building with communal facilities.

8.6 The [Landlord] may from time to time publish regulations in respect of recycling household and/or bulk waste. You must keep to the rules of that scheme and in the event you do not we may impose a penalty charge, or take such other action we think appropriate which may include a charge for removing and disposing of the waste.

9 **Our responsibility for cleaning**

9.1 We will arrange to clean the Communal Areas (other than those that you are obliged to clean, as set out in the previous section).

9.2 We will remove and dispose of any personal belongings left in the Communal Areas that block, obstruct or are hazardous and recharge the cost to the person responsible.

10 **Our responsibilities for communal areas and lift maintenance**

10.1 We will take all reasonable steps to keep all lifts in working order.

10.2 We will make sure that grassed areas of estates are mown and any flower beds, hedges and trees on the estate are kept tidy and free of rubbish.

10.3 We will take all reasonable steps to keep all communal lighting, entry-call systems, communal aerials and domestic refuse facilities in good repair.
For details on target response times, contact your housing office.

11 Gardens and fences

11.1 If you have a garden, you must keep it reasonably tidy. If you fail to keep it reasonably tidy, we may require you to tidy your garden, or we may decide to do the work for you and to charge you for it. You are also responsible for keeping trees and hedges within your garden pruned and trimmed back so they do not cause an obstruction or nuisance to others. You must not cut down, remove, relocate, plant or significantly alter any tree in your Property unless we have given you our written permission in advance. Remember that many trees on estates are Landlord property, and many are also legally protected through Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), so it is important to check first before any work takes place.

11.2 You must get our written permission before you put up a shed, porch, fence or any similar structure in your garden. If we give you permission, you must then maintain and look after the structure.

12 Insurance

12.1 We will insure the structure of the building against certain risks, together with our fixtures and fittings, but we are unable to insure your fixtures, furniture or possessions.

12.2 Where the damage to a tenant's home is caused by a fault within the Landlord’s responsibility / ability to keep certain items in good repair (e.g. hidden pipes under a bath), and if it is proven that the damage was caused by no fault / neglect of the tenant, the Landlord will repair and redecorate all affected areas.

13 Our right to enter your Property

13.1 You must let our officers, contractors or management agents enter your Property to:

(a) inspect or survey your Property or adjoining property for any reason;
(b) carry out any repairs, gas servicing, treatment, modernisation or improvements; or safety inspections;
(c) deal with any other matter for which we are responsible including inspecting the condition of your property and ascertaining who is living there;
(d) to ensure compliance with the conditions of this agreement and health and safety regulations;
(e) to carry out emergency work.

13.2 You can allow our officers or agents to enter your Property at any time without notice if it is convenient for you. You must let our officers or agents enter your Property if we give you at least 24 hours’ written notice and ensure that an adult is present.
13.3 If you do not let us in to your Property after we have given you proper notice we may force entry and charge you for any costs, any damage or financial or other loss caused by the delay.

13.4 Our officers or agents may also enter your Property without giving notice if, they believe that you or others are at risk or that the Property or any other property may be damaged if they do not enter. We will do our best to contact you before we force entry to your Property. If there is no-one in the Property to let us in we will make sure that your Property is secure after we have carried out our inspection or any work we have to do.

13.5 Where it is reasonably necessary for the Property to be empty for us to carry out any works you must give us access by moving into temporary accommodation. We will provide you with temporary accommodation which is reasonably suitable to your needs (Note that this may not be accommodation which is equivalent to your Property if a different kind of property is reasonably suitable for your needs).

14 Alterations and improvements

14.1 You must not alter the structure or outside of the Property or the building in which it stands in any way without our written permission. For example, you must not fix a security grille to your external doors or windows or put up a satellite dish, aerial or other telecommunications equipment to the exterior of the building. This rule also applies to garages, greenhouses, sheds, pigeon lofts, parking spaces, driveways and walls.

14.2 You must not install laminate floor covering or sanded floor boards in the Property, other than:
   (a) on the ground floor; and then
   (b) only if there is no-one living beneath you, without first obtaining written permission from the Landlord.

14.3 Any existing laminate flooring and sanded floorboards can remain only if there are no complaints from the neighbours or a nuisance to others living in adjacent properties. If there are complaints then we would have to ask you to remove the floor covering in the Property or take measures to minimise noise being transmitted to adjacent properties.

14.4 The Landlord recognises that there may be circumstances where carpet and additives in alternative floor coverings may exacerbate some health conditions. The Landlord will develop mitigating policies and procedures to reduce any adverse impact on tenants under such circumstances.

14.5 You must not make any alteration to the Property such as remove any internal walls or take out any other part of the building which is in breach of any planning or building control regulation, whether you have sought and obtained our permission or not. If you do carry out any improvements or changes to your Property or add any fixtures or fittings without our permission, or in breach of any planning or building control regulation, we may require you to put back the Property to its original condition, or we may do this and charge you the cost of doing so and of rectifying any damage that may have been caused to the Property or the building in which it stands.

[Note: Secure tenants cannot carry out improvements without consent (as it set out here). In addition, for secure tenancies: (a) the landlord is obliged to pay compensation for improvements in certain circumstances; and (b) the landlord may not increase the rent on account of certain improvements being carried out. This will be extended to the tenants under this Tenancy Agreement and it is intended that the details of this will be set out in the Tenant's Handbook.]
14.6 We will not be responsible for any damage that is caused whilst removing anything you have installed without our permission.

15 \textit{Recharges}

15.1 In addition to specific clauses mentioned here, there are other occasions where the Landlord will recharge for costs incurred. Please see your Tenant's Handbook for more details.

15A \textit{Consultation \& Information}

15A.1 We will publish information about the terms of our assured tenancies. We will also publish a summary of our rules for determining priority as between applicants in the allocation of housing accommodation. Further details can be found in the Tenant's Handbook.

15A.2 We will maintain such arrangements as we consider appropriate to enable you, if you are likely to be substantially affected by a matter of Housing Management and/or any proposal to dispose to homes subject to Assured Tenancies, to be informed of any proposals and to let us have your views. Further details can be found in the Tenant's Handbook.
YOUR USE OF THE PROPERTY

Your obligations as a Tenant apply to you, and anyone else living or visiting your Home. We will also hold you responsible for any breach of these tenancy conditions by any persons living with you or visiting your Home.

16 Your use and occupation of the Property

16.1 You must live at your Property as your only or principal home.

16.2 You can only carry out a business or trade from your Property if you get our written permission first. This will only be given if you can work from your Property without causing a nuisance to anyone else or break any planning or use regulations. It may be withdrawn if, having granted permission, the business or trade causes a nuisance or you break any planning or use regulations.

16.3 If you are going to be away from your Property for more than 8 weeks, you must let us know in writing. If you do not do so we will normally assume that you have abandoned the Property.¹

16.4 If you are going to be away from the Property for more than 6 months we will normally assume that you no longer wish to occupy the Property as your only or principal home. You may wish to discuss the circumstances of this with us if this is not the case.

16.5 If you do not return to the Property after the date you told us you would be returning, we will assume that you have abandoned the Property. You must contact the housing office at least once a month if you are away from your Property for a long time.

16.6 If you go away without telling us and we discover someone else living in the Property, we will assume that you have sublet the Property or parted with possession of it and may take legal action to end your Tenancy.

16.7 We will not usually accept rent from anyone other than you unless we have agreed to this in advance. If we do accept a payment made by someone other than the Tenant it is accepted only on the basis that it is paid on the Tenant’s behalf.

16.8 While you are a tenant you must inform us if you acquire any legal or beneficial interest in any other residential property. If we discover that you have a legal or beneficial interest in another property we will assume that that is your principal home unless you show us that this is not the case.

¹ NOTE: As well as obtaining our written permission for any alteration or business use of your Property you should always check whether or not planning, building control or other permissions are needed. You can get more advice about these from the Borough of Lambeth’s Planning Department
17 Your right to have sub-tenants or lodgers

17.1 You can take in lodgers if this does not cause the Property to become overcrowded.

17.2 You can sublet part of your Property, but only if you have our written permission first. If you sublet part of your Property you must not allow this to cause the Property to become overcrowded. [Details of how to apply for consent and the basis on which we will consider granting consent are set out in the Tenant's Handbook].

[Note: The Tenant's Handbook will set out the basis on which we will grant consent, which will mirror the current statutory basis for secure tenants.]

17.3 You cannot sublet the whole of your Property. If you do so, you will lose your status as an Assured Tenant and we will take action straight away to end the Tenancy and evict you.

18 Changes in your Household

18.1 You must notify us in writing within 4 weeks of any long-term change in the people who are living in the Property. Please see your Tenant's Handbook for further details.

19 Assignment, Exchange & Succession

19.1 ‘Assignment’ is where you transfer your Tenancy to someone else. ‘Succession’ is where a tenancy passes to someone else when the tenant has died. ‘Exchange’ is where you swap your Property with another of our tenants, or a tenant of another local authority, housing association or certain other bodies.

19.2 Assignment, Succession and Exchange can only take place under the limited circumstances set out in the Tenant's Handbook and (in the case of Exchange) with our written permission which we can only withhold in certain specified circumstances. Your rights will depend on whether there has been a previous succession. You may also require the written permission of any other landlord involved.

19.3 Under the terms of "Lambeth’s Tenancy Policy (February 2013)", in the case of tenancies granted after 1st April 2012, succession rights will be afforded to tenants’ children who have lived with the tenant for 12 months prior to the tenant’s death, in addition to the statutory right to succeed conferred by the Housing Act 1988 (as amended).

19.4 Details of the circumstances in which Assignment, Succession & Exchange can take place, and the circumstances in which we can withhold permission are set out in the Tenant's Handbook.

[Note: The Tenant's Handbook will set out the basis on assignment, exchange and succession may take place, and these will broadly mirror the current statutory basis for secure tenants.]

20 Pets

20.1 You may keep a dog if your property is suitable and you have written permission from your housing office. If permission is given, it will be on condition that the dog is micro chipped and relevant owner details recorded and kept up to date. The dog must not cause any damage to your home or cause nuisance, danger or harm to any other person in or around the locality. You are allowed to keep assistance dogs for either yourself or members of your household.
20.2 Permission will not be granted for dogs covered by the Dangerous Dogs Act, such as pit bull terrier, Japanese Tosa, Dogo Argentino, Fila Braziliero or any other especially dangerous dogs.

20.3 You may keep a cat, small caged pets or fish in small aquarium.

20.4 Except in a very exceptional case we would never grant permission to have more than 2 dogs and we will not give permission if we think your home is unsuitable for your pet, or would cause a nuisance or danger to any other person. Permission to have domestic pets may be withdrawn at any time. You are not allowed to sell pets from your property or in and around the locality.

20.5 Your households’ or visitors’ pets must not be allowed to foul the inside of your Property or any Communal Areas. Under the Control of Dogs Order (1992) a dog must wear a collar and tag giving the owner’s name / address at all times while in public and must be kept on a lead at all times when walking on estates. We will charge you the costs if we have to clean up after a pet, or repair damage caused by a pet, which is owned by you, a member of your Household, a lodger, sub-tenant or visitor.
ILLEGAL AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

20A Definitions

In Clauses 21-23 (inclusive):

20A.1 The term ‘Property’ includes the Communal Areas.

20A.2 The ‘Locality’ is the general area in which the Property sits.

20A.3 Where these tenancy conditions require you not to do anything, you must also not permit any of your Household or any visitor to do so.

20A.4 If any joint tenant, or member of your Household or any visitor does any act which is forbidden by these tenancy conditions you (or in the case of joint tenants, all of you) will be held responsible for that act as if you had yourself done that act.

21 Your duty not to let the Property be used for illegal activities

21.1 You must not use your Property, or permit it to be used, for an illegal purpose or activity.

21.2 You must not carry out any illegal activity in the Locality.

22 Your duty not to cause nuisance or harass others

22.1 You may not put anything in the Communal Areas that is likely to cause a nuisance, annoyance or danger to anyone. This includes washing, personal belongings and household rubbish not left inside the bins provided. We will charge you for the cost of clearing anything left by you or your household or visitors which is likely to cause a nuisance, annoyance or danger to anyone.

22.2 You must ensure that you have adequate floor coverings to stop or reasonably minimise noise being transmitted to adjacent properties. You must ensure that only curtains or proper window dressings are used at windows. You must not cover the walls in fabric or other materials so as to significantly impede the exposure of the walls to air.

22.3 You must not do anything which is, or which is intended to, or which is likely to be a nuisance or danger to other people, or which causes damage to our property or the property of our tenants and lessees, their families, lodgers or visitors. For example, you must not:

(i) play any music or use a radio, television or other equipment in a way which is intended or is likely to annoy any other person;

(ii) allow your dog, or a dog brought into your Property by someone living with you or visiting your Property, to bark in a way which is likely to annoy any other person or to foul the Communal Areas or the Locality;

(iii) put up any sign, notice or advert (except a temporary notice of reasonable size about elections or community events) without our written permission;

(iv) block any Communal Area, either by standing or sitting there or by leaving gas cylinders and other hazardous items, rubbish, prams, bicycles or other objects there;
(v) damage any part of the Property or the Communal Areas;
(vi) throw rubbish or anything from a window or balcony, or anywhere in the estate or Locality;
(vii) feed pigeons or other pests;
(viii) unreasonably rev engines or use noisy machinery or tools;
(ix) damage, deface or write graffiti in the Communal Areas or Locality;
(x) remove wheel clamps fitted by us or our contractors;
(xi) interfere with security and safety equipment;
(xii) tamper with gas or electric supplies or with the meters;
(xiii) park illegally or contrary to any directions or notice issued by us, or in any way that may hinder the collection of refuse or emergency vehicles or without reasonable consideration for other road-users;
(xiv) undertake any activity which produces poisonous fumes;
(xv) leave oil or car parts on estates, or in garages or parking areas;
(xvi) leave hypodermic needles or syringes in the Locality, or dispose of them anywhere except in a designated "sharps" bin.

22.4 You must not be violent, abusive or threatening towards any other person in the Property or the Locality or allow members of your household or invited visitors to do so.

22.5 You must not be violent, abusive or threatening towards any officers, representatives or contractors or allow members of your household or invited visitors to do this.

22.6 You must not be violent, abusive or threatening towards or discriminate against anyone who also has a right to be in the Property or Locality, because of their race, sex, sexuality, age, religious belief or disability. And you must not allow members of your household or invited visitors to do this.

22.7 You must comply with any regulations which we impose from time to time concerning parking of vehicles and any other matters relating to the Property or estate.

22.8 You must not keep any firearm, shotgun, or air-powered weapon (for example, an air rifle) in the Property without appropriate firearms or shotgun certification required by any legislation and (whether any certification is required) not without the Landlord’s written permission. If you are permitted to keep such an item, you must ensure that it is secure and you must comply with any legal requirements or any conditions of our permission at all times.

22.9 You must not discharge any firearm, shotgun, rifle, air weapon in the Property or in the Locality.

23 Risk of fire, flood and other damage

23.1 You must not do anything which increases the risk of fire, flood or damage to your Property, or that might affect our insurance against these risks or make us responsible for damage or annoyance.

23.2 You must not keep flammable material, liquids or gases in the Property (other than may be reasonably required for domestic use) or do anything (including holding a barbeque), which might
cause a fire, flood or other damage to the Property.

23.3 You are not allowed to use a barbeque or patio heater on or directly underneath balconies. You may have a barbeque in your garden provided it is safe to do so and does not cause a nuisance to your neighbours.

23.4 If you live in a flat or maisonette you are not allowed to keep or use liquid petroleum gas other than that in disposable containers such as aerosols which comply with the current British Standard for disposable cylinders and which have a maximum capacity of 1 litre. The number of such cylinders must be limited to that reasonable for domestic use.

23.5 You must not store dangerous or hazardous substances in the Communal Areas or the Locality.

24 Parking and vehicles repairs

24.1 You must not park any vehicles on our land unless they are roadworthy, taxed and insured, unless you can provide a valid acknowledgment of a Statutory Off Road Notice (SORN) issued by the DVLA for the period. A copy of the SORN must be visible on the vehicle and vehicles with a SORN must not be parked on our land for more than six months. After six months a vehicle with a SORN will be considered to be abandoned.

24.2 You must not abandon any vehicle on our land. Any abandoned vehicles may be removed and disposed of.

24.3 You must not park anywhere on our land except in areas signposted for parking and which is made available for you to use. We may require you to pay to park on our land. If there is a local parking regulation in force, you must keep to the rules of that scheme.

24.4 If we discover a vehicle parked in an area which is not signposted for parking, or parked other than in accordance with any local parking regulation or without the appropriate fee having been paid we may have it wheel clamped or towed away. You will have to pay a fine to get your vehicle back, if it has not by then been destroyed or disposed of.

24.5 You must get our written permission to park a caravan, boat, or trailer on our land or on any part of your garden or yard.

24.6 You must also get our permission to park a commercial vehicle on our land, or on any part of your garden or yard, if it is more than 16 feet (4.8 metres) long, or more than 6 foot (1.83 metres) wide, or more than 6 foot 6 inches (2 metres) high.

24.7 You must not carry out major repairs including engine changes, body part replacements and paint spraying, to any vehicle at the Property or on our land. You may carry out routine maintenance such as the changing of tyres, plugs or oil, providing that this does not cause a hazard or nuisance or annoyance. In particular when changing oil you must not allow it to foul roadways or paths. You must not pour oil, petrol or any other chemical substance down drains or gullies or place it in domestic bins. You will be responsible for cost of remediying any damage caused to the Property or Communal Areas as a result of vehicle repairs and maintenance that you have carried out.
SECTION C: ENDING YOUR TENANCY

25 Your Right to end your Tenancy

25.1 If you want to end your Tenancy, unless we agree something else in writing you must give us at least four weeks written notice and this must be delivered to your local housing office. The period of written notice that you give must end on a Monday.

25.2 Notice given by one joint tenant will end the Tenancy for all joint tenants. If you are a joint tenant we strongly recommend that you tell all the other joint tenant(s) if you are serving a notice.

26 Our power to end your tenancy (Assured Tenancies Only)

26.1 As an Assured Tenant you have the right to stay in your Property. We cannot evict you from the Property unless the court grants us an order for possession which will require you to leave your home on a specific date.

26.2 Before we start court proceedings we must serve on you a 'Notice of Intention to Seek Possession'. The notice will tell you why we want to end your tenancy and when we will be entitled to start court proceedings. We may only ask the court to end your Tenancy for one (or more) of the grounds set out in schedule 2 of the Housing Act 1988. A detailed summary of grounds is set out in the Tenant's Handbook. They include:

(1) You have not paid the rent for a specified period of time;

(2) You have broken any of the other tenancy conditions;

(3) [Your partner has left home because of your violence or threats of violence against them, or against a member of their family residing with them, and they are unlikely to return;]

(Note: Whether this Ground applies will depend on the identity of the landlord.)

(4) You, a member of your household or a visitor to your home has caused a nuisance, or annoyed any one;

(5) You or a member of your household or visitor to your home has been convicted of using your home, or allowing it to be used, for illegal purposes, or has committed an arrestable offence in or near your home;

(6) The condition of the Property, or any of the Communal Areas, has worsened because of any actions, neglect or fault of you or anyone living with you;

(7) You or anyone acting together with you or for you has lied to help you get a tenancy;

(8) Your Property is to be demolished or reconstructed;

(9) "Suitable Alternative Accommodation" is available to you to move into.

26.3 In some cases we are required to offer you 'Suitable Alternative Accommodation’ before we obtain a court order. The Tenant's Handbook Explains what this means.

27 Our power to end your tenancy (Demoted Tenancies)

27.1 If, during a [Demoted Period], you break any of the tenancy conditions, or if we have some other good reason, we may take action to end your Tenancy. We must serve a notice upon you setting out the reasons that we intend to terminate your Tenancy called a ‘Notice of Proceedings for
27.2 The Notice of Proceedings for Possession which we send to you must explain why we want to evict you, your right to request a review of our decision within 14 days of the notice being served upon you, and where you can get legal help and advice about it.

27.3 Details of the review procedure are set out in the Tenancy Handbook. If you do not seek a review or the decision to terminate your Tenancy is upheld by the reviewing officer, we can then seek an order from the court and the court must make an order ending the Tenancy.

28 **Our power to end your tenancy (non-assured tenancies)**

28.1 If the tenancy has ceased to be an Assured Tenancy (for example because the Property is no longer your only or principal home or because you have sublet it) we can bring the tenancy to an end by giving at least 4 weeks’ written notice ending on a Monday.

28.2 Your obligations in this agreement continue to apply until your Assured Tenancy is brought to an end even if you leave the Property. The following rights (which apply to some kinds of tenancy) shall not apply to tenancies that are no longer Assured Tenancies:

1. The right to sublet part of your Property with permission, or to take in a lodger;
2. The right to assign your Tenancy;
3. The right to exchange your Property;
4. Although our obligations to repair your Property continue, the Right to Repair Scheme (which permits tenants in some circumstances to nominate another contractor) do not apply.

29 **Your responsibility when your Tenancy ends**

29.1 You will continue to be charged rent until you or we validly end your Tenancy. At the end of the Tenancy you will continue to be liable for any arrears that have not been cleared.

29.2 When your Tenancy ends you must give us back possession of your Property by leaving it vacant and returning the keys to your housing office.

29.3 When you leave your Property you must clear out all your belongings and any rubbish and leave the Property and its fixtures and fittings in as good a state as they were at the beginning of your Tenancy (allowing for fair wear and tear and any failure by us to do repairs).

29.4 We will inspect the Property at the end of your Tenancy. We will charge you for any repairs, cleaning, rubbish removal which we consider are your responsibility and for any damage caused before you have left the Property vacant and returned the keys to us. We may also charge you a sum equivalent to the lost rent while we carry out repairs if the condition of the Property prevents us from re-letting it because you did not carry out your responsibilities before returning the Property to us.

29.5 If you do not return all your keys when you leave the Property we will charge you the cost of replacing any locks, and the rent for the period until we have changed the locks.

29.6 If you are transferring to another one of our properties and fail to pay all outstanding charges we
may withdraw your offer of a transfer to an alternative home.

30 ‘Use and Occupation Charges’ and other sums owed to us

30.1 If you enter or remain in a property after a tenancy has ended, or before a tenancy has been granted to you, we are entitled to damages for your ‘use and occupation’ of the property. We may send you statements which show the damages that we are demanding for your ‘use and occupation’, which are sometimes known as ‘Use and Occupation Charges’. These are not the same as rent.

30.2 We will use any sums that you pay to us in the following order (unless we agree otherwise in writing:

(1) Any Rent or Other Charges shown on your rent account, starting with the oldest first; then

(2) Any Use and Occupation Charges to which we are entitled, starting with the oldest first; then

(3) any other amount that you owe us, for example the cost of any repairs, decorating, or cleaning which were your responsibility but which you did not carry out before returning the Property to us.

31 After your Tenancy has ended.

31.1 However, if your Tenancy is brought to an end, and even if we agree to let you remain in the Property after it has ended, you will no longer be a tenant from that point.

31.2 If your Tenancy has been ended by a court order (either on a specified date or because you have failed to comply with a condition of a suspended or postponed order) you may, in certain circumstances, be able to apply to court to revive your tenancy.

32 New Tenancies

32.1 We will not grant a tenancy to any person (whether or not they have previously been a tenant) except by entering into a written, signed Tenancy Agreement with that person(s). No other action by us is intended to grant you or any other person(s) a new tenancy.

32.2 Before a Tenancy Agreement has been entered into and a tenancy has started, or after your Tenancy has come to an end:

(1) If we refer to you in any document as a ‘tenant’ this does not mean that we are granting you (or anyone else) a new tenancy or licence.

(2) If we refer to any obligation on you to pay ‘rent’, we are referring to your obligation to compensate us for your ‘use and occupation’ of the property. We will seek to recover from you an amount equivalent to the rent set by the Landlord for that property for this time;

(3) If we send you a notice which refers to an alteration of the ‘rent’ (and/or Occupation Charges which make up part of the ‘rent’) you should treat this as notice of the amount that we will demand from you as Use and Occupation Charges whilst you continue to remain in that property, and as notice of the amount of rent which will be charged in the future if we ever grant you a new tenancy, or in relation to your old tenancy of that
property if it is ever revived.

(4) If we serve on you a notice referring to the alteration of our tenancy conditions, you should treat this as a notice of the tenancy conditions which would apply to a tenancy in the future if we ever grant you a new tenancy, or to your old tenancy if it is ever revived.
SECTION D: CHECKLIST OF DOS AND DON'TS

This is not a complete list of what you should and should not do. However, you must sign to commit yourself to this checklist. It forms part of your conditions of tenancy. If you do not sign it we will withdraw your offer of accommodation.

I agree to do the following:

TO PAY all my rent on time in advance.

NOT to harass, or let my family or friends harass anyone.

NOT to commit or permit any criminal act at or near the Property.

NOT to damage the Property and to return it to the Landlord in a good state when I leave.

Where I have a garden, TO KEEP it tidy.

TO DISPOSE of my rubbish in the appropriate bins provided.

TO BE RESPONSIBLE for the good behaviour of my family, friends and visitors in my home, on the estate and local areas.

TO ENSURE that any pets the Landlord has given me permission to have are kept in order and do not make a mess, bark or any other way cause a nuisance, or damage my home or other homes in the vicinity or any part of the estate I live on.

TO ABIDE BY the parking scheme on my estate and ensure that any vehicle used by me or my household is taxed and insured, unless I produce a valid DVLA acknowledgement of a Statutory Off Road Notice (SORN), for the period which will not exceed 6 months.

I understand and agree to the conditions listed above and that if I break this agreement the Landlord has the right to take action to evict me from my home.

Signed:

Print name:
Address:
Date:
Witnessed by:
Appendix B

Why Does LB Lambeth Need Homes for Lambeth to Support it to Deliver New Housing and Regeneration?

1.1 This document has been developed to provide a more detailed, technical narrative in support the proposal and recommendations to be considered by Cabinet in the report Homes for Lambeth: A Special Purpose Vehicle for Lambeth’ at its meeting on 12 October 2015.

1.2 This document should be read in conjunction with the Cabinet report and is a direct extension of the proposals presented therein.

1.3 The Council already has a number of options available to it for delivering new housing in Lambeth, which could be regarded as ‘self delivery’. These include:

- Entering into a Development Management Agreement with one or more private sector companies to develop and deliver new housing, which may be procured using one of a number of frameworks and panels that the Council is party to, or through a formal procurement exercise;
- Contracting with a Registered Provider to deliver new housing for social rents; or,
- Securing commitments from private developers to deliver affordable housing (on or off-site) through the planning process. In some cases a sum of cash may be paid in lieu by the developer, which may be deployed directly by the Council for new housing delivery.

1.4 However, in considering the Council’s ambitions to deliver significant volumes of new housing that meets the current and future needs of for Lambeth’s residents (and which includes adding significantly to the availability of new homes at Council rent levels), it is essential to note that these ambitions cannot be effectively realised through conventional approaches alone and as such there is a clear need for a new approach to housing delivery in Lambeth.

1.5 Conventional mechanisms provide the Council with only a limited ability to stimulate and shape the pace, volume and mix of housing delivered, or to control the delivery of housing in a way that supports its wider agenda for regeneration and growth:

1.5.1 The estimated numbers of new homes that will be delivered at an equivalent to Council rent levels through these approaches will not meet the Council’s targets for current or future residents’ needs, this shortfall also extends across a range of tenures and a range of price points.

1.5.2 There is little incentive for private developers to share the surpluses of development and efforts made by public bodies to raise the levels of affordable housing to be delivered are typically met with resistance across the market.
1.5.3 Where the Council is not directly involved in originating new development activity, its ability to directly influence private development is primarily effected through the planning system, which provides only very limited abilities to increase the pace and scale of delivery, or to optimise local socioeconomic benefits for residents.

1.5.4 Viability testing and constraints in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) mean that developers can legally negotiate affordable housing offers that are lower than required in local planning policies if the financial modelling shows that the financial return on investment will be less than 20%. The effect of the viability assessments is that sometimes developments deliver below Lambeth’s stated aims on the proportion of affordable and social housing delivered, or these units are provided off-site within an agreed radius.

1.5.5 The number of new social rented units being built in the borough has fallen dramatically due to the Central Government cutting the grant for building new social homes. In 2010-11, 700 new social homes were built in Lambeth in one year; by 2013-14 this had fallen to 120; the forecast for 2015-16 from housing associations is that just 40 homes for social rent will be built. New housing delivery planned by registered providers (RPs) will not make up the shortfall and it is questionable whether many RPs could offer the capacity, flexibility or assurances around nominations to the Council that it needs. In view of Central Government’s pre-election statements around the intentions for RTB to be extended to RP stock, RPs face a period of significant uncertainty about their future investment abilities.

1.5.6 The Localism Act 2011 states that the Council must carry out activities that are commercial in purpose (such as the objective of creating a surplus for future growth and expansion plans, which could for example include development of homes for private rent), through a company and cannot carry them out itself. Therefore, a Special Purpose Vehicle in the form of a standalone business is required if the Council’s strategic intention is to create a surplus, to be reinvested for future activities.

1.5.7 Legislation imposes a ring-fence as between the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the General Fund. Any housing activities carried out directly by the Council (with the exception of temporary accommodation) must be carried out within the HRA.

1.5.8 As part of the summer budget, Central Government announced plans for a 1% cut in social rents, which means that the HRA will struggle to deliver the remainder of the LHS Programme without some cuts to revenue budgets. As such, the Council is currently revising the HRA Business Plan to identify its options to fund its existing revenue and capital commitments. The Council must safeguard its ability to meet its long-term obligations towards maintaining its social housing stock. As such these cuts limit is effective abilities to deliver new housing via the HRA.

1.5.9 Further to this, the HRA borrowing cap effectively limits the Council’s ability to use its existing HRA resources, or increase its borrowing in order to directly deliver new homes for social rent. The base position for Council-led housing delivery is that capital investment in HRA assets is accounted for within the HRA, and any financing requirements will lead to an increase in the HRA capital finance requirement. As such, the Council is effectively constrained in its ability to increase its HRA capital financing requirement.
1.5.10 Although the Council has secured a significant income stream from One for One (1-4-1) RTB receipts which are to be used to deliver replacement social housing, this funding comes with a number of attached conditions that restrict how it may be used. In effect, these conditions limit how the funding may be used and place the Council at risk of repaying any sums unspent within a given period with interest. Specifically, if the Council wishes to use RTB receipts to fund acquisition or development of property it must find 70% of the costs of doing so from its own resources, within the HRA. It cannot obtain "match funding" from any other public sector sources. As identified above, there are significant capacity pressures on the HRA brought about by planned cuts mandated by Central Government.

1.5.11 A number of factors are contributing to a lack of available finance for publicly-funded house building. Grant finance to Registered Social Landlords for building affordable housing is being significantly reduced – the last round of funding provided on average only 10% of delivery costs, and with what little grant that is available being focused on 'affordable' rent rather than social rent. Coupled with the borrowing limitations on the HRA and the restrictions on the use of Right to Buy receipts, these factors are severely inhibiting the availability of finance for house building.

1.5.12 A significant source of potential funding that is available to the Council is the Public Works Loan Board. However, because of the HRA borrowing cap it isn’t possible to make use of this source beyond the limits imposed by the cap.

1.5.13 Funding brought into the Council by way of an investment as opposed to a loan would necessitate the creation of some form of Joint Venture, in order to provide the third party investor with an equity position to invest against. If the Council wishes to retain control over delivery then this route would not be suitable as a ‘catch-all’ for new housing delivery.

1.5.14 Consequently, in considering the Council’s ambitions to deliver significant volumes of new housing that meets the current and future needs of Lambeth’s residents (and which includes adding significantly to the availability of new homes at Council rent levels), it is essential to note that these ambitions cannot be effectively realised through conventional approaches alone under the current Government’s policies for housing and funding. As such there is a clear need for a new approach to housing delivery in Lambeth.
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Appendix C: Frequently Asked Questions

Homes for Lambeth

What is ‘Homes for Lambeth’?
‘Homes for Lambeth’ is a new company set up by the Council and wholly owned by the Council. The company will bring in money from pension funds and other sources which the Council can’t itself use. It will use this money to build more homes and better homes in Lambeth to meet the growing demands for home in the borough.

What is a ‘special purpose vehicle’?
‘Homes for Lambeth’ is a special purpose vehicle (SPV). An SPV is a company that the Council can set up, control and own to fund the development of new Council homes. In addition, where appropriate, it will undertake commercial development for the benefit of local people – so that we retain and reinvest surpluses into building homes and delivering the services that local people need and desire.

Why is the Council setting up ‘Homes for Lambeth’?
Homes for Lambeth will allow the Council to:

- Take greater control over the pace, quality and volume of new housing delivery in Lambeth across a range of tenures, in order to address market failures and to support the Council's growth agenda.
- Take an active role in delivering complementary regeneration, commercial and infrastructure developments in addition to new housing;
- Access funding from a variety of public and private sources
- Minimise the leakage of financial surpluses to the private sector and generating income that can be reinvested in housing and other development
- Enable the Council to invest in developments which are intended to generate an investment return;
- Provide the Council with a flexible platform that can grow and evolve to support it to realise new strategic delivery opportunities; and,
- Effectively manage the Council’s overall exposure to the risks of development.

Are the buildings being built going to be owned by Homes for Lambeth?
Yes, the Council will grant long-leases to Homes for Lambeth to build new homes. However, the Council will still own the land. In addition Council tenants who move into a home owned by Homes for Lambeth will still be managed by Lambeth Council.

Are any retained buildings on estates which are part of the estate regeneration programme going to be transferred to Homes for Lambeth?
No, it is not expected that the Homes for Lambeth will take on the ownership of buildings that it has not delivered.

Is the Council going to own Homes for Lambeth? Under what conditions and subject to what constraints would the Council allow other investors to take an interest in Homes for Lambeth?
The Council will own all the shares in Homes for Lambeth. There will, however, be the potential for Homes for Lambeth to create subsidiary companies. These could be joint ventures in which the equity could be shared with a third party. The Council would consider doing this so, for example, we can use Right to Buy Receipts to build more and better homes.
Can the Council sell Homes for Lambeth?
Ultimately yes, however the articles and governance arrangements for Homes for Lambeth will safeguard the Council’s long-term commitment to prioritising the needs of Lambeth’s communities.

In addition the Council will require that any proposed sale of part of all of Homes for Lambeth (and any of its companies) be subject to a ‘triple lock’ of approvals:

- A unanimous vote of full Cabinet; and,
- A 2/3rds vote of full Council approval; and,
- A unanimous agreement of the Homes for Lambeth Board.

In addition the Council will deploy a robust approach to governing the actions of Homes for Lambeth to ensure that it remains fully committed to its objectives to support Lambeth’s communities.

Why can the present tenancies and leases not be assigned into the new SPV?
Only local authorities can grant secure tenancies for properties held within their Housing Revenue Accounts. Homes for Lambeth will however offer a new form of tenancy which will be offered to existing Council tenants in the form of assured lifetime tenancies (See Appendix A of the Cabinet report).

This seeks to provide an assured lifetime tenancy that mirrors as far as is possible the terms of existing secure tenancies, with the exception of the Right to Buy, Right to Manage and Right to Transfer. There is the option for secure tenants to seek to move to other properties within Lambeth, away from their existing estate, in order to maintain their secure tenancy status.

Existing leaseholders, who chose to remain on an estate and take up the Council’s offer of shared equity or shared ownership or full ownership, will need to transfer to new leases granted by the Homes for Lambeth.

What happens to my right to buy?
If you move to a new home built by Homes for Lambeth, you would not have the Right to Buy under the Lifetime Assured Tenancy. If you move to an existing Council property off the estate, your secure tenancy would still include the Right to Buy unless for example the home you move to is exempt, for example sheltered accommodation.

Can the SPV be criminally convicted under the Landlord & Tenants Act?
As a private company, Homes for Lambeth can be criminally convicted. In order to establish liability the Court would need to show that the “controlling mind” of the company knew about and directed the activity involved. In the case of Homes for Lambeth this would mean the company’s board. The board will be made up of council officers elected members.

Will the current rights of redress that residents currently enjoy be replicated with the new arrangements? Will residents be able to sue the SPV?
The Local Government Ombudsman can only deal with local authorities and certain other public bodies. Homes for Lambeth would not be covered by this. However tenants and leaseholders transferring into Homes for Lambeth properties would have other routes for complaints including the Housing Ombudsman.
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Wards: All
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Report summary
The reintegration of Lambeth Living provides an opportunity to transform and improve housing management services and provide a direction of travel for wider service integration. This paper:

- provides an update on the short term plan to improve services following reintegration; and,
- looks to the next 3-5 years and the ambition to develop an integrated model of service delivery which focuses on better and cheaper outcomes for residents, particularly those who are vulnerable, and delivers services which improve wellbeing.

Finance summary
None arising from this report.

Recommendations
(1) To note the successful transfer of housing management services from the Arms Length Management Organisation back to the Council and the subsequent service improvement programme.
(2) To note the development of a task force to develop a common understanding of vulnerability and wellbeing across the council and with partners.
(3) To agree that the Cabinet Member for Housing oversees the improvement action plans.
(4) To agree the proposals for consultation to change the engagement governance structure for housing management tenants and leaseholders.
1. **Context**

1.1 Housing Management provides services to 24,000 tenants and 9,000 leaseholders. It is responsible for collecting rents, providing estate services such as cleaning, repairs and maintenance. Many of the actual services are provided under contracts with external companies. We are midway through the largest ever improvement programme as part of the Lambeth Housing Standard.

1.2 Cabinet agreed in April 2015, that reintegrating housing management services into the Council would allow a more 'joined-up' approach to services, based on the recognised link between housing, health and life chances. This decision also provided:

- an opportunity for tenants and residents to influence the shape of a new housing service;
- better alignment of housing management with other council services;
- better value for money for residents;
- savings to reinvest in services; and,
- better support to housing management services to improve performance.

1.3 Over a short time scale a project plan to ensure the smooth transfer was implemented, a new Director of Housing Management appointed and services successfully returned to the Council on 26 June 2015. This is in itself a remarkable achievement and was organised and implemented across delivery, commissioning and enabling teams as well as involving residents and other stakeholders including Lambeth Living staff and the Lambeth Living Board.

2. **Proposals and reasons**

2.1 Improving housing management services

With housing management back in house there are significant opportunities to improve and develop joint and integrated services. The first integration step has been to bring Housing Delivery services under the line management of the Director of Housing Management. There will also be an early realignment of the senior management team within housing and a redesign of services to meet service priorities. It is however important to manage expectations and understand that not everything will change immediately. It is also important to recognise and celebrate some of the existing work, often beyond basic bricks and mortar maintenance.

2.2 This report sets out the priorities for the development of the service within the context of an uncertain future for the Council’s housing provision. The recent Government announcements since the general election and in the budget in particular will have a severe detrimental financial impact on the provision of housing services across the sector. These include:

- the change in rent policy from CPI+1% increases to an impending 1% rent reduction for four years from April 2016 will result in an HRA loss of between £2.5bn and £3.9bn nationally and around £28.5m from Lambeth’s HRA business plan against planned income;
- the policy for the forced sales of high value stock could mean the loss of an additional 100-120 units a year, on top of the increased reduction in stock through increased right to buy discounts;
- the continuous impact of welfare reform particularly the reduction in the benefit cap and the introduction of Universal Credit is likely to affect rent collection;
- the access to lettings from Registered Providers (nearly half of new lets) will be hit by the extension of the right to buy to registered provider (housing association) tenants and so put additional pressure on our own stock; and,
- there are also likely to be additional requirements placed on the service through the Government’s “pay to stay” policy, requiring the Council to collect – but not retain - substantially higher rents from tenants earning more than £40k.

The Council is both actively involved in working with other local authorities and stakeholders on policies to mitigate some of the worst impacts of these changes and working to assess possible implications. It is anticipated that the Government will publish a Housing Bill in October with more details.

2.3 We will also need to consider other changes such as the impact of the estate regeneration programme, in terms of the housing management service’s key role in assisting with the programme, and the longer term planning for managing a more diverse stock.

2.4 Meanwhile Housing Management services have continued to be provided during the transition process and improvements in performance have been sustained. Work has also started in the last three months to develop a new programme for improvement to reflect the issues and concerns raised by residents and other stakeholders during the consultation and transfer process. Housing Management has developed four key priorities based on resident feedback as areas for improvement or change:

- improving repairs and capital works services;
- better services for leaseholders;
- supporting vulnerable residents; and,
- improving engagement and involvement.

**Priority 1: repairs and capital works**

2.5 The majority of complaints, about 70%, are related to repairs or capital works. They are generally about the responsiveness of service, quality of work or poor communication. There has been evidence of appointments not being kept or mis recorded, delays in getting works done and a large number of outstanding jobs. The capital works team which is responsible for delivering the Lambeth Housing and Decent Homes standards, and investing almost half a billion pounds over five years, has been criticised in particular for poor communication with residents and members.

2.6 The good news is that services are improving:

- we have delivered more responsive repairs to date than last year, and driven better value for money has allowed additional resources to be put into a planned preventative maintenance programme;
• 1000 follow up enquiries per month following a repair booking rates the service at 95% satisfaction;
• we have had zero overdue home repairs since July 2015;
• complaints have fallen year on year from 2100 in the year 2013-14 to 530 in the year 2014-15;
• reduced the number of disrepair claim cases to 82; and,
• Short Cycle void turnaround time is an average of only 9 days.

2.7 In order to drive further improvements a number of workshops have been organised attended by contractors and a cross section of council staff. These have established a set of common principles and is driving innovation and service delivery. These meetings will drive the improvement plan, which includes;

• improved communications to residents and members. All 2015/16 capital works are now available on the website and a commitment that 2016/17 and 2017/18 capital works will be added by March 2016;
• personal newsletters sent to all residents whose homes are in the capital programme in 2015/16;
• development of a mobile application (App) to manage repairs and raise jobs keeping residents more informed;
• providing 2 hour appointments;
• providing open data for residents who will have an easy access route to see the performance of the council and contractors on an estate by estate basis so they can have confidence in the performance of the service;
• introducing a handy persons service;
• an enhanced repairs service where residents can pay for jobs which aren’t our responsibility;
• providing i-pads to estate officers to manage work in the field;
• introducing Wednesday Walkabouts (see 6.6); and,
• mapping data to better understand our repairs and maintenance needs. This will inform the development of a planned works programme.

2.8 In addition a repairs task force has also been set up with officers and residents which will monitor improvements and produce an action plan ahead of the reprocurement of repairs contracts from 2016 onwards so that our contractor can see what we want to achieve and what needs changing. The task force will also look at longer term issues responding to what our residents want as service users.

**Priority 2: leasehold services**

2.9 Leaseholders represent nearly a third of our residents and this will grow each year. They have told us through the STAR survey and in workshops that they are dissatisfied with the service. Satisfaction is at an all time low:

• 19% were satisfied that we listen to and act on their views;
• 26% are satisfied that they have opportunities to participate in decision-making;
• 20% satisfied with the ease of contacting the right person; and,
• overall only 32% satisfied with services.
2.10 In response a new leaseholder task and finish group has been set up to focus on delivering the Leasehold Action Plan (Major Capital Works Plan), driving leaseholder satisfaction and improving the home ownership services. Improvements include:

- Martin Arnold Limited has been appointed as the Independent Expert;
- a Major Works committee has been created with clear terms of reference and will meet 6 weekly to review work carried out by Independent Expert; and,
- the areas the Independent Expert will consider are:
  - The appointment and performance of consultants and contractors
  - Design, specification and necessity or works
  - How were the works procured, was the work tendered and did the procurement process offer value for money?
  - Were the works priced accurately and reasonable?
  - Has the work been carried out to industry standards?
  - Are residents satisfied with the service?

2.11 There needs to be a greater recognition of the increasing numbers of leaseholders the opportunities to develop services and relationships further. There is an added layer of complexity where a significant number of leaseholders are non resident and rent to the private rented sector.

**Priority 3: supporting vulnerable residents and wellbeing**

2.12 Residents told us that they want better joined up services protecting vulnerable households. In the short term we are working with partners and colleagues to develop new ways of working. This will build on existing initiatives to support strategies like financial resilience and the health and wellbeing strategy. We will also seek to support residents by working across services and focusing on services which support residents with mental health problems.

2.13 Some of the joint work includes:

- a Service Plus pilot proactively supporting older people (over 75 year olds) working with Age UK and Ace of Clubs;
- a LEAP project is being scoped with Housing Management, Housing Options and other partners to tackle and alleviate the pressures for families an children living in overcrowded conditions;
- koint work with housing services and social care to manage families and vulnerable adults with no recourse to public funds; and,
- we are developing a new housing management service for sheltered housing including a tailored tenant offer for sheltered residents.

2.14 There has been a progressive rise in interest in outcomes which look to measure individual and social wellbeing and whether increased wellbeing and happiness of citizens can be demonstrated through better integrated service models. As part of the housing management transformation and integration it is intended to develop an approach to wellbeing which is
being led by a project manager. He has begun to scope the issues and current practice with the aim to develop a service offer based on wellbeing.

2.15 A report, which is currently being prepared, will provide more detail of all of this and will additionally provide a comprehensive update of what we know about existing relevant projects. It will contain proposals for how we progressively move from the present situation where there are a great many initiatives underway both large and small (mainly small) to a situation where we have streamlined our offer and take advantage of economies of scale offered by larger projects. This is likely to involve rolling up some smaller projects and consolidate work in bigger better integrated projects.

2.16 We need to think about supporting a range of vulnerable residents and the ambition is to offer a minimum universal service offer and a further more holistic offer made available by assertive outreach to those whose wellbeing we can most increase. However at the moment definitions of vulnerable groups tend to be too wide (for example all the elderly) or ill-defined (e.g. ‘young people who are vulnerable’). Further vulnerability policies are not informed by an understanding of what might be achieved by each additional unit (measured in £s) of increased support we might offer. Therefore we need to develop a model which can achieve the biggest increases in wellbeing from each pound spent. But there is a great deal of uncertainty which derives from a lack of understanding of what works and also from not knowing what kinds of inputs /enhancements particular clusters of residents might most value.

2.17 We therefore plan to convene a new task force with the active support of our public health department to look at what we know about (1) vulnerable groups likely to be living on our estates (2) what we know about what we might be able to do to maximise wellbeing gain from limited resources and (3) to consider how we might get our residents to input into both the range and design of interventions we might want to offer as a result.

2.18 The early piece of work for the task force will be to help us arrive at an initial practical definition of vulnerable resident groups we wish to support in our initial work which have a positive impact. We will invite all interested stakeholders to make a case with supporting data for those residents they would see as prime targets of our work. The task force will collate all this information and offer a paper in response summarising all this data and offering our own perspectives (informed by national data/evidence of what works) and would then convene a ‘big tent’ event early next year to discuss findings and to agree a way forward. This event would involve the Lambeth 500 (see engagement section).

2.19 This would give us both a definition of who we wish to target (based on evidence of need) and something close to a specification of the offers available to these groups. We could then trial an initial intervention either/or by geographical area or by vulnerable group and collect pre data re wellbeing.

2.20 The range of interventions likely to be on offer will include but not be limited to the kinds of interventions that concern the housing-related structural determinants of health, and that we will be looking to offer a service that goes beyond public health interventions that relate to housing. An example being developed between housing and the LEAP project is where
interventions in the home to alleviate overcrowding and support families in their accommodation.

2.21 Clearly we need to make sure we are tackling the most basic problems that have direct health impacts including for instance damp homes, thermal inefficiency and overcrowding, but ultimately we need to develop those interventions that increase the wellbeing of residents more broadly that go beyond these basics to include integrated offers from health/social services/third sector and other stakeholders.

**Priority 4: engagement and involvement**

2.22 The basis for the Council’s engagement with those who rent our properties is driven by the Tenants’ Compact which aligns a Government requirement introduced in 2000 to give guidelines to Local Authorities for involving residents. Councils are to:

- actively promote and develop new approaches for tenant participation;
- make tenants aware of opportunities to get involved;
- provide training; and,
- provide financial support and facilities.

2.23 The Council’s wider formal engagement structure with residents is Neighbourhood Forums. Some are drafting local plans as required under the Localism Act but these will be superseded by Co-operative Local Investment Plans (CLIPS) of which there are 7 – Waterloo, North Lambeth, Stockwell, Clapham, Brixton, Norwood and Streatham. Other forums which our residents in particular are involved with include the Safer Neighbourhood Panels which are co-ordinated by the Police but have no budget.

2.24 It was clear from pre reintegration consultation and from the STAR survey that our current engagement offer isn’t reaching out. By far the majority of tenants and leaseholders are not involved and 70% have not heard of the Area Forums or the Tenant or Leaseholder Councils. Under 10% had attended such meetings with the main reason given for not attending being the resident not being aware of the (34%) and time of meetings/other commitments (32%). Of those who had attended meetings, 26% did not feel there was anything good about them and the main area for improvement stated by nearly 50% was around governance and providing residents with feedback.

2.25 The Council recently looked at resident engagement more widely which highlighted that there is:

- lack of coordination across the Council towards engagement;
- limited insight into residents’ needs and interests generally;
- limited range of engagement methods, traditionally relying on meetings and workshops; and,
- concentration on project specific engagement rather than a more general approach across a range of issues that are important to residents.

2.26 Lambeth housing management has a very traditional and formal engagement model focused on numerous levels of meetings with both tenants and leaseholders. The process can be adversarial, engages with a very small number of residents and tends to be drawn
into localised issues. It doesn’t reflect the changing nature and different types of occupiers in our stock which comprises council tenants, leaseholders, tenants of leaseholders (private tenants), shared ownership and freeholders.

2.27 The current model comprises:

- **tenants and residents associations** which are the backbone of engagement. We currently have 90 TRAs of which 23 are either out of registration or active but not interested in registering. But only 58% of our 102 estates (>50 units) have a TRA;
- the structure of **area forums** (six in total) has been in place for over 30 years and attendance is declining, and it’s not uncommon for officers to outnumber residents. Last year the terms of reference were reviewed by the Residents’ Steering Group and the Area Housing Managers to strengthen the scrutiny function. Training was also organised for Area Forum officers but has been poorly taken up with less than 30% attendance. Despite these changes there continues to be limited appeal particularly for new TRA reps;
- **contractor forums** were set up to discuss repairs issues and meet monthly in the north and quarterly in the south, but not in the central area;
- **Tenants’ Council** has existed more or less unchanged for nearly 20 years and is the strategic body for residents. It has 5 or 6 reps from each AHF as well as representation from TMOs. However, attendance is consistent from only 15 TRAs over the past 12 months and opportunities for real strategic discussion is limited;
- **Area Leasehold Forums** (ALF) were set up in the early 2000’s following complaints from leaseholders that existing forums didn’t deal with their issues. The 6 ALFs differ from Area Forums in that they are made up of interested leaseholders living in the area and not elected TRA reps. Attendance was problematic until Lambeth Housing Standard started when attendances attendance increased significantly largely around concerns regarding LHS;
- each ALF elects 4 reps to **Leasehold Council**;
- both area forums and Tenants’ and Leaseholders’ Council have **executive meetings** for chairs/vice chairs to work with officers to decide forum agendas. These meet in between forums;
- the **sheltered housing forum** was re-established last year having been moribund for a number of years. It meets quarterly and has good attendance from the majority of sheltered schemes; and,
- the annual **residents’ conference** has been used to co-produce policy although not every year. Average attendance about 100 of both tenants and leaseholder TRA reps primarily.

2.28 Operationally and locally there are some excellent innovative examples to increase engagement and participation, including:

- the **Lambeth 500**, launched at the Country Show in July 2015, aims to recruit five hundred residents who want to actively engage and be involved with housing services. The Lambeth 500 will interact in a number of ways such as responding to surveys but also by joining communities of interest to review services. This bespoke way of communicating will pay closer attention to residents’ needs and concerns and be more responsive and reactive in the type of service we offer;
we organised a residents engagement workshop on Saturday 11th July where both tenants and leaseholders discussed with staff and the Cabinet Member for Housing what's wrong with current engagement and how we make it better. We discussed:

- how do we and should we talk to residents;
- how we communicate and what they would like;
- how should we help to build community involvement;
- how would they like to influence housing service;

- increasing estate walkabouts and launching the **Wednesday Walkabouts** where Lambeth staff, partners and contractors visit an estate, engage residents, coordinate clear ups and resolve issues. We have started to record all actions from walkabouts so that TRAs and residents can hold the council to account for issues that have been raised – we will turn these into estate action plans and respond to all issues, even if we can’t resolve them, so residents know they’ve been considered and it’s available to scrutiny;

- the **Getting Involved** grants programme enables resident groups to organise or commission activities. These have included summer youth programmes, fun days, social events, sewing classes, lunch clubs and sports activities;

- the **Edible Living** food growing programme has 18 estates actively involved with growing interest from others. This programme has been shortlisted for the 24Housing Green Initiative awards;

- **learning works** is an educational and training programme aimed at developing community leaders and aiding employment opportunities. This has developed with the Get, Set, Go project where welfare affected residents volunteer on community projects in return for credits on their rent accounts equivalent to the lost benefit; and,

- establishing virtual leasehold panels to review our communications to make them more user friendly.

2.29 It is clear, however, that our formal approach to engagement and involvement needs to change. There is an appetite to re-vamp resident engagement to address some of the issues in the structure as well as develop new ways of working already started. Residents have told us they want a change. Throughout the pre and post reintegration consultation with tenants and leaseholders there has been a consistent message that residents are not properly communicated with and the engagement that is on offer doesn’t reflect what people want. Participants at the engagement workshop in July with the Cabinet Member for Housing found the structure of layers of meeting both confusing and at unhelpful.

2.30 A move away from this traditional approach would embrace the recommendations of the Council’s review, particularly the need to work collaboratively and innovatively with the Third sector in order to be inclusive with residents. It might also offer an opportunity to deliver savings. A recent Amicus Horizon report, ‘Success, satisfaction and scrutiny’, calculated the savings generated by involving residents as £2,763m per year. Fundamental to achieving this was a change of culture to a one team culture which all levels of the organisation adopted. Other Registered Providers have queried the value of traditional engagement (eg. Family Mosaic’s report ‘Changing Places’) concluding that engagement needs to be more relevant to residents.
2.31 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has recently completed a commission on resident involvement and a summary of their findings is attached in the appendix to this report. The terms of reference was to focus on improving housing related services to residents through the development of resident involvement strategies. A number of key recommendations resonate with this report in particular:

- to embed resident involvement in Lambeth housing services, including the scrutiny of performance;
- placing residents at the heart of the service;
- using data and business intelligence to improve services;
- creating structures around three levels of involvement;
- Level 1: involvement at a local level eg in a TRA;
- Level 2: involvement in a task and finish group looking at a specific issue (eg selection of contractors, complaints, procurement strategy); and,
- Level 3: involvement in scrutiny and performance management.

Proposed new governance arrangements

2.32 In response to the clear messages that residents have sent the Council, we are proposing a clean break with the way this has worked in the past and a fresh opportunity for the new housing service to improve on the engagement offer. It's important that at all levels of engagement we work closely with both residents and ward councillors.

2.33 Locally we will:

- make our engagement individual by keeping residents informed (50% of residents just want to know, not to be involved). This will be addressed through better communications within existing budgets;
- listen and ask. The launch of the Lambeth 500 is an ambition to make engagement and involvement much bigger and enable us not just to ask people borough-wide what they think of us and want from housing management services, but to be able to start to ask people on an estate by estate basis about decisions on their estate. This will not be done through meetings but via email, text, phone, post so we can involve as many people as possible and to provide a forum for direct feedback from what they tell us;
- drawing from the Lambeth 500 we will recruit and train people to sit on resident panels. The first panels will be on:
  - Contract procurement;
  - Grant awards, taking over the role of the residents’ steering group;
  - Complaints adopting a recognised good practice to oversee the final review stage;
- work with all estates, or clusters of estates, using formal TRAs, organised open meetings, walkabouts or evening forums. These will be regular and planned to ensure we talk about plans for their estate, address issues that have been raised and to talk about other opportunities such as estate pride, food growing etc. Resources will be diverted from area forums to support more work with estates and we will invest in
technology to enable housing officers to access the necessary information at meetings to respond to questions rather than having to ‘take it away’; and,

- focus on local environmental issues which are a priority for residents on estates. We want to encourage more involvement in the look of our local estates and hold the area offices to account on what goes on in the estates, particularly around waste management and maintenance.

2.34 On an area basis we propose:

- to change Area Forums. Consultation tells us that most people don’t know about them, and those that do often don’t go. Those that do go don’t think they achieve anything (the most reported section in the consultation that was good about area forums was “nothing”). It is therefore proposed that area forums will be replaced. In their place the existing contractors meetings will be turned into 3 Area Boards, to be made up of representatives from local TRAs. They will not be forums to discuss casework but will interrogate Key Performance indicators and will be responsible for holding both contractors and the Area Offices to account; and,

- the casework function of the area forums will be addressed by reviewing the opening hours on a weekly basis of area offices and call centre. We will hold a surgery at different regular locations in the evenings to allow people to come and speak face to face with someone who can help them. We will investigate occasional Saturday opening of the front desks in the area offices and better interactive communications such as web chat.

2.35 Borough wide we propose to:

- recognise the complex nature of tenure on our estates and move towards a collective view of residents rather than just by tenure. This should allow a more citizen focus on engagement and move closer to achieving more resilient neighbourhoods where residents work together to tell us what they want. Working in a more joined up way and understanding our stock profile better may provide additional benefits such as fraud detection;

- replace Tenants Council and Leaseholder Council. We recognise there is still a need to address strategic, borough-wide issues therefore at the Tenants’ Conference in October and the Leaseholders’ Conference in November we will discuss this proposal and possible mechanisms to elect a Tenants’ Executive and a Leaseholders’ Executive with representatives from the north, south and central areas;

- the timetable for the proposed changes will be:

  - prepare a report and presentation on the mechanism and terms of reference for the new proposals; and initiate consultation at tenants conference (October 2015) and leaseholders conference (November 2015);
  - send the proposals to all residents by January 2016; and,
  - put into place the new formal structure from April 2016.

The longer term vision to integrate services

2.36 The development of a new integrated operating model will help to meet manifesto commitments, narrowing inequalities and shape a broader set of outcomes around the
person and place. This will improve health, community safety, improve environmental sustainability, build stronger communities and create jobs; and will also improve our capacity to jointly commission across outcomes and revenue streams delivering efficiency savings and achieving more from the money we collectively spend.

2.37 Work with children’s and adult’s social care colleagues is underway to develop a joint understanding of wellbeing. In the longer term commissioning plans will be clear about how services will be developed to provide holistic and integrated services. This will achieve better coordinated services and drive down spending by avoiding duplication, targeting services and adopting an early intervention and prevention approach. The result should be an improvement in resident wellbeing. Early thinking about wellbeing in a Lambeth housing context is taking place and a separate scoping report is being drafted. A small delivery / commissioning and health project team has been established to take this forward.

2.38 The big question is how do we get there? There have been repeated attempts with limited success to encourage greater collaboration between public bodies. The challenge to work in an integrated way within a local authority is multiplied when dealing with health or third sector services. There are numerous barriers such as letting go or working to different or ill defined outcomes. Research undertaken after attempts to integrate describes the need to have critical success factors, including strong governance and management control. There are other dependencies too such as cultural and behavioural change, strategic and political direction and an agreed operations model for delivering customer services.

2.39 Integration with public services and third sector providers is a longer term ambition and will require an integrated commissioning strategy. Using the experience of Commissioning we will be bold in identifying where there is overlap in service delivery and create commissioning plans to recommission single coordinated services for residents wherever possible. An integrated commissioning approach allows us to review access routes to and provision of, housing for all vulnerable households and ensure that bricks and mortar provision is properly linked into other support services. The Council’s commissioning focus on outcomes for residents, rather than individual service activity, will help us and there are several examples of where such an approach is having an impact including our multi-agency approach to the Troubled Families programme, our NRPF improvement project and our work to integrate older peoples’ housing services.

2.40 A key element of any integration will be our approach to customer services and the development of a customer-focussed model for the design of services. This needs to include:

- improved access to services and information;
- earliest possible resolution of customer enquiries and requests;
- shifting work forward in the organisation towards customer facing staff;
- streamlined, modern and efficient approach;
- measuring performance to drive improvements; and,
- ensuring a sustainable level and quality of services that we can provide.

Using integrated technology and a more flexible culture should improve the customer journey. For customers this will deliver a range of benefits such as a single point of contact,
a case management approach, fewer handoffs and delays, skilled staff empowered to act on customers’ behalf, and greater automation for, and communication with, customers. This model reflects the concerns of housing management service users and was discussed with the Reintegration Board that oversaw the housing management transition back to the council. The board endorsed this approach and moves towards wider integration needs to ensure that this customer-centric ethos is developed.

2.41 It is increasingly understood that housing is central to the success of achieving better outcomes for citizens. The development and transformation of housing services can be seen as key in the process to create a wider integrated service model. The commissioning expertise Lambeth which has developed over the last few years will greatly assist the development of linked housing and social care services to work towards a combined service delivery model.

3. Finance
3.1 The recommendations of this report should deliver efficiencies in operations both within the Housing Revenue Account and other interlinked services. In light of the announcements in the summer budgets, there will be pressure on the HRA budgets and the efficiencies will contribute to ensuring that the HRA is able to mitigate some of these pressures.

4. Legal and Democracy
4.1 Section 21 of the Housing Act 1985 vests in the Council the general management, regulation and control of its housing stock.

4.2 Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985 requires Council to maintain such arrangements as it considers appropriate to enable those of its secure tenants who are likely to be substantially affected by a matter of housing management:

(a) to be informed of the Council’s proposals in respect of the matter; and,
(b) to make their views known to the council within a specified period and the Council is required, before making any decision on the matter, to consider any representations made to it in accordance with those arrangements.

4.3 A matter of ‘Housing management’ relates to the management, maintenance, improvement or demolition of dwelling-houses let by the authority under secure tenancies, or the provision of services or amenities in connection with such dwelling-houses.

4.4 This requirement relates to matters of Housing Management that constitute a new programme of maintenance, improvement or demolition, or a change in the practice or policy of the authority, that are likely substantially to affect either its secure tenants as a whole or a group of them who form a distinct social group or occupy dwelling-houses which constitute a distinct class (whether by reference to the kind of dwelling-house, or the housing estate or other larger area in which they are situated). As such, changing the consultation requirements may apply to any new policy or practice in respect of consulting with secure tenants.
4.5 The Council is further required to publish those arrangements which must be available for inspection at the Council’s main place of business and available on request.

4.6 In *Moseley v LB Haringey*, the Supreme Court held that procedural fairness sometimes requires the public authority to explain why alternative proposals have been rejected when consulting residents. The Supreme Court held that the purpose of consultation is to:

(a) lead to better decisions informed by relevant information and properly tested;
(b) avoid a sense of injustice; and,
(c) reflect the democratic principle at the heart of our society.

4.7 Further, the Supreme Court endorsed the principles for fair consultation expounded in *R v Brent London Borough Council ex p. Gunning* that the basic requirements that are essential if the consultation process is to have a sensible content are that:

(a) consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
(b) the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response;
(c) adequate time must be given for consideration and response; and,
(d) the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposals.

4.9 Article 1 of The First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998 provides that every person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and that no one shall be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law. These provisions do not impair the rights of the state to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.

4.10 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to:

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other form of conduct prohibited under the act; and,
(b) to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender re-assignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, and sexual orientation) and persons who do not share it.

4.11 Having regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

Article 1 of The First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998 provides that every person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and that no one shall be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law. These provisions do not impair the
rights of the state to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.

4.12 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to:

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other form of conduct prohibited under the act; and,
(b) to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender re-assignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, and sexual orientation) and persons who do not share it.

4.13 Having regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
(b) take steps to meet the needs of the persons who share that characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; and,
(c) encourage persons of the relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

4.14 This proposed key decision was entered in the Forward Plan on 11 August 2015 and the necessary 28 clear days notice has been given. In addition, the Council’s Constitution requires the report to be published on the website for five clear days before the proposed decision is approved by Cabinet. A further period of five clear days – the call-in period – must then elapse before the decision is enacted. If the decision is called-in during this period, it cannot be enacted until the call-in has been considered and resolved.

5. Consultation and co-production
5.1 There has been extensive consultation with residents prior to the reintegration of housing management services. It is through this consultation that the four priorities emerged and the recommendations to update the structure and governance for engaging and involving residents. Further consultation will be undertaken on the proposed changes to engagement as set out in paragraph 2.34 above.

6. Risk management
6.1 Risks and appropriate mitigations associated with any actions arising from the four priority work streams outlined above will be considered as programmes of service improvement are developed.

7 Equalities impact assessment
7.1 There are likely to be equality implications associated with the outcomes of the four priority workstreams identified above, for example in making sure the engagement and communication strands are accessible and in considering how services for vulnerable resident groups can be improved. The background and context for considering these areas to be priorities will be considered as part of the EIA process by the corporate EIA panel in October/November, to ensure that the workstreams fully address any gaps in service and that the development of service improvement adequately seek to address these gaps.

7.2 The key equalities issues associated with the changes to housing management have been highlighted through this report:

7.2.1 Priority 3: **supporting vulnerable residents and wellbeing**: we must target our resources and support on those who need it most based on a robust assessment of need.

7.2.2 Priority 4: **engagement and involvement**: we must better engage with all tenants and leaseholders by ensuring we use methods that are accessible based on meaningful ongoing conversations.

7.3 A detailed challenge session is scheduled with the Corporate EIA Panel on 5 November 2015 to help develop these two priority areas of work to ensure they best meet the needs of residents with particular protected characteristics (as described by the Equality Act (2010) as well as our own local equality characteristics (socio-economic, health and English as a second language).

8 **Community safety**

8.1 Any community safety implications associated with the priority workstreams will be considered as part of the improvement programme.

9 **Organisational implications**

9.1 Organisational implications arising from the priority workstreams will be considered as the improvement programme is developed.

10 **Timetable for implementation**

10.1 Timetables are contained in the body of the report.
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Resident Involvement in Housing Scrutiny Commission – Draft Recommendations

The terms of reference of this housing scrutiny commission focus on improving housing services to residents through resident involvement strategies. An implicit focus of the commission’s work was to identify ways to support a culture where resident “feedback is valued” and systemically embedded into service improvement.

These recommendations are for Lambeth Housing Management (LHM) but will also be reported to local housing associations with the expectation that all housing providers in the borough will work together to achieve our common goals, as well as continuing to adhere to the Lambeth Social Housing Charter.

**Principles**

1. To embed resident involvement in Lambeth housing services through the following principles:

   - **Co-operative co-regulation.** Co-regulation is an approach which enables achievement of the housing regulatory framework ‘Consumer Standards’; these apply to all registered providers including local authorities. Co-regulation is defined by the Chartered Institute of Housing as “an approach where housing organisations’ frameworks for directing, accounting for, monitoring, assessing and modifying their own behaviour and performance are based on residents’ priorities, views, and engagement with relevant processes”. Elected Councillors are also bound by these principles;

   - **Empowering residents through co-production.** Co-production can be defined as starting without a fixed outcome in mind, having a diverse set of people contributing their views and ensuring that everyone understands the constraints, resulting in participants having ownership of the end product;

   - **Recognising that there is no “one size fits all” solution** and thus it is important to have a range of structures and mechanisms – both fixed and flexible – to facilitate resident involvement;

   - **Rigorous use of data, intelligence and insight** to inform improvement, engagement and involvement; and,

   - **Value for money** – resident involvement has been shown not only to drive up satisfaction but also to lead to savings.

**Placing residents at the heart of the service**

Embedding the principles articulated above through a range of outcomes:

2. Increase and facilitate resident *engagement* in housing and the wider community by enhancing personal skills (e.g. training in chairing meetings, confidence building, taking part in committees, managing budgets).

3. Increase and facilitate resident *involvement* so that it is embedded in the delivery of housing services. This will include policy development, relevant decision-making and
the scrutiny of performance. Such activities will utilise skills people already have and develop further skills connected to the roles in question (e.g. in contract management, procurement panels for contractors and sub-contractors, complaints processes including the review of Council decisions).

4. Training to support Recommendations 2 and 3 should be made available and accredited wherever possible. Training should be done cooperatively (i.e. jointly with officers if appropriate) to develop shared understanding of issues and solutions.

5. A range of recruitment incentives for resident engagement and involvement should be developed. These should be co-produced with tenants and leaseholders and be subject to feedback and review to ensure they are effective.

6. Budgets should be identified to support Recommendations 2-5.

7. A strategy for involving those residents that are not named tenants, such as young adults, to be developed that would encourage engagement in the above outcomes.

**Improving satisfaction and value for money**

8. Training should be run jointly (with housing officers/ housing associations and/ or other groups as appropriate) wherever possible in order that resources are pooled and opportunities for identifying cross-cutting solutions are maximised.

9. All key performance indicators (KPIs), mandatory and non-mandatory, which are used to measure the performance of housing services should be benchmarked locally and/ or nationally. Where possible, non-mandatory KPIs should be co-produced with residents and reviewed annually. All KPIs should be presented in a range of formats (i.e. written/ visual/ graphical), to be developed by a cooperative working group, in order to ensure they are accessible and user-friendly.

**Smarter working: improving use of data, intelligence and insight**

10. Performance data should be open and transparent, readily accessible and available to residents to interrogate and use as they see fit. Training should be provided to facilitate this.

11. Systems used to collect and store data should be joined up, including aggregating with other relevant publicly available data (such as indices of multiple deprivation), in order to build a more sophisticated picture of local circumstances and challenges, and target resources effectively. This will involve working across the council as relevant data will sometimes be held by departments other than housing.

12. Estate walkabouts led by officers should take place regularly to help add context to raw data. This should be done in a systematic way, ensuring all areas are covered and feedback is captured in order that it can be cross-referenced with the available data and further develop intelligence. Processes and mechanisms (such as varied dates and times) to be co-produced to enable clear responsive action.
13. The use of social media should be increased to extend the reach of engagement/involvement beyond traditional mechanisms such as meetings and phone/paper surveys, particularly in relation to younger, diverse and/or excluded residents.

14. In order to assist achievement of Recommendation 13, a social media engagement strategy should be co-produced with younger residents. This could also involve the Youth Council and/or Young Lambeth Cooperative.

**Striving for excellence**
15. The Commission recognises it is Lambeth Housing Management’s aim to be “one of the best housing management services in London” (Lambeth Living Delivery Plan 2015/16, p2). This should be evidenced and benchmarked in both the short and long term.

16. LHM should continue to exceed the housing consumer standards and, in the longer term, aim to achieve the Tenant Participation Advisory Service (TPAS) Resident Involvement Accreditation for Landlords.

**Organisational culture and ethos**
17. In addition to embedding the principles set out in Recommendation 1, LHM should at all times follow the cooperative behaviours, which form the basis for staff appraisal in the Council, particularly with regard to ‘supporting learning and development’ (level 3) and ‘thinking strategically and creating clarity’ (levels 1-4).

18. LHM should follow all relevant recommendations contained within the July 2015 Community Engagement Cabinet Review conducted by the Deputy Cabinet Member for Community Engagement and Customer Access (and the associated toolkit).

19. Joined up working should be encouraged at all levels. This should involve LHM working closely with other areas of the council as well as other housing providers and community/voluntary groups in the borough, to ensure residents receive as coherent, consistent and cost effective a service as possible.

**Mechanisms and structures**
To enable achievement of the above principles and outcomes, and to sustain their implementation, visible accountability is required – thus:

20. There should be a variety of involvement structures, both fixed and flexible, to accommodate the skills, needs and appetite of a wide range of residents. These could be existing or new and might include:

   - alignment with the Lambeth 500 scheme that seeks to identify residents willing to get involved for short-term and long-term problem solving;
• Tenants’ and Residents’ Associations (TRAs): these are the bedrock of resident involvement and should be supported and promoted. Every resident should be able to join a TRA; to this end street properties and small “orphaned” estates should either be connected virtually to create their own TRA or linked in with other local TRAs, depending on the views of the residents in question;
• area structures, which would have devolved powers in terms of agenda setting and possibly budgets/grants. It would be beneficial for these groups to have links with existing structures to ensure good use of resources (for example, the five-neighbourhood structure where each neighbourhood has a lead councillor who acts as a coordinator);
• borough-wide mechanisms for communication to be considered and co-produced if necessary;
• running alongside the more formal structures should be more flexible structures such as task and finish groups and scrutiny panels. Scrutiny panels should be time and scope limited with independence, power and formality. Each report should go to the head of service, and other relevant decision-making forums; a response must be mandatory; and,
• Councillors and independent co-optees with expertise should be on scrutiny panels if required.

21. Consideration should be given to links with residents in housing associations for the purpose of sharing good practice and training (i.e. widening of the TRA network, scrutiny training).

22. The commission envisages levels of involvement as follows:

• Level 0: communication and access to information in a regular and accessible form;
• Level 1: involvement at a local level (e.g. in a TRA), including becoming a chair or treasurer, or participation in a local working group;
• Level 2: involvement in a time-limited task and finish group looking at a specific issue (e.g. selection of contractors, repairs, complaints, and procurement processes). These may be borough-wide or area-based and should produce outcomes that are co-produced and responded to by relevant housing managers and/ or Councillors; and,
• Level 3: involvement in scrutiny, policy reviews and performance management, borough-wide and/or area-based.

Levels 2 and 3 would require specialist skills and hence a filtering process should be developed; a skills audit of residents would also be beneficial and should be co-produced.

23. The above recommendations are to be aligned with the business processes of Lambeth Housing Management (and the Council more widely as appropriate) and also considered in relation to the requirements of the Resident Participation Compact.
Introduction

Now that Housing Management is back in Lambeth, there are significant opportunities to improve and develop joint and integrated services. There have been significant improvements in performance and work has started to develop a new programme for improvement based on four priorities raised by residents and other stakeholders during consultation.

Not everything will change immediately, and there are challenges due to an uncertain future over policy and funding. The Government has announced it will reduce council tenant rents which will restrict future funding. Policies to move more social housing tenants into home ownership will further reduce the number of homes to rent and impact on the provision of housing services.

Cllr Matthew Bennett, Cabinet Member for Housing
Neil Wightman, Director Housing Management

Priority 1: improve repairs and capital works

Getting repairs done and improving residents’ homes is a top priority. The largest number of complaints we receive are about how quickly we do repairs and the quality of work. We also know that we can do a lot better informing residents about when their home is going to be improved under the Lambeth Housing Standard (LHS).

We will:
- Improve the way we communicate with residents and Members. This years LHS programme is now on the website and we have written to all residents due to receive improvements. All future works will be on the website by March 2016. We will also move to open data so residents can easily access information.

We will:
- Improve our repairs service by offering 2 hour appointments slots, piloting a handypersons service and developing a mobile application (App) to improve the management of repairs. This will allow us to raise repair jobs, take photos on our estates or in tenant’s homes and track jobs.

We will:
- Develop Wednesday Walkabouts with Lambeth staff, contractors and other stakeholders.
- Review services to provide more resident advice and support available from the area.
Priority 2: improve services for leaseholders

Leaseholders represent nearly a third of our residents and this will grow each year. They told us through the STAR survey and in workshops that they are dissatisfied with the service.

Only

- 15% were satisfied that we listen to and act on views;
- three quarters of leaseholders told us they had no opportunities to participate in decision making;
- and overall only 24% were satisfied with the service.

We will:
Set up a repairs task force with officers and residents to monitor improvements and produce an action plan. This will inform the procurement of repairs contracts from 2016 onwards and make sure contractors know what we want and what needs changing.

Priority 3: support vulnerable residents

Residents told us that they want better joined up services to protect and support vulnerable households.

We will:
Set up a repairs task force with officers and residents to monitor improvements and produce an action plan. This will inform the procurement of repairs contracts from 2016 onwards and make sure contractors know what we want and what needs changing.

We will:
Support the newly appointed Independent Expert, Martin Arnold Limited, to drive up leaseholder satisfaction and improve services.

We will:
Support a new task force with social services, education and public health to look at how we can work together more successfully. This will involve an understanding of who

We will:
Develop a better understanding of who is vulnerable and what services could and should be offered. Part of this will be to review the services and projects currently on offer to assess whether they are benefiting as wide a group of residents as possible. Residents will input into both the range and design of services.

We will:
Set up a new leaseholder task and finish group to help deliver the Leasehold Major Works Plan (formerly Leaseholder Action Plan).

We will:
Set up a new leaseholder task and finish group to help deliver the Leasehold Major Works Plan (formerly Leaseholder Action Plan).

We will:
Be on estates once a week listening to residents. During Wednesday Walkabouts, Lambeth staff, partners and contractors will visit an estate, coordinate clear ups and
Priority 4: engage and involve residents

It was clear from consultation and the STAR survey that the way we engage with residents isn’t working. Most tenants and leaseholders are not involved and we want to increase meaningful engagement.

It is proposed to move away from our traditional way we involve residents. We want to rely less on formal meetings, which can be adversarial, engage with a very small number of residents and tend to be drawn into very localised issues.

The overwhelming majority of both tenants and leaseholders told the council in the Future Model of Housing Management survey that they hadn’t heard of tenant or leaseholder council or area forums. Participants at the engagement workshop found the structure of layers of meeting both confusing and at unhelpful.

We will:
With LEAP (a lottery funded service supporting families in three Wards who have a child under 4) develop a project to help families in overcrowded conditions

We will:
Develop a tailored offer for tenants in sheltered accommodation.

We will:
Ensure that tenant and resident associations remain the backbone of engagement. We will support both the current TRAs and residents who want to set up a new TRA. We will work with all estates, or clusters of estates, using TRAs, organised open meetings, walkabouts or evening forums. These will be regular and planned to ensure we talk about plans for their estate, address issues that have been raised and to talk about other opportunities such as estate pride, food growing etc.

Resources will be diverted from area forums to support more work with estates and we will invest in technology to enable housing officers to access the necessary information at meetings to respond to questions rather than having to ‘take it away’.

We will:
Set out proposals to replace Tenants Council and Leaseholder Council with a biannual meeting.

We will:
Review Area Office and the Contact Centre opening hours and hold surgeries in estates.

We will:
Develop a tailored offer for tenants in sheltered accommodation.
We will:

Make our engagement individual by keeping residents informed (50% of residents just want to know, not to be involved). This will be addressed through better communications.

We will:

Recruit and train people to sit on resident panels. The first panels will be contract Procurement, awarding grants (taking over the role of the residents’ steering group) and overseeing the final review stage of complaints.

---

**Future Model of Housing Management survey**

**WE ASKED IF RESIDENTS HAD HEARD OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>TRA</th>
<th>Tenants Council</th>
<th>Leasehold Council</th>
<th>Area Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants Council</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Council</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Forum</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WE ASKED IF THE RESIDENT WAS A MEMBER OF THE GROUP OR ATTENDED A MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>TRA</th>
<th>Tenants Council</th>
<th>Leasehold Council</th>
<th>Area Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants Council</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Council</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Forum</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IF YOU DID ATTEND A MEETING WHAT WAS GOOD ABOUT IT?**

- **Nothing**: 26%
- **Sharing of information**: 25%
- **Active Resident/TRA involvement**: 18%
- **Opportunity to provide feedback**: 12%
- **Officer attendance**: 6%
- **Good governance**: 6%
- **Other**: 8%

---

**There have been no overdue home repairs since July**

**We have completed more responsive repairs than last year**

**We do 1,000 follow up calls to tenants per month following a repair**

**We are developing a mobile App to improve the repairs service**

**Introducing 2 hour appointment slots for repairs**

**Developing Open Data so information can be viewed on the website**

**Launched the Lambeth 500 to increase resident involvement**

**Complaints have fallen from 2,100 in 2013/14 to 530 last year**

**66% of tenants are satisfied with the quality of their home**

**All scheduled 2015/16 capital works now available on the website**

**All homes to be improved this year have received newsletters**

**We have provided i-pads to estate officers to manage work in the field**
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Report summary
This report provides Cabinet with an overview of performance for quarter 1 against agreed outcome indicators and key performance measures.

In relation to outcome indicators – those that enable a judgement to be reached around whether the Council’s 13 community outcomes are being achieved – there is reasonable progress overall, although this judgement should be considered an emerging snapshot for now. A more complete picture will emerge as further data is published during the course of the year.

In relation to key performance measures progress is mixed overall, with more than half of all measures not achieving target. The measures that have slipped to red or have been red for two or more consecutive quarters are listed in the report along with the management actions in place to improve performance. Some recommendations are made at the end of the report as to where further scrutiny is needed to give assurance that plans are in place to improve performance.

Finance summary
There are no capital or revenue implications arising as a direct result of this report.

Recommendations
(1) Comment on and challenge performance against the outcome indicators and key performance measures set out in this report.

(2) Endorse the conclusions and recommendations for improvement activity.
1. **Context**

1.1 The Community Plan sets out the Council’s aspirations and priorities for 2013-16. It does this through our outcomes framework which identifies where we want to make the biggest difference, helping us to prioritise our resources and drive all the activities we commission. The outcome framework has three overarching outcomes: more jobs and sustainable growth; communities feel safer and more resilient; and cleaner, greener streets, and 13 community outcomes. This report provides a review of performance against the 13 community outcomes for quarter one (Q1).

**Performance management strategy 2015/16**

1.2 For 2015/16 the Council’s performance framework has been substantially revised to give a stronger and sharper focus on the achievement of outcomes and to provide a more robust analysis and explanation of what performance is as it is. This year progress is reported against two baskets of indicators:

- **Outcome indicators** – these give an understanding as to whether the Council’s 13 community outcomes are being achieved and have been carefully chosen to most clearly show progress. Whilst some indicators are within the Council’s direct control most are not, but they are nonetheless important as they give us an understanding of the wider wellbeing of the borough.

- **Key performance measures** – this basket is much more concerned with monitoring the Council’s own performance. The measures here include those concerned with key Council processes as well as with delivery, and their achievement is entirely within the Council’s control.

From these, thirteen priority indicators have been identified which matter most to the Council and to our residents. The priority indicators are to be reviewed annually and may change to reflect changing Council priorities.

**How we report our performance**

1.3 Performance is reported for indicators where data is available for that quarter, including annual indicators. For each indicator a red, amber or green ‘traffic light’ status is used to show how it has performed against its target in the last quarter:

- **Red** – this means an indicator is not achieving its current target and is outside the agreed tolerance level.

- **Amber** – this means an indicator is not achieving its target, but is within the agreed tolerance level. For most indicators, this tolerance level is 10% of the target.

- **Green** – the indicator is achieving its target.

1.4 Direction of travel is used to show how performance changes over time for each indicator. It is not linked to whether we are meeting any targets for performance – indicators can be under performing (red) but still be improving overall, and indicators can be achieving their target but deteriorating in performance.
Benchmarking
1.5 Where data is available Lambeth’s performance has been benchmarked against our statistical neighbourhs and with London and national averages. This has been done to get a better understanding of how performance in Lambeth compares and to highlight possible areas where support or intervention is needed to bring us into line with others. Benchmarking data has been taken from the latest published data sources, either nationally available data sets or specialist local government benchmarking tools. Going forward, we will seek to integrate this benchmarking data into these quarterly performance reports.

Performance improvement
1.6 The provision of detailed performance analysis should lead to activity to improve performance, particular where it is below that expected. To support this, a clear approach to performance improvement has been agreed. All indicators rated as red should have management actions setting out what is being done to bring performance back on track. Where performance is rated as red for two consecutive quarters, a detailed action plan should be prepared to improve performance. Performance improvement plans may also be required where benchmarking data suggests that Lambeth is substantially adrift from our local authority neighbours or from London or national average. If performance fails to improve after this then further targeted support will be given including performance clinics to diagnose root causes of performance issues or intervention from senior management to resolve or remove any blocks that are preventing progress.

On-going development of the performance management strategy
1.7 Whilst the approach to performance management set out above represents a considerable step forward, it will take time to embed fully and there remains work to do to develop the strategy further. In particular, it will be important to ensure that there is an objective assessment of poor performance as well as sufficient scrutiny and challenge by senior managers, with capacity for further analysis and ‘drill down’ as required. In addition, it will be important to move to joining up performance data with finance and other data to present a more rounded and fuller picture. Finally, as further data becomes available – particularly in relation to the outcome indicators – so a fuller narrative of overall performance will be provided.

2. Proposals and Reasons

Quarter 1 performance against outcome indicators
2.1 An overview of achievement against the Council’s 13 outcomes is provided in Appendix A. This shows that in this quarter:

- 5 outcomes are rated green overall;
- 4 outcomes are rated amber overall;
- 1 outcome is rated red overall; and,
- For 3 outcomes it is not possible to apply a RAG rating in this quarter due to the unavailability of data for indicators that are reported annually.
2.2 This demonstrates that overall there was reasonable progress toward achieving the Council's 13 community outcomes. However, this judgement should be considered an emerging snapshot. The assessment of most outcomes relies on either the resident's survey – which is reported as part of the Q2 report – or from national datasets sources, which are published annually at various points during the year. Therefore, a more complete picture will emerge as the year progresses.

2.3 However, based on data against our 13 outcomes gained to date, some emerging achievements or issues can be highlighted. These are provided below.

*Lambeth residents have more opportunities for better, quality homes*

2.4 Overall, performance against the indicators chosen to best demonstrate the achievement of this outcome is reasonable with two out of three indicators rated as green. For example, private sector rents for 2 bedroom properties in Lambeth increased by 1.69% since 30 September 2014, compared to an increase of 2.93% compared to inner London. However, it is very early in the year to be able to form any concrete judgements given the wider challenges associated with the housing market more generally and the particular concerns around supply and affordability.

*Lambeth plays a strong role in the London economy*

2.5 The five outcome indicators that are reported in this quarter relate to: 1) employment rates and how Lambeth compares to London; and 2) whether the gap between the overall employment rate in Lambeth is being narrowed for particular groups of residents. Overall, Lambeth continues to perform strongly against the London economy, although the gap between Lambeth and London has fallen slightly from 9% at the end of Q4 2014/15 to 7.4% at the end of this quarter. This is more a result of strong growth in London rather than decline in Lambeth, although the employment rate has fallen slightly.

2.6 A priority for Lambeth is to ensure that all residents have the opportunity to benefit from the employment opportunities being created. This is measured by a reduction in the gap between the general Lambeth employment / unemployment rate and the employment / unemployment rate for particular groups of residents. This shows more of a mixed picture. The gap for black and ethnic minority people and young people has narrowed in Q1, but the gap for older people has widened.

*People lead environmentally sustainable lives*

2.7 This indicators associated with this outcome aims to assess the extent to which residents are using less resources. At the end of Q1, the target for household waste generated had been achieved although trends over the last five years point to a steady increase which looks set to continue. The percentage of household waste recycled is slightly off target, although a more challenging target for 2015/16 has been set. Over the longer term recycling rates have shown a gradually improving trend. Air quality levels have remained steady compared to Q4 of 2014/15 although they continue to exceed the Government's air quality objectives. A number of schemes are being drawn up to address air quality and TfL is being lobbied to reduce emissions from buses travelling on routes along the A23.
Quarter 1 performance against key performance measures

Performance overview

2.8 A total of 90 key performance measures were due to be reported on in Q1. During this period:

- 43% were rated as green (achieving target)
- 31% were rated as amber (within 10% of achievement of target)
- 23% were rated as red (more than 10% off from achieving target)
- Data for 4% indicators was either not available or not provided. These mostly relate to local indicators where data collection are yet to be confirmed.

2.9 Direction of travel shows how performance changes over time for each indicator. Depending on the type of indicator, performance is either compared to 1) the baseline for the year (which is the outturn for 2014/15) or 2) performance at the same period in the previous year.

2.10 When trend data for Q1 is compared this shows that:

- 46.0% (29) of indicators improved;  
- 47.6% (30) of indicators deteriorated; and,  
- 6.3% (4) of indicators had no change.

2.11 There are a large number of indicators where it is not yet possible to provide trend data because they are new to the corporate performance digest. Trend data for these will follow in future performance reports.

Achievements and issues by outcome

2.12 The section below provides further narrative and analysis for key performance measures (i.e. those within the Council's control), where there have been particular performance achievements or where there have been performance issues where an indicator has slipped to red or has been red for two consecutive quarters or more. A full list of performance against all key performance measures by outcome can be found in Appendix B.

2.12.1 Lambeth residents have more opportunities for better quality homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.64 Number of Lambeth Council homes brought up to LHS standard in-year.</td>
<td>This indicator has been red for two or more consecutive quarters. The overriding objective for 2015/16 is to drive forward progress in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
second half of the programme, developing strategies to bridge any identified investment gaps. To help quantify those gaps, and to ensure that planning is more accurate going forward, existing management information systems are being reviewed, and in particular making best use of our new ‘Keystone’ asset management system which offers a much more accurate view of the condition of housing stock than ever had before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OF.68</th>
<th>Number of households in nightly charged accommodation (B&amp;B Hotels and Annexes).</th>
<th>This indicator has been rated as red for two or more consecutive quarters. The new ‘Temp to Settled’ project is beginning to reduce the cost of temporary accommodation and the overall numbers. A temporary accommodation strategy is also being developed to seek longer term solutions. Other initiatives are being explored to reduce the use and cost of B&amp;B Annexe accommodation that include increasing the number of leased properties for use as temporary accommodation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.69</td>
<td>Number of families in shared Bed and Breakfast hotels for over 6 weeks.</td>
<td>This indicator has slipped from amber at the end of Q4 to red at the end of Q1. However, Lambeth reports one of the lowest levels of shared B&amp;B hotel usage, suggesting that performance is good in very difficult circumstances overall. With a view to improving future performance, on a weekly basis temporary accommodation managers will be required to report on who is in shared bed and breakfast and for how long to the Programme Director, Housing Delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.70</td>
<td>Number of private sector empty dwellings brought back to use through intervention.</td>
<td>This indicator has been red for two or more consecutive quarters. Benchmarking with other local authorities shows that there is overall reduction in the number of empty properties being reported as returned to use through Local authority input; on average 70% of the 2013-14 outturn. In addition, a number of grant related schemes that were expected to be completed in 2014-15 have fallen behind schedule now due for completion in 2015-16. To address this, the way that landlards are engaged and incentivised once empty properties have been found is being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.71</td>
<td>Percentage of housing management provider KPIs that achieve target.</td>
<td>This indicator has been red for two or more consecutive quarters. With Housing Management now reintegrated into the council, it is expected that key areas of performance such as repairs will be prioritised, leading to improved performance by the end of the second quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.12.2 People have the skills to find work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.12.3 Lambeth plays a strong role in the London economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentage in June was because a low number of major schemes were determined during this period. The Council will continue to work to ensure that all major applications are subject to PPAs with agreed time-frames and where they are not to determine in a timely fashion, where appropriate extensions of time will be sought.

### 2.12.4 People live in, work in and visit our vibrant and creative town centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.130 Visitor numbers in libraries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.12.5 All young people have the opportunity to achieve their ambitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.14 Percentage of schools judged good or better in Ofsted inspections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.12.6 Older, disabled and vulnerable people can live independently and have control over their lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.73 Proportion of people using social care who receive direct payments (Part 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
being developed to assist social workers and service users with developing a thorough understanding of direct payments including the advantages and flexibilities this brings in personalising their support. Additional resource and capacity will be allocated to the money management team to ensure increased referrals are dealt in timely manner.

2.12.7 *Vulnerable children and adults get support and protection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator is new to the corporate performance digest but rated as red. More robust adoption tracking is ensuring that decision making is timelier. Some historic cases will continue to skew the figures for sometime yet. Improved scrutiny and mentoring in respect of Child Permanence reports will also ensure timelier presentations at panel. Actions taken to improve performance includes:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Adoption tracker and challenge meetings to track children who have a plan for adoption;
- Revocation of adoption orders where children no longer have a plan for adoption but remain subject to a Placement order. A batch of historical cases which have adversely impacted the data averages;
- Introduction of parallel planning for adoption in PLO and early proceedings including family finding and fostering to adopt;
- Predictive data alongside the score card to establish the progress in adoption being made by management actions; and,
- An IT project to migrate adoption data from paper files to FrameWork so management of children’s journey is more easily overseen. |

| OF.146 | Average time between a child becoming looked after and being placed with adopters. |

| OF.149 | Percentage of children subject to Child Protection Plans for two or more years. |

This indicator is new to the corporate performance digest but rated as red. Work to achieve the reduction for those children who have had plans for over two years has been undertaken with managers and staff from the Safeguarding Service and Family Support and Child Protection. For the most this reduction
has been achieved through the issuing of proceedings. This suggests that in some cases, these matters could be resolved by earlier identification of children in need of legal intervention. On that basis, whilst retaining a focus on those young people who have plans for over two years, work has also now begun to review children who have had plans for more than 12 months, in an attempt to ensure that these plans continue to be relevant and appropriate. Plans will be considered to determine the actions required for effective intervention at the right level. This could either be as a consequence of stepping cases down from CP processes earlier, or through preparing for legal intervention in a more timely manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OF.161</th>
<th>Proportion of care leavers in employment, education or training.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This indicator has been rated as red for two or more consecutive quarters. The NEET cohort has increased since the service lost a direct link with dedicated resources to find options for Looked After Children and care leavers. Discussions are taking place regarding the re-establishment of the NEET panel to implement a multi-agency approach and will also explore the revival of corporate parenting initiatives such as bespoke apprenticeships for care leavers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OF.164</th>
<th>Percentage of children who leave care as a result of adoption.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This indicator is new to the corporate performance digest but rated as red. Early permanency planning is now becoming embedded for children will ensure that this percentage increases to become more in line with the England average. Training in respect of permanence, attachment and good quality report writing has been delivered to a number of front line social workers with more planned. There is a small but improved trend towards the England average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.12.8 Corporate Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.23 Council tax collection rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance issues

| OF.20 | Agency workers as a percentage of workforce | This indicator has been red for more than two consecutive quarters. To address this, Heads of People Management are working closely with business areas to reduce usage where possible. In particular, there is a high reliance of agency workers in children’s social care. This is being addressed by looking closely at the need for agency workers as well as recruiting more permanent workers to the business area, including absorbing agency workers to permanent positions where possible. Running alongside this are plans to review remuneration as a means of recruiting and retaining staff. Generally, placements over 6 months duration are under review including those where the reason for hire is "recruitment in progress" There is also planned recruitment to specialist social worker posts in adult social care and a |
recruitment campaign for social workers in children's social care planned for September 2015. It is anticipated that both of these actions will result in a decrease in agency workers in these areas once permanent workers are in post but this will not be for several months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OF.29</th>
<th>Percentage of complaints completed on time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator has been red for two or more consecutive quarters. Despite performance being below the target, it has improved steadily over the last 12 months, particularly from February. The challenge is to maintain that improvement so that we can bring the YTD within the tolerance level and then over target. The complaints team continue to monitor the performance of complaints. Regular monthly reporting to CMT is now taking place and the reporting framework that is covered at the Complaints &amp; Information Review Board (CIRB) has been reviewed. This maintains the high profile around this important area of work and sets out expectations of directors in terms of what they should be monitoring at a local level in each period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OF.33</th>
<th>Percentage of MEs completed on time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This indicator has been red for two or more quarters and performance in responding to MEs continues to be well below target. Looking at performance over the last twelve months it has been consistently between 60-70%. This is largely due to poor performance in the former Delivery Cluster (where the majority of enquiries are received), particularly in Communities, Housing and Environment. There is a restructure of the service that deals with MEs in this division which is having a knock-on effect on performance. An improvement would expect to be seen when the restructure has been completed. As with complaints, performance continues to be monitored with regular monthly reporting taking place to CMT and the reporting framework that is covered at the CIRB has been reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions and next steps
2.13 Overall, there is scope to improve performance further in some areas, particularly where indicators are rated as red.

2.14 Some red rated indicators have been or are currently subject to activity to improve performance. However, for other red rated indicators, it is less clear. It is **recommended** therefore that further action is taken against the indicators listed below, in order to give assurance that performance improvement activity is in place and that it is of the required sufficiency and rigour. These are:

- Number of private sector empty dwellings brought back to use through intervention;
- Number of households in nightly charged accommodation (B&B Hotels and Annexes); and,
- Proportion of care leavers in employment, education or training.

2.15 As a starting point it is suggested that the Performance Team work with relevant Service Managers to scrutinise performance in more detail and to obtain or work up performance improvement plans. These will be submitted back to CMT as part of the Q2 performance report for review.

3 **Finance**

3.1 There are no direct capital or revenue implications arising as a direct result of this report. Any business improvement activity to address poor performance will be delivered from within existing budgets.

4 **Legal and Democracy**

4.1 There are no legal implications arising directly from this report.

4.2 The Council’s Constitution requires that all key decisions, decisions which involve resources between the sums of £100,000 and £500,000, and important or sensitive issues, must be published on the website for five clear days before the decision is approved by the Director or Cabinet Member concerned. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the decision-maker before the decision is taken.

5 **Consultation and co-production**

5.1 The completion of the performance report relies on service managers / Heads of Services to provide performance data and commentary on progress and management actions, particularly if the indicators is not achieving target.

6 **Risk management**

6.1 There are no risk implications arising from report.

7 **Equalities impact assessment**
7.1 The community plan incorporates the equality objectives to ensure they are closely aligned our broader strategic vision. This ensures that our equalities work is not an add-on, but an integrated part of how we deliver services and meet the needs of residents. Accordingly, there are a number of performance indicators that enable us to determine whether we are achieving our equalities objectives.

8 Community safety
8.1 There are no community safety implications arising from this report.

9 Organisational implications
9.1 Environmental
   None.

9.2 Staffing and accommodation
   None.

9.3 Procurement
   None.

9.4 Health
   None.

10 Timetable for implementation
10.1 Not applicable
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<td>Delivery Director: Housing Management</td>
<td>10.09.15</td>
<td>14.09.15</td>
<td>2.13.1; Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Sharpe</td>
<td>Director: Strategy &amp; Commissioning Housing and Communities</td>
<td>10.09.15</td>
<td>15.09.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ashmore</td>
<td>Business &amp; Customer Services</td>
<td>10.09.15</td>
<td>11.09.15</td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Ellerby</td>
<td>Director: Policy &amp; Communications</td>
<td>10.09.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hynes</td>
<td>Director: Corporate Affairs</td>
<td>10.09.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana Amoa-Buahin</td>
<td>Director: HR and Organisational Development</td>
<td>10.09.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Crump</td>
<td>Corporate Resources - Finance</td>
<td>08.09.15</td>
<td>09.09.15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison McKane</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>08.09.15</td>
<td>23.09.15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rose</td>
<td>Corporate Affairs -</td>
<td>08.09.15</td>
<td>09.09.15</td>
<td>Throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Services</td>
<td>Councillor McGlone</td>
<td>Deputy Leader: Finance &amp; Resources</td>
<td>08.09.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report history**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original discussion with Cabinet Member</td>
<td>08.09.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report deadline</td>
<td>30.09.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date final report sent</td>
<td>01.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report no.</td>
<td>49/15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II Exempt from Disclosure/confidential accompanying report?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key decision report</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date first appeared on forward plan</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information</td>
<td>Performance Report – Q4 2014/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>Appendix A – overview of Q1 performance against outcome. Appendix B – table of Q1 performance for full list of key performance measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>Lambeth residents have more opportunities for better, quality homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME INDICATORS</td>
<td>Overall RAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator RAGS</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>There are five indicators associated with this outcome. Performance overall suggests that this outcome is being achieved, although it is very early in the year to make this judgement. The amber indicator is concerned with people in temporary accommodation which has increased by 1% compared to the same period in the previous year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not possible to form a full judgement around whether this outcome is being achieved as the majority of indicators are reported annually. The amber indicator measures the percentage of working age people on out of work benefits and the gap between Lambeth and the London. The gap remained the same at 1.3%, with the percentage rate in Lambeth and London similarly remaining static at 10.4% and 9.1% respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Again, the majority of indicators are reported annually and it is not possible to form a full judgement yet about whether this outcome is being achieved. The one indicator that is reported quarterly (percentage of young people in cohort years 12-14 who are not in Education, Training or Employment (NEET)) is rated as red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The five outcome indicators that are reported in this quarter relate to: 1) employment rates and how Lambeth compares to London and 2) whether the gap in employment rates is being narrowed for particular groups of residents. Overall this shows a mixed picture, although Lambeth continues to perform strongly compared to the London economy more generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At this point in the year it is not possible to form a proper judgement around whether this outcome is being met as the majority of indicators are reported annually. As a result, there are no issues yet identified. The one green indicator measures footfall rates in Brixton which have increased compared to the same period in the previous year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcome indicators overview

<table>
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<tr>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATORS</th>
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<th>Overall RAG</th>
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### Outcome indicators overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall RAG</th>
<th>Indicator RAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All young people achieve their ambitions</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Total: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable children and adults get support and protection</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Total: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older, disabled and vulnerable people can live independently and have control over their lives</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Total: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are healthier for longer</td>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Total: 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issues

- **All young people achieve their ambitions**
  At this point in the year it is not possible to give a full judgements about whether this outcome is being achieve. The majority of indicators relate to educational attainment which is due to be reported in Q4. The two indicators where data is available in this quarter are concerned with Ofsted inspections of schools and children’s centres. Both are achieving target.

- **Vulnerable children and adults get support and protection**
  Overall performance against this outcome is mixed. In relation to children getting support and protection, two indicators out of four are red – the proportion of children on a child protection plan for two or more years is too high and the average time between a child becoming looked after and being placed with adopters is too long. There is only one indicator in this quarter concerned with adults getting support and protection. The proportion of adult social care clients receiving a review is marginally below target but within an acceptable tolerance.

- **Older, disabled and vulnerable people can live independently and have control over their lives**
  Performance against this outcome is mixed. Indicators concerned with clients having choice over how their care and support works are below target. In addition, targets for delayed transfers i.e. a patient who is ready for transfer from a hospital bed but hasn't been moved are red and off target.

- **People are healthier for longer**
  All indicators for this outcome are obtained from the Public Health Outcomes Framework. These are annual indicators which report at different times during the year. None are due to report in Q1.
## Appendix B – Key performance measures by outcome

### Vulnerable adults and children get support and protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OF.146 | Average time between a child becoming looked after and being placed with adopters | 694 | 426 | 371 | 871 | 419 | 535 | R | Better | More robust adoption tracking is ensuring that decision making is timelier. Some historic cases will continue to skew the figures for some time yet. Improved scrutiny and mentoring in respect of Child Permanence reports will also ensure timelier presentations at panel. | The data relating to the adoption score card is a slow and painstaking process, the impact of increased scrutiny and actions taken to improve performance take a number of months to show improvement. Actions taken to improve performance include:  
- Adoption tracker and challenge meetings to track children who have a plan for adoption  
- Revocation of adoption orders where children no longer have a plan for adoption but remain subject to a Placement order. A batch of historical cases which have adversely impacted the data averages  
- Introduction of parallel planning for adoption in PLO and early proceedings including family finding and fostering to adopt  
- Predictive data alongside the score card to establish the progress in adoption being made by management actions  
- IT project to migrate adoption data from paper files to FW so management of children’s journey is more easily overseen. |
| OF.147 | Percentage of children becoming the subject of a child protection plan for a second or subsequent time | 6.70% | 12% | 5% | 0% | 7% | 4.0% | G | Better | There continues to be an improvement in this area which would suggest families are responding to services that have been provided. This would also suggest outcomes for children have been more effective. | Child Protection tracking systems are in place to monitor children and to evaluate the effectiveness of plans. Audits on conference decision making will establish whether children are removed from a plan too early and/or whether further intervention is required. |
| OF.148 | Referrals to children’s social care going on to Child and Family Assessment | 90.50% | 90% | 88.0% | 96.0% | 95.0% | 93.0% | G | Better | The Threshold document was recently approved by the LSCB and the previous trial of this has assisted in providing information to partners and to the Council about the threshold for Children’s Social Care (CSC). This slow decrease is showing the results of improved application of the threshold. The introduction of the MARF is starting to be embedded and work is being undertaken with partner agencies. This means that referrals are clear to what the issues / concerns are and helps to identify a referral that meets threshold. | Audits are to be undertaken to establish consistency of threshold application and decision making at the front door about proportionate response to referrals. Levels of assessments that end in No Further Action will be part of this work.  
Work with partner agencies on the thresholds for CSC and the role of step down to tier 3/ tier 2 services will be continued.  
Further work has been undertaken with all the managers in FRT/MASH/CAT to ensure that when a referral has been passed through to the duty CAT team from FRT that they are not closing without the agreement of service manager to make sure those thresholds are consistent.  
Work will continue with partner agencies. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.149</td>
<td>Percentage of children subject to Child Protection Plans for two or more years</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Although performance is off track, Q1 has seen improvements compared to the baseline for 2014/15. Lambeth performance against this indicator is worse than the London average.</td>
<td>Work to achieve the reduction for those children who have had plans for over two years has been undertaken with managers and staff from Safeguarding Service and Family Support and Child Protection. For the most this reduction has been achieved through the issuing of proceedings. This suggests that in some cases, these matters could be resolved by earlier identification of children in need of legal intervention. On that basis, whilst retaining a focus on those young people who have plans for over two years, work has also now begun to review children who have had plans for more than 12 months, in an attempt to ensure that these plans continue to be relevant and appropriate. Plans will be considered to determine the actions required for effective intervention at the right level. This could either be as a consequence of stepping cases down from CP processes earlier, or through preparing for legal intervention in a timelier manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.150</td>
<td>Child &amp; Family Assessments completed within 45 working days</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The figure for children having overdue assessments has been reviewed and findings indicate that the majority of these assessments were completed by social workers in timescale, however there have been issues with managers signing off in timescale. Further issues identified include duplicate episodes, which is a data cleansing issue. In one team there has been a high number of staff depart for a variety of different reasons however as locum staff they have left with one week’s notice which has meant outstanding tasks have been left for new workers.</td>
<td>Recruitment to vacant positions is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.151</td>
<td>Proportion of child protection conferences which were reviewed within required timescales</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>This performance reflects errors on Framework that need to be resolved, which has meant that conference episodes could not be completed.</td>
<td>The errors have been reported and are being worked on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.152</td>
<td>Proportion of looked after children who had their review completed within timescale</td>
<td>97.90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Some reviews have not been completed on time due to non-compliance to timescales by the Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) and social workers. 1. Discussions have occurred with IROs regarding meeting timescales. 2. Specific IROs will be performance managed where lateness is an ongoing occurrence. 3. The IRO Interim Service Manager to meet with the social work teams Service Manager and Head of Service in regard to social workers not providing reports for Reviews 4. The IRO Interim Service Manager to have discussions with the Assessment Teams to ensure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Performance Indicator</td>
<td>2014/15 baseline</td>
<td>2015/16 Target</td>
<td>April Actual</td>
<td>May Actual</td>
<td>June Actual</td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>DOT QTR</td>
<td>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</td>
<td>Management action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.153</td>
<td>Timeliness from placement order to child placed with adopters</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>142 days</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reception into care episode is completed in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.154</td>
<td>Stability of placements: Proportion of LAC in same placement for 2+ years</td>
<td>69.44%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Placement stability meetings are chaired by the IRO as soon as there is concern that a placement may disrupt, to consider any additional support that can be offered to prevent a placement ending. Stability is good. However some children have remained in short term placements for extended periods due to delays in care planning. In these circumstances movement to permanent homes is positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.155</td>
<td>Percentage of children looked after at 31 March with 3 or more placements during the year ending 31 March</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The children in care population has declined which means that the children in care are now the most hard to place and with the greatest need. Lambeth has a high population of children 14 years plus whose placements are likely to be the most vulnerable to breakdown due to need. This coupled with the smaller overall number of CLA impacts the statistical return. The increase in placement stability percentage is also as a result of improved recording of placement change. Closer case tracking, improved care planning, greater placement choice and improved matching are priorities and will help improve this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.156</td>
<td>Number of completed CAFs</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The number of CAFs for the 1st quarter is under the agreed target. Further examination of the data reveals a drop in Step Down cases from Social Care from the same quarter last year however this has been accompanied by an increase in number of cases accepted and deemed appropriate for the MAT service. The CAFs from Early Years Services remains low and further focussed work by the heads of MAT with all practitioners in these settings will take place in the next quarter. The CAF and Information Sharing Training process will also help practitioners with early identification and prevention of children with additional needs who may not have previously filled out a CAF Form on a Child/Young Person’. It is noted that there has been an increase in Health Visitors attending training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.157</td>
<td>Proportion of adult social care clients receiving a review</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>This performance indicator is measured cumulatively and the target for June and quarter 1 was 20%. Significant progress was made in June and performance increased by 8% (337 reviews). It is anticipated that further progress will be made across all teams and the target will be met in quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Performance Indicator</td>
<td>2014/15 baseline</td>
<td>2015/16 Target</td>
<td>April Actual</td>
<td>May Actual</td>
<td>June Actual</td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>Q1 RAG</td>
<td>DOT QTR</td>
<td>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</td>
<td>Management action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.161</td>
<td>Proportion of care leavers in employment, education or training</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td>The NEET cohort has increased since the service lost a direct link with dedicated resources to find options for LAC and care leavers. Discussions are taking place regarding the re-establishment of the NEET panel to implement a multi-agency approach and will also explore the revival of corporate parenting initiatives such as bespoke apprenticeships for care leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.162</td>
<td>Percentage Education, Health and Care Plans completed in 20 weeks (with valid exemption and without valid exemption)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Out of the 55 plans issued only two were outside the 20 week deadline and they were both subject to a valid exemption.</td>
<td>To ensure that the team have the capacity and support to enable them to continue to reach such high standards of delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.163</td>
<td>Percentage of children who wait less than 16 months between entering care and moving in with their adoptive family</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>This indicator relates only to those children who have been adopted rather than those who have a placement order. It is anticipated that the more robust tracking of cases will ensure that this continues to improve.</td>
<td>Adoption tracking, parallel planning for adoption initiatives such as fostering to adopt will show a future impact upon this performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.164</td>
<td>Percentage of children who leave care as a result of adoption</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Early permanency planning now becoming embedded for children will ensure that this percentage increases to become more in line with the England average. Training in respect of permanence, attachment and good quality report writing has been delivered to a number of front line social workers with more planned.</td>
<td>There is a small but improved trend towards the England average. It will be met by early permanency planning, changes in the adoption team to begin family finding for children prior to the conclusion of court proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.165</td>
<td>Average timescale for children adopted between placement order and match to an adoptive family</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>Again improved processes in relation to family finding will ensure this performance improves for children particularly those more recently into care.</td>
<td>Data for this continues to be developed and will be a slow process given the score card data. Adoption tracking, family finding at an early stage and parallel planning will show impact upon this statistic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Older, disabled and vulnerable people can live independently and having control over their lives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.72</td>
<td>Proportion of people using social care who receive self-directed support (Part 1)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Performance in quarter 1 is just below the target set. This is partly due to under performance in mental health due to further progress on system informatics and also the implementation of the new FACE assessment tool that is waiting for the RAS (Resource Allocation System) component to become live on 10 August 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.73</td>
<td>Proportion of people using social care who receive direct payments (Part 2)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>The target for this performance indicator is cumulative and Individual team targets have been set on a monthly basis and are being monitored through the service specific performance boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.74</td>
<td>Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes for 18-64, per 100,000 population (Part 1)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The operational and commissioning teams are working closely to highlight and resolve issues with The securing and availability of personal assistants. Information packs are being developed to assist social workers and service users with developing a thorough understanding of direct payments including The advantages and flexibilities this brings in personalising their support. Additional resource and capacity will be allocated to The money management team to ensure increased referrals are dealt in timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.75</td>
<td>Permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes for over 65s, per 100,000 population (Part 2)</td>
<td>484.5</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The performance indicator is cumulative and Individual team targets have been set on a monthly basis and are being monitored through the service specific performance boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| OF.76| Delayed Transfers of care from hospital, per 100,000 population (Part 1)              | 5.4              | 5.4            | 9.2          | 7.8        | 7.8         | 7.8  | R  | Worse | There are a number of factors that have negatively impacted on the performance of the hospital & discharge team at GSTT:  
  • There is an increasing number of cases where ‘ordinary residency’ is disputed and because Lambeth is the authority of the moment, time taken to try to resolve dispute is often logged against this authority  
  • Time lag to fill vacant posts - although recruitment for replacement staff is started within a timely manner identifying suitable and appropriately experienced staff can be a lengthy process  
  • High level of staff turnover including two long standing practitioner managers |                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.77</td>
<td>Percentage of people who use adult social care services who have improved overall control over their daily life?</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Sustain performance against baseline</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Performance has worsened slightly compared to the 2014/15 baseline, but remains within acceptable tolerances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.80</td>
<td>Proportion of adults with learning disabilities in paid employment</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Although performance has improved compared to the 2014/15 baseline, it continues to remain off target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.81</td>
<td>Delayed Transfers of care from hospital, and those which are attributable to adult social care per 100,000 population (Part 2)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Delayed Transfers of Care figures for social care relates to a small number of patients with very complex situations and delays are often attributable to factors beyond the social work team (Dom care provision/housing issues etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.82</td>
<td>Has the care and support you receive changed your quality of life overall?</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Sustain performance against baseline</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Performance has worsened slightly compared to the 2014/15 baseline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.83</td>
<td>Proportion of carers receiving a needs assessment or review, a specific carers service, or advice and information</td>
<td>60.60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.84</td>
<td>Planned moves within the Vulnerable Adults Pathway (reduction in evictions and abandonments)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Low move on numbers from usually high turnover services. Continued issues with justified evictions from high support hostels.</td>
<td>Meeting with hostel management re high number of evictions to see if any mitigating actions can be taken. Monitor high turnover services to ensure this does not become a trend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.85</td>
<td>Proportion of adults with learning disabilities who live in their own home or with their family</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Crime reduces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.46</td>
<td>Average number of days taken to resolve ASB cases</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>The methodology for collecting data for this indicator is currently under development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.47</td>
<td>Repeat incidents of domestic violence reported by those victims who are managed by a MARAC</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>In the last 12 months (Jul14-Jun15) the Lambeth MARAC discussed a total of 405 high risk victims of domestic violence, of which 86 were repeat cases, a repeat rate of 21%.</td>
<td>CAADA have provided the current average repeat victimisation rate for London which stands at 19%, and that nationally this increases to 24%. CAADA have highlighted that a mature MARAC, like Lambeth, is performing well if it maintains repeat victimisation between 28-40%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.48</td>
<td>Reduction in levels of risk for victims of VAWG engaged with GAIA</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>Performance has been steady over the last year, although with the introduction of the Mayors DV advocacy service we are concerned about victims potentially falling through the cracks between services so will be monitoring closely over the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.49</td>
<td>Number of people on Gangs matrix</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>The number of active nominals recorded on the Lambeth Gangs Matrix at the end of the 1st quarter 2015/16 had reduced by 94 people from the baseline of 133. This leaves a total of 39 nominals on the matrix. Of those 94 who had exited the Matrix, 25 had been subjected to custodial sentences and 69 had affected a positive exit. A positive exit will relate to the reduction or cessation of problematic and illegal behaviour. For many, this will be through access to new support networks, training and also employment opportunities. Looking at the data, it can be seen that at the end of the first quarter, the number of nominals had reduced by 71%. The target is to reduce the number gangs nominals exiting the matrix by 55.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## People are healthier for longer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.104</td>
<td>Number of eligible adults (aged 40 - 74 and without pre-existing long-term conditions) who have received an NHS Health Check</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Narrow the gap between Lambeth and the London average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Performance continues to lag well behind the London and England levels</td>
<td>The service is being retendered to improve performance and seeking to better target the offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.105</td>
<td>Number of people in drug or alcohol treatment who were retained for 12 weeks or more, or completed treatment</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Increase from 2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.106</td>
<td>Successful completions from drug treatment – opiates</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>Better than the London average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.107</td>
<td>Successful completions from drug treatment – non opiates</td>
<td>34.10%</td>
<td>Better than the London average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Successful treatment completions are worse than local comparator (most similar boroughs) average which is currently 41%.</td>
<td>Improvement plan has been instituted to address this and early indications suggest some improvement in trajectory over recent months. Comparator is top quartile of most similar boroughs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.108</td>
<td>Proportion of drug treatment clients with no record of completing a course of HBV vaccinations as a proportion of all eligible clients</td>
<td>79.70%</td>
<td>Reduce from 2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.109</td>
<td>Proportion of women who choose a Long-Acting Reversible Contraceptive method after abortion</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>The methodology for collecting data for this indicator is under development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lambeth residents have more opportunities for better quality homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.59</td>
<td>Number of households where major aids and adaptations are delivered</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>No units were expected to be completed in the first quarter. Registered Providers provided assurance that their schemes will be completed in 2015/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.60</td>
<td>Number of new affordable housing units delivered</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Q1 the highest number of permanent homes in the private rented sector (111) since 2010 was delivered, as a prevention of homelessness. Benchmarking across the 33 London authorities reveals that in Q4 March 2015, using the most recently published CLG statistics, Lambeth recorded third highest performance in London for this measure. However, lower outcomes reflect the challenging high-rent private sector housing market. Q1 outturn is short of target but there is a new marketing drive in place to incentivise the private rented pipeline. Implementation is scheduled for Q2 and results should be seen in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.63</td>
<td>Number of new private sector tenancies created as a prevention of homelessness</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>During quarter 1 we have delivered some 80 per cent of the LHS delivery target profiled for that quarter, with a total of 417 homes brought up to the LHS standard. The key issues that have prevented us from achieving 100 per cent of that target were: • The formal sign off of the annual budget was delayed. The budgets were due to be approved at the end of March at the latest and were not formally approved until the early days of May. This had a knock-on effect where the Capital team could not commit and mobilise any work until the end of May. • We undertook a competitive tendering exercise for all of the M&amp;E elements of the programme. The lead times associated with that process mean that, a significant portion of the M&amp;E works will not commence until September or October. • Some projects have had performance and litigation issues with one large contractor. We have negotiated an out-of-court settlement to reallocate the work from the underperforming contractor, which should now allow us to progress the programme in a more timely way going forward. The overarching objective for 2015/16 is to drive forward progress on the second half of the programme, developing strategies to bridge any identified investment gaps. To help us quantify those gaps, and to ensure that our planning is more accurate going forward, we are reviewing existing management information systems, and in particular making best use of our new ‘Keystone’ asset management system which offers us a much more accurate view of the condition of our housing stock than we have ever had before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.64</td>
<td>Number of Lambeth Council homes brought up to LHS standard in-year</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>At the end of Q1, performance is 7% short of target but is healthy and it is too early in the year to flag this measure as risk. We have identified that among similar authorities we do not prevent as many family/friend evictions as we might. A pilot has been scoped to address this issue and to persuade a higher number of households to remain at home with for example the reward of priority Band B rehousing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.66</td>
<td>Number of households where homelessness is prevented</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>The target is for less than 700 homelessness acceptances so the target is on track to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.67</td>
<td>Number of homelessness acceptances</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>&lt;700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>The target is for less than 700 homelessness acceptances so the target is on track to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Performance Indicator</td>
<td>2014/15 baseline</td>
<td>2015/16 Target</td>
<td>April Actual</td>
<td>May Actual</td>
<td>June Actual</td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>Q1 DOT QTR</td>
<td>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</td>
<td>Management action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.68</td>
<td>Number of households in nightly charged accommodation (B&amp;B Hotels and Annexes)</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>&lt;700</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The number of households in nightly charged accommodation has gone up by 20 compared to the end of Q4 2014/15. The number increased significantly during 2013/14 as the traditional supply of affordable leased property for use as temporary accommodation reduced due to buoyant private rental market.</td>
<td>The new Temp to Settled project is beginning to reduce the cost of TA and the overall numbers. A longer term temporary accommodation strategy is also being developed to seek longer term solutions. We are exploring other initiatives to reduce the use and cost of B&amp;B Annex accommodation that include increasing the number of leased properties for use as temporary accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.69</td>
<td>Number of families in shared Bed and Breakfast hotels for over 6 weeks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>In the London context Lambeth reports one of the lowest levels of shared B&amp;B hotel usage. Highest occupation levels at the end of Q4 March 2015 were reported by Redbridge, 252 households in Shared B&amp;B accommodation. Tower Hamlets and Newham reported the highest figures for families accommodated in shared B&amp;B hotels for 6+ weeks, 148 and 147 households respectively.</td>
<td>With a view to improving future performance and on a weekly basis temporary accommodation managers will be required to report on who is in shared bed and breakfast and for how long direct to the Programme Director, Housing Delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.70</td>
<td>Number of private sector empty dwellings brought back to use through intervention</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Benchmarking with other local authorities shows that at the end of Q4 2014-15 there is overall reduction in the number of empty properties being reported as returned to use through Local authority input; on average 70% of the 2013-14 outturn. A number of grant related schemes that were expected to be completed in 2014-15 have fallen behind schedule now due for completion in 2015-16.</td>
<td>Work is taking place to:  - reassess how landlords are engaged and incentivised once empty properties have been found  - quantify both the need for intervention and the availability of housing opportunities. This includes enquiries to establish ownership and follow up action to provide advice on financial assistance for repairs and how to let through the Council’s deposit guarantee scheme. A number of long term empty properties have also been identified where CPO action is to be progressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.71</td>
<td>Percentage of housing management provider KPIs that achieve target</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>HM has now been re-integrated into the council so we expect that key areas of performance such as repairs will be prioritised and therefore expect to see improved performance by the end of the second quarter. 22 KPIs are monitored monthly with a further 14 monitored quarterly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People achieve financial security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.89</td>
<td>Proportion of all households in arrears with their Council Tax payments</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>Reduce from 2014/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.91</td>
<td>Proportion of residents referred to the Lambeth Advice Network that have been supported to resolve a benefits, housing or debt issue</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.92</td>
<td>Number of multiple debtors (to the council)</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Decrease from 2014/15</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>This is the number of accounts that are in arrears for Council tax and council rent of at least £100 in each. The numbers always increase in April as the outstanding Council tax balances of the previous financial year become previous year’s arrears.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.93</td>
<td>Number of Every Pound Counts clients supported to achieve benefit gains</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>418</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>In order to achieve the annual target 450 Every Pound Counts (EPC) clients were expected to be supported in this quarter. Take up of EPC services has been steady so far this year, with referrals continuing to be made from a range of other services. As the Government’s latest changes to welfare benefits are introduced we expect the number of EPC clients to increase.</td>
<td>Delays in DWP responding to benefit appeals that EPC is supporting continue to slow our performance. We will be responding to the House of Commons Work and Pensions Select Committee call for evidence on delays and errors in benefit processing and appeals to highlight this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### All young people have opportunity to achieve their ambitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.07</td>
<td>Percentage of children’s centres judged good or better in Ofsted inspections</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Lambeth children’s centres are judged outstanding or good, following their most recent Ofsted inspection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.14</td>
<td>Percentage of schools judged good or better in Ofsted inspections</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td>Over this period a school was removed from ‘special measures’, thus ensuring that there are no longer schools causing Ofsted concern. An additional three schools were removed from the category, ‘requires improvement’. All these schools are now judged to be good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.16</td>
<td>Percentage of young people in suitable education, training or employment at the end of their YOS intervention</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td>As at March 2015, Lambeth’s engagement of young people in suitable education has increased (improved) compared with the same time last year by 8.1% points and is meeting the 70% target. A working group has met to agree immediate actions and this is an area of focus for the improvement plan. Part of these actions is to create a more stretching target, which will be proposed to the June 2015 YOS Management Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.17</td>
<td>Rate of permanent exclusions from school</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td>An additional 10 permanent exclusions were avoided during Q1 via Managed Transfer agreements via schools, the LA and families. Proactive working with school locations to prevent exclusions but also to look into alternative placements to avoid exclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### People have the skills to find work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.13</td>
<td>Percentage of young People in cohort years 12-14 who are not in Education, Training or Employment (NEET)</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>This indicator has slipped from green at the end of Q4 of 2014/15 to red at the end of Q1. A contributory factor toward this is appears to be the setting of a more challenging target for 2015/16, as the percentage of NEETs has reduced compared to the outturn for Q1 2014/15</td>
<td>The figure of 2.68 % for April-June only reflects a snapshot in time at which destinations for all young people will not have been finally decided. For example, this will not include all the data for Year 11 &amp; 12s destinations, which will be provided by September and inform the NEET data. Schools have been reminded to submit the data and the 14-19 Co-ordinator will be contacting schools to ensure they forward the data for guaranteed EET destinations by the end of September. This should be reflected in the NEET figures for the second quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.114</td>
<td>Number of unemployed residents with barriers to progression that are supported into work through Lambeth Working</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>Performance is accounted for through late receipt of New Homes Bonus grant agreement and resultant delays in planned recruitment for externally funded staff team to support delivery.</td>
<td>Key staff members have now been appointed and a small number of residual posts are at interview stage. A further 30 placements have also been secured since June 2015. Quarterly targets were new and untested and will now be re-profiled to ensure final achievement of targets at year end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.120</td>
<td>Number of employers supported to employ through Lambeth Working</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>Performance is accounted for through late receipt of New Homes Bonus grant agreement and resultant delays in planned recruitment for externally funded staff team to support deliver.</td>
<td>Key staff members have now been appointed, which will lead to increased performance in Q2. A small number of vacant/new posts are at interview stage. Quarterly targets were new and untested and will now be re-profiled to ensure final achievement of targets at year end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.121</td>
<td>Number of Lambeth residents supported into employment through the tri-borough Pathways to Employment programme</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>The annual target for this is currently 37. This will increase from Dec</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance is accounted for through late receipt of New Homes Bonus grant agreement and resultant delays in planned recruitment for externally funded staff team to support delivery.
## Lambeth plays a strong role in London’s economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.55</td>
<td>Major applications determined within 13 weeks or in accordance with Planning Performance Agreement</td>
<td>88.30%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td>Although a lower proportion of major applications were achieved within target during June the YTD figures remain well above year target. The reason for the low percentage in June was because a low number of major schemes were determined during this period. Only 1 major application was not determined within time, but as a percentage figure of the low overall number it seems much more significant. We will continue to work to ensure where possible that all major applications are subject to PPAs with agreed time-frames and where they are not to determine in a timely fashion, where appropriate extensions of time will be sought.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.56</td>
<td>Minor &amp; Other planning applications determined within 8 weeks</td>
<td>74.71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
<td>The performance on minor and other applications continues to improve with a month by month increase in the proportion dealt with within the 8 week timeframe. With improvements to our processes from the move to paperless working and our forthcoming systems thinking review we hope there may be scope to improve this further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.57</td>
<td>Annual S106 spend is met</td>
<td>111.00%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 is historically low expenditure draw down period. Expenditure normally builds up in latter quarters.</td>
<td>Section 106 expenditure draw down will be monitored and progressed in subsequent quarters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People live in, work in and visit our vibrant and creative town centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Ref. Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.130</td>
<td>Visitor numbers in libraries</td>
<td>1,371,998</td>
<td>Increase by 3%</td>
<td>119503</td>
<td>131349</td>
<td>125355</td>
<td>376207</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>This represents an 11% increase on the same quarter last year. Improved performance is due to increased stock, better opening hours, refurbished buildings, more computers and improved staff skills.</td>
<td>OF.130 Visitor numbers in libraries Increase by 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.134</td>
<td>Miles of carriageways and footways resurfaced</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>30 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>Works are progressing well and are on target to be delivered in year.</td>
<td>OF.134 Miles of carriageways and footways resurfaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.135</td>
<td>Bus route reliability through Lambeth</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OF.135 Bus route reliability through Lambeth TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology for collecting data under development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Ref. Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.142</td>
<td>Number of reported fly tipping incidents (no. of FlyCapture reports)</td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Changes to recording of fly tip show a fall in numbers. However, this appears to contrary to other sources (complaints etc) which indicate increases</td>
<td>A Task and Finish group has been established and actions include additional collection resource to tackle identified hotspots on a daily basis and a temporary enforcement team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.143</td>
<td>Proportion of active ‘street champions’</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methodology for collection data under development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.144</td>
<td>Number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The data is received 4 months in arrears from Transport for London. It is expected that the KSI rate in the borough will continue to fall this year although London-wide data shows that falls in accident rates are slowing and it is likely that any reduction this year will be less dramatic than in previous years. The borough met its 2020 target, set by the Mayor, of reducing KSIs by 40% working from a 2005-2009 baseline. It is on track this year to meet the target again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.145</td>
<td>Number of blue badge prosecutions</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>150 prosecutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td>Although performance is Q1 is less than required to achieve the target, it is anticipated that 150 prosecutions will be achieved over the 12 month period. The figure for June is low as the officer responsible for processing prosecutions was on leave. Additionally, a further 30-40 referrals per month are made by NSL. Each of these is reviewed and the most serious cases are investigated further.</td>
<td>No further action needed at this stage. There remain outstanding interviews to complete and enquires to be made which will push numbers up in Q2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### People lead environmentally sustainable lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Ref. Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.124</td>
<td>Percentage of municipal waste that is recycled (EU option 4)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45.80%</td>
<td>45.62%</td>
<td>45.36%</td>
<td>45.59%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>A small improvement in the recycling rate due to the start of fly-ash recycling programme at the energy from waste plant and a fall in contamination levels. Residual waste is constant and the quantity of waste diverted by residents for recycling actually fell significantly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.125</td>
<td>Kerbside households – waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37.81%</td>
<td>38.02%</td>
<td>36.65%</td>
<td>37.48%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>A fall of 1.5% in performance compared to Q1 2014/15. Residual waste is stable and residents are recycling less, but this has been countered to a degree by a fall in contamination levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.126</td>
<td>Estate households – waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.39%</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td>18.68%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>A fall of 0.5% in performance compared to Q1 2014/15. Residents are recycling less and residual waste is increasing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.127</td>
<td>Percentage total household waste recycled (EU option 3)</td>
<td>50.19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50.64%</td>
<td>50.49%</td>
<td>49.34%</td>
<td>50.14%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>The target has just been exceeded for Q1, but performance is flat-lining compared to 2014/15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.129</td>
<td>Total household waste generated per household</td>
<td>619kg</td>
<td>650kg</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>51.14</td>
<td>54.03</td>
<td>156.84</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Residual waste is increasing on estates, which has resulted in a minor fall in performance compared to Q1 2014/15. Overall this PI is on track to meet the target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Corporate Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Ref. Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OF.20</td>
<td>Agency workers as a percentage of workforce</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17.47%</td>
<td>17.79%</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Heads of People Management are working closely with business areas to reduce usage where possible. There continues to be close scrutiny of data by the unions at CCF with a strong focus on longer term and higher paid agency workers.</td>
<td>There is a high reliance of agency workers in children’s social care. This is being addressed by looking closely at the need for agency workers as well as recruiting more permanent workers to the business area, including absorbing agency workers to permanent positions where possible. Running alongside this are plans to review remuneration as a means of recruiting and retaining staff. Generally, placements over 6 months duration are under review including those where the reason for hire is &quot;recruitment in progress&quot;. There is also planned recruitment to specialist social worker posts in adult social care and a recruitment campaign for social workers in children’s social care planned for September 2015. It is anticipated that both of these actions will result in a decrease in agency workers in these areas once permanent workers are in post but this will not be for several months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.21</td>
<td>Average days to process new Housing Benefit claims and change in circumstances</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>12.5 - 15 days</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>YTD outturn is within target and fits the expected profile month on month. Age profile of work remains stable and additional burdens from DWP have been absorbed into business as usual in spite of budgetary constraints with negligible impact on performance.</td>
<td>On-going refinements and automation of benefits processing will have a positive effect on the outturn moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.22</td>
<td>Average number of working days lost to sickness per FTE</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.59 (7.07)</td>
<td>0.50 (6.00)</td>
<td>0.65 (7.74)</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>The average number of days lost to sickness has reduced to 6.9 per FTE from 8.37 FTE at the end of Q4. However, these figures need to be treated with a degree of caution. It is very likely that the fall is as a result of under reporting following the roll out of Oracle last August.</td>
<td>The Assistant Director, HR and Organisational Development will work with Heads of People Management to prepare a short action plan to address this, which will be a part of a larger plan incorporating a wider range of sickness reporting issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.23</td>
<td>Council tax collection rate</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>12.62%</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>31.03%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>This is a cumulative indicator so DoT is compared with the same period in 2014/15. The collection target for the end of the 1st quarter was 30.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.24</td>
<td>Invoices from SMEs paid in 10 days</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72.92%</td>
<td>67.03%</td>
<td>77.85%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.25</td>
<td>Invoices paid in 30 days</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95.79%</td>
<td>92.43%</td>
<td>92.85%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.26</td>
<td>NNDR collection rate</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
<td>22.59%</td>
<td>33.58%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.27</td>
<td>Percent of sundry debt collected</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94.20%</td>
<td>93.47%</td>
<td>94.09%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>The collection target for the end of the 1st quarter was 30.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.28</td>
<td>Percentage complaints upheld at stage 2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Performance is within target and has improved compared to the 2014-15 baseline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.29</td>
<td>Percentage of complaints completed on time</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Despite the performance YTD being below the target we can see a slight improvement in performance when we look across the last twelve months. Particularly in December to February when performance dipped to 72%, 69% and 70% respectively, there has been a steady regular monthly reporting is now taking place to CMT and we have reviewed the reporting framework that we cover at the Complaints &amp; Information Review Board. This maintains the high profile around this important area of work. This sets out our expectations of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: The table includes data for various performance indicators along with comments on performance and management actions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Ref. Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement in performance ever since. The challenge is to maintain that improvement so that we can bring the YTD within the tolerance level and then over target.</td>
<td>directors in terms of what they should be monitoring on a local level each period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.30</td>
<td>Percentage of corporate customer centre calls abandoned</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although the performance for responding to FOIs is below the target it is still within the tolerance level. This shows a marked improvement in performance which has historically been very low. There has been a continuous improvement in this measure despite a continued large volume of requests.</td>
<td>Continue the improvement in performance by maintaining a council-wide focus on the importance of dealing with enquiries on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.31</td>
<td>Percentage of Freedom of Information (FoI) requests completed on time</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance by the call centre has been strong on all key measures throughout the whole of quarter 1. In addition to the low call abandonment rate shown here, performance has been strong on average call answering time (18 seconds, one of the lowest in the sector) and the percentage of calls answered within target time (84 per cent answered within 20 seconds, also amongst the best in the sector).</td>
<td>We will continue to manage the contract in a close a rigorous way and expect to maintain strong performance into quarter 2 and throughout the rest of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.32</td>
<td>Percentage of Housing Management customer centre calls abandoned</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>New indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance in responding to MEs is well below target and is an area of major concern. Looking at performance over the last twelve months it has been consistently between 60-70%. This is largely due to poor performance by the Delivery Cluster (where the majority of enquiries are received), particularly in CHE. There is a restructure of the service that deals with MEs in this division which is having a knock-on effect on performance. We would expect to see an improvement when the restructure has been completed.</td>
<td>Regular monthly reporting is now taking place to CMT and we have reviewed the reporting framework that we cover at the Complaints &amp; Information Review Board (CIRB). This maintains the high profile around this important area of work. This sets out our expectations of directors in terms of what they should be monitoring on a local level each period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.33</td>
<td>Percentage of Members Enquiries’ (MEs) completed on time</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June saw further improvements in in-year rent collection rates against the May out-turn, rising by just under 1 percentage point to 99.72 per cent which is significantly above both the profiled target for quarter 1 (97.10 per cent) and the year-end target (99.00 per cent). Some of the key activities that have helped us achieve this strong performance during the first quarter are:</td>
<td>Continued close case management as described for Q1 to maintain the strong performance on income collection and to continue to drive down arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.35</td>
<td>In-year rent collection</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.35%</td>
<td>98.76%</td>
<td>99.72%</td>
<td>99.72%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key: RAG**
- **R** - Red
- **A** - Amber
- **G** - Green
- **W** - White

**DOT QTR**
- **Q1** - Quarter 1

**Q1 Quarterly performance commentary**
- Improvement in performance ever since. The challenge is to maintain that improvement so that we can bring the YTD within the tolerance level and then over target.
- Although the performance for responding to FOIs is below the target it is still within the tolerance level. This shows a marked improvement in performance which has historically been very low. There has been a continuous improvement in this measure despite a continued large volume of requests.
- Performance by the call centre has been strong on all key measures throughout the whole of quarter 1. In addition to the low call abandonment rate shown here, performance has been strong on average call answering time (18 seconds, one of the lowest in the sector) and the percentage of calls answered within target time (84 per cent answered within 20 seconds, also amongst the best in the sector).
- Performance in responding to MEs is well below target and is an area of major concern. Looking at performance over the last twelve months it has been consistently between 60-70%. This is largely due to poor performance by the Delivery Cluster (where the majority of enquiries are received), particularly in CHE. There is a restructure of the service that deals with MEs in this division which is having a knock-on effect on performance. We would expect to see an improvement when the restructure has been completed.
- June saw further improvements in in-year rent collection rates against the May out-turn, rising by just under 1 percentage point to 99.72 per cent which is significantly above both the profiled target for quarter 1 (97.10 per cent) and the year-end target (99.00 per cent).
- Some of the key activities that have helped us achieve this strong performance during the first quarter are:
  - The continued success of our ‘Bridging the Gap’ initiative. Through this initiative we work with residents to rectify instances where full entitlements to Housing Benefit may not have been correctly claimed.
  - Improved collection of rent arrears through enhanced rigour in case management.
  - Improved efficiency in case management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>2014/15 baseline</th>
<th>2015/16 Target</th>
<th>April Actual</th>
<th>May Actual</th>
<th>June Actual</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Q1 RAG</th>
<th>DOT QTR</th>
<th>Q1 Quarterly performance commentary</th>
<th>Ref. Management action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are now taking earlier actions and making earlier interventions to ensure that rent arrears are recovered at the earliest possible stage, and making sure that where escalation action needs to take place it does so in a timely way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF.37</td>
<td>Call centre satisfaction</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents contacting the call centre record a score against 4 questions about their experience using a 5 point scale - 1 being most dissatisfied and 5 being most satisfied. Capita must achieve a score of 3.0 (out of 5) from all responses in a particular quarter. The average response at the end of Q1 was 4.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Report Authorised by: Sean Harriss, Chief Executive

Portfolio: Councillor Lib Peck, Leader of the Council,

Contact for enquiries: Adrian Smith, Commissioning Director, Commissioning
asmith2@lambeth.gov.uk, 020 7926 0182

Report summary

Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham Councils have agreed to set up a Joint Committee to oversee current and future Community Budget programmes (Better Placed), and over time other joint work deemed appropriate. The Joint Committee is not a self-standing legal entity but part of its constituent authorities. Section 102 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables two or more local authorities to set up a Joint Committee (JC) to discharge their functions jointly. These arrangements must comply with the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012. The Joint Committee is needed to:

- share risk and facilitating joint decision-making in relation to the community budget pilot, Pathways to Employment;

- provide a mechanism that could be used to support joint decision-making in relation to future joint initiatives and local service transformation and co-commissioning arrangements; and,

- support devolution of responsibilities from Whitehall in relation to welfare and employment support, where appropriate.

Finance summary

None arising from this report.

Recommendations
That Cabinet notes this report and attached appendices and agrees to the establishment of a joint committee between the three boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark with the terms of reference set out in this report at Appendix 1 and the Memorandum of Understanding as laid out in Appendix 2.

To appoint the following councillors to the joint committee:

(1) The Leader of the Council; and,

(2) Cabinet Member for Jobs and Growth as his/her substitute

To agree to enter into a governance agreement with the London Boroughs of Lewisham and Southwark in accordance with the principles set out in this report, and to request that the approval of the terms of that agreement is delegated to the Director of Finance in consultation with the Director of Corporate Affairs.
1. **Context**

1.1 Employment levels are relatively high across the three boroughs, but there are still significant numbers of unemployed residents and welfare recipients, many of whom are individuals with complex needs. An enormous amount of detailed development work and research was undertaken by the three boroughs to understand these needs and why current approaches are not helping our residents. This was undertaken as part of the Community Budget programme, an initiative providing government support for local places to transform services (see: www.local.gov.uk/community-budgets/-/journal_content/56/10180/3692233/ARTICLE), of which Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark became a pilot area in March 2013.

1.2 This work led to the development of a pilot employment project, Pathways to Employment, designed to test an integrated work and skills system with a single pathway for claimants with complex barriers to employment, by taking an individual from their universal credit/welfare application to employment using a key worker approach. The pilot is currently being delivered by the employment charity Tomorrow’s People and funded through a blend of government grant, JCP flexible support fund and borough contributions. The three Councils’ intention was always to explore, through the pilot, the possibilities for greater integration and joint commissioning in order to achieve savings to the public purse, better outcomes for priority residents and demonstrate to central government that devolving responsibility to local areas can achieve better results.

1.3 The Community Budget pilot has been managed to date through an informal partnership agreeing joint action, but with Lambeth Council holding the contract for the Pathways to Employment pilot on behalf of the other boroughs. The governance structure is made up of a Leaders’ Group which provides political oversight and a Programme Board which is made up of senior officers from each of the Councils and senior leads from Jobcentre Plus, local colleges, the Skills Funding Agency, and Work Programme providers. At the moment there is no capacity for binding joint decision-making.

1.4 In Phase 1, the programme secured £150,000 of Transformation Challenge Award funding, awarded by the Department for Communities and Local Government, to launch the pilot project. For Phase 2, the funding secured is over £1.1m, and consequently there will be an increase in scale. Phase 2 will also potentially see additional sources of funding coming in (via a match funding bid to the European Social Fund) and further bids are being considered for new sources of income. The three boroughs require a governance structure that enables them to respond proactively to any further developments in the devolution agenda.

1.5 Initial advice from legal services teams has been that it would be advisable to put in place formal structures to manage the joint budget and contract. In addition, if there is a need, or ambition, in the future to pool budgets, to take on devolved responsibilities or consider further and permanent joint commissioning with other agencies and between the boroughs in other areas, it would be helpful to strengthen these arrangements and thereby take a more equal share in commitment and risk.

1.6 The boroughs’ intentions were always to explore, through the pilot, the possibilities for greater integration, joint commissioning and supporting the move towards greater
the three boroughs have started a journey of transformation and want to see that continue;
• the programme needs to have sharper governance and leadership to oversee the pilot going forward;
• Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark should be prepared to respond proactively to the devolution agenda; and,
• joint work must be grounded in tangible and practical action.

1.7 In order to strengthen the arrangements for the community budget programme going forward, to provide a platform for joint working and oversight in the future and to provide the right legal and financial oversight, it is recommended that the three boroughs should form a joint committee. This would:

• give the current governance arrangements the legal strength that is sought to progress with the pilot and enable the three boroughs to make joint decisions. Legal advice is that the current arrangements are insufficient for the next phase of the pilot;
• provide a sound legal basis for joint-decision making and allow transparency, whilst permitting each constituent local authority to retain autonomy and independence;
• symbolise the three boroughs’ stated intention to collaborate, which will be important as the devolution debate continues;
• act as a platform for lobbying for funding or for devolved responsibility to help advance a joint approach to employment, skills and welfare across the three boroughs; and,
• allow for flexibility, as the responsibilities of the joint committee could be amended over time.

1.8 The power to form a joint committee between two or more local authorities is found under section 101(5) of the Local Government Act 1972. There are many joint committees across the country, particularly for the oversight of Local Enterprise Partnerships and other growth-based initiatives.

1.9 The South London Partnership is in the process of setting up a joint committee. The Growth Boroughs (Barking and Dagenham, Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest) are set up as a joint committee and are about to publish a prospectus for devolution and Central London Forward is looking at establishing a joint committee.

1.10 Devolution is top of the political agenda at the moment nationally and in London. The Government has made clear that it requires strong governance to be in place to devolve responsibility or funding. For example, the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) reaffirmed their joint committee in 2008 which “provides streamlined decision-making; excellent co-ordination of services across the combined administrative area;
mutual co-operation; partnering arrangements, and added value in the provision of shared services.

1.11 These arrangements were established under section 20 of the Local Government Act 2000 and Regulations 4, 11 and 12 of the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2000 (since replaced by the 2012 Regulations) and section 101(5) of the Local Government Act 1972. Other boroughs are considering where they want to invest and strengthen cross-borough working and sub-regional partnerships.

2. Proposal and Reasons

2.1 There are a number of reasons for seeking to strengthen joint arrangements across the three boroughs:

- sharing risk and facilitating joint decision-making in relation to the community budget pilot;
- providing a mechanism that could be used to support joint decision-making in relation to future joint initiatives and local service transformation and co-commissioning arrangements; and,
- supporting devolution of responsibilities from Whitehall in relation to welfare and employment support, where appropriate.

2.2 The joint committee is executive in nature; every member appointed to the joint committee by an authority operating executive arrangements must be a member of that authority’s executive (Cabinet).

2.3 Joint committee meetings will be open to the public unless confidential or commercially sensitive information is being discussed and by exception access to the public is constrained to the extent permitted by law. How meeting papers and agendas are published will be decided by the authorities and is at the discretion of the committee, subject to any legislative requirements and the standing orders of the constituent authorities. These are detailed in the Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding at Appendix 1 and 2.

2.4 As the functions which will be exercised by the joint committee will be executive functions, the participating authorities will need to ensure that they are subject to overview and scrutiny in the usual way. They would be subject to the call-in procedures under the Lambeth Constitution. Consequently, existing scrutiny arrangements would prevail.

2.5 At present the law does not permit local authorities to discharge their executive functions through a non-local authority body or through mixed bodies. Therefore, stakeholders and other partners can be co-opted on to the committee but in an advisory capacity only. Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark could have Jobcentre Plus, for example, as a co-opted member.

2.6 To be quorate, there must be a representative from each borough at the meeting. The proposal for Lambeth is for the Leader of the Council to be the named member, with the
Cabinet Member for Jobs and Growth as deputy. In the absence of the leader, the presence of the deputy from the respective borough will allow for the meeting to remain quorate. Each authority will have one vote. The members will appoint a chair and this will rotate every 12 months unless members agree to retain the chair for another 12 month term. As Southwark will be servicing the meetings its is envisaged that meetings will take place at Southwark premises unless agreed otherwise by members of the board.

2.7 In setting up a Joint Committee, the Councils will require clear lines of accountability for certain functions of the Joint Committee. These are set out in the committee’s Terms of Reference at Appendix 1 (which may be subject to minor changes). It is proposed that Lambeth Council will be the accountable body for procuring and contracting with third parties.

2.8 Administration of the committee will be the responsibility of Southwark Council.

3. **Finance**

3.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

3.2 Funding has been secured for current Joint Committee activity and administration. Should the Joint Committee wish to commission further activity, this will need to be within the current approved budget, otherwise additional funding will need to be identified and secured.

4. **Legal and Democracy**

4.1 The three authorities may establish the joint committee as proposed in the exercise of their powers under section 101(5) and s102 of the Local Government Act 1972.

4.2 Joint committees are not a separate legal entity and cannot employ staff, hold assets or enter into contracts with third parties, but they are permitted, for the joint discharge of local authority executive functions.

4.3 Cabinet must approve the delegation of executive functions to another local authority.

4.4 Safeguards will need to be built in to protect the interests of all three participating authorities. It is therefore proposed that a governance agreement between the three authorities is entered into to deal with the following issues: this is set out in Appendix 1 and 2 in the form of a Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding. There may be some minor changes before sign-off but the content of the documents will be substantially as set out in the Appendices.

4.5 The Terms of Reference which are set out at Appendix 1 to this report details:

- decision-making – it is hoped that decisions will be on the basis of unanimous agreement, and there will be provisions in the agreement setting out the intention to co-operate and act in the spirit of partnership. However the formal mechanism to
resolve deadlock is the casting vote of the chair, in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 12 LGA 1972, which applies to joint committees;

- any officers on the Programme Board making decisions must do so within the authority of their delegation from their respective Executives;
- a further proposed safeguard is that decisions taken by the Joint Committee must not be inconsistent with the budget and policy framework of each Council;
- in relation to any procurement decision or contract letting, this must be in accordance with the contract procedure standing orders of each authority unless agreed by the constituent Councils to the contrary; and,
- arrangements have been provided to deal with contracts with third parties in the Memorandum of Understanding, including how these will be let and managed and the resolution of liability and mutual indemnity arrangements.

4.6 No additional comments from Democratic Services.

5. **Consultation and co-production**
5.1 Consultation and coproduction will be undertaken as activity from the Joint Committee is commissioned.

6. **Risk management**
6.1 In establishing the Joint Committee the Council will be able to manage risks associated with the three borough joint working. A weak governance structure could lead to:

- the risks and liabilities of Lambeth being the lead contracting body for the Pathways to Employment programme are not shared sufficiently;
- there is no mechanism for the three boroughs to make formal joint decisions in relation to the community budget pilot through a democratically approved process; and,
- Lambeth not being fully engaged and ready to take forward activity arising from devolution.

6.2 The key risk associated with establishing the Joint Committee is that the committee leads to unnecessary bureaucracy that gets in the way of the partnership working already established. In order to mitigate this risk, Informal Joint Committee meetings will be established, adopting similar governance arrangements of Informal Cabinet meetings.

7. **Equalities impact assessment**
7.1 Equality Impact Assessments are not required for executive decisions.

7.2 Equality Impact Assessments for Joint Committee activity will be undertaken and scrutinised in line with governance and scrutiny arrangements of the respective councils.

8. **Community safety**
8.1 There are no community safety implications arising from this report or from the establishment of the Joint Committee.

9. **Organisational implications**

9.1 Environmental
None

9.2 Staffing and accommodation
None

9.3 Procurement
As Lambeth Council will be the lead accountable organisation for procurement activity officers will be responsible for ensuring that procurement legislation is adhered to. This will be achieved by following internal processes and procedures.

9.4 Health
None

10. **Timetable for implementation**

10.1 Should the establishment of the Joint Committee be approved by the three boroughs the following timetable will be implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Cabinet agreement reached across the three boroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding agreed and signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>First Joint Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Review of Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Draft Terms of Reference

Joint Committee of the London Boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark

Purpose and function

The London Boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark have established a joint committee to discharge executive functions on behalf of the three boroughs, in so far as they relate to joint activities or areas of common concern in relation to growth, economic development and skills. Over time the committee may consider other areas. The committee will:

- provide oversight and decision-making of the Pathways to Employment pilot;
- work together to transform local public services in employment support;
- work collectively with employers, colleges and other stakeholders on jobs and skills, where appropriate;
- represent the collective interests of the constituent boroughs to national and local government and other bodies, where appropriate;
- joint bidding for funding, training and employment programmes e.g. EU funding and oversight of that funding;
- management and allocation of spending of funding and other financial resources allocated to the committee; and,
- take on additional responsibilities and funding delegated from Government where the Committee judges this to be in best interest.

The governance arrangements provide flexibility so that these functions can be added to or amended over time.

The joint committee does not have power to exercise non-executive functions on behalf of the three boroughs.

Membership

It is proposed that each Council appoint its Leader / Mayor to sit on the joint committee. Each Council should also appoint a named substitute (to be an executive member for those operating executive governance arrangements) to attend in the Leader / Mayor’s absence.

Partners and stakeholders will be invited to be part of/or send representatives to the meetings of the joint committee as appropriate; they will attend in an advisory capacity only.

Quorum

The quorum for meetings will be at least one member from each of the boroughs.

Voting

Each member of the joint committee will have one vote and all questions coming or arising before the joint committee shall be decided by a majority of the members of the joint committee present and voting (in accordance with paragraph 39 of Schedule 12 to the Local Government Act 1972).
Overview and scrutiny
Decisions of the joint committee are subject to scrutiny and ‘call in’ by each or any of the three boroughs.

Each of the three boroughs has established overview and scrutiny arrangements for the joint committee.

In the event that a decision of the joint committee or any sub-committee is ‘called in’ the Chief Executive (or an officer designated by the Chief Executive) for the relevant borough will attend the relevant scrutiny committee together with the member or their substitute nominated from that borough to be on the joint committee.

Administration
Administrative support for the meetings of the joint committee will be provided by Southwark Council and Eleanor Kelly (Chief Executive of Southwark Council) will be formally designated as clerk to the joint committee with responsibility for the provision of administrative support.

Lead Borough / Accountable Body Arrangements
Where necessary a lead borough shall be identified from amongst the parties to implement any necessary activities. Subject to any change from Joint Committee members, below details the roles and responsibilities of Joint Committee members:

- London Borough of Lambeth – lead accountable body for procuring and contracting with third parties;
- London Borough of Southwark – lead accountable body for administering the joint committee; and,
- London Borough of Lewisham – lead accountable body for bidding for and holding grant funding and managing Community Budget staff.

Any changes to this will be accepted by unanimous agreement by voting members.
Draft Memorandum of Understanding

Supporting the Joint Committee of the London Boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark

BETWEEN:
(1) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH of Town Hall, Brixton Hill London SW2 1RW;
(2) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM of Town Hall, Catford Road London SE6 4RU; and,
(3) THE LONDON BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK of Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB.

Hereinafter called "the three boroughs".

1. Introduction
1.1. The London Boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark are establishing a Community Budgets / Better Placed Joint Committee to:

- share risk and facilitating joint decision-making in relation to the community budget pilot, including but not limited to the Pathways to Employment programme;
- provide a mechanism that could be used to support joint decision-making in relation to future joint initiatives and local co-commissioning arrangements; and,
- support devolution of responsibilities from Whitehall in relation to welfare and employment support.

2. Purpose
2.1. The purpose of this MoU is to clarify the relationship, roles and responsibilities of the three boroughs in establishing a Joint Committee.

3. Status of this Memorandum of Understanding
3.1. The Memorandum of Understanding is an operational document. It is not a formally binding legal agreement and the partnership is not a legal entity.

3.2. The Authorities enter into the MoU intending to honour all their obligations in a spirit of commitment to joint working and co-operation. The Partners individually and collectively agree to use all reasonable endeavours to comply with the terms and spirit of the Memorandum of Understanding.

3.3. Under the Memorandum of Understanding the Partners cannot employ staff, let contracts or commit financial resources on behalf of the constituent Partners without their formal agreement.
4. **Management and governance arrangements**

4.1. Administrative support for the meetings of the joint committee will be provided by the London Borough of Southwark on a lead borough basis and the Chief Executive of Southwark Council will be formally designated as clerk to the joint committee with responsibility for the provision of administrative support and to ensure that all access to information requirements are met.

5. **Meetings**

5.1. Joint Committee meetings will take place as required, likely to be twice a year.

6. **Funding and finance**

6.1. Any funding requirements will need to be agreed by the voting members and liabilities will be split equally unless otherwise agreed by unanimous decision of voting members.

6.2. London Borough of Lewisham will be responsible for administering and holding grant funding, and will be the accountable body for any such grant funding.

7. **Duration**

7.1. This MOU will take effect from October 2015 and will terminate on such date as shall be agreed by all the Parties. This is a non-statutory agreement and is subject to the applicable national and international laws of the states to which the Parties belong.

8. **Review, amendments, dispute resolution and termination**

8.1. The content of this MOU will be reviewed annually or at the request in writing of one of the Parties. Amendments can only be made on the agreement of the three boroughs.

8.2. Disputes and/or disagreements between the members of the Joint Committee will be referred to the chief executives of the authorities to deal with the matter directly.

8.3. Disputes and/or disagreements arising from officers in the boroughs in the JC will go to Directors and then to Joint Committee members.

8.4. The Parties will actively seek to develop co-operation, MOUs and other forms of agreement with other local authorities and regional stakeholders.

9. **Intellectual Property Rights**

9.1. Subject to the rights of third parties, the Partners will share equally the intellectual property rights to all data (except personal data), reports, specifications, designs, inventions or other material produced or acquired including copyrights in the course of their joint work. The Partners agree that any proposal by one Partner to permit a third party to utilise the documents and materials produced by the partnership shall be subject to the agreement of all other Partners. Any changes, amendments or updates made to the documents and
materials, if made under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding, shall be jointly owned by the Partners.

10. Freedom of Information Requests
10.1. If any partner receives a freedom of information request in respect of shared work associated with the Memorandum of Understanding it will be shared at the earliest opportunity with the other relevant authorities in order to determine and achieve a consensus as to what information shall be released.

11. Termination
11.1. Any of the Partners may withdraw from the Memorandum of Understanding at any time. Any Party wishing to withdraw from the Memorandum of Understanding must obtain the approval of all members of the joint committee, who will give any such approval subject to conditions that will ensure an orderly winding down of that Partner’s responsibilities without detriment to the other Partners that would arise from premature withdrawal. No Partner may withdraw agreed funding which has already been committed by the Lead contracting party to third parties, or which would expose the lead accountable Partner to financial loss.

11.2. If the Memorandum of Understanding is terminated, the Partners agree that any reports, studies or any other information which has been jointly prepared by the Partners can be used by each of the Partners separately.

12. Indemnities
12.1. The three boroughs agree to indemnify against any costs, losses, liabilities and proceedings which the Lead Boroughs may suffer as a result of or in connection with its obligations hereunder provided and to the extent that such costs, losses, liabilities and proceedings over and above that which each borough to this Agreement is required to contribute and such extra costs are not due to any avoidable negligent act or omission (determined at law) of the Lead Borough or breach by the Lead Borough of its obligations hereunder.

12.2. Any Lead Borough appointed hereunder shall indemnify the other Parties against any costs, losses, liabilities and proceedings over and above that which each borough to this Agreement is required to contribute and such costs which the other Party or Parties may suffer as a result of or in connection with any breach of the Lead Borough’s obligations hereunder and/or any avoidable negligent act or omission (determined at law) in relation thereto.

12.3. Each borough to this Agreement shall inform the other boroughs at the earliest opportunity of any issue or matter or legal process or proceedings which may affect the three Boroughs obligations under this Agreement.

13. Signatories
Signed for and on behalf of Lambeth Council:
  Name………………………………………………………………
  Title……………………………………………………………
  Signature ………………………………………………………
  Date……………………………………………………………

Signed for and on behalf of Lewisham Council
  Name………………………………………………………………
  Title……………………………………………………………
  Signature ………………………………………………………
  Date……………………………………………………………

Signed for and on behalf of Southwark Council
  Name………………………………………………………………
  Title……………………………………………………………
  Signature ………………………………………………………
  Date……………………………………………………………
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