

DRAFTHousing Environmental Improvement Programme (HEIP) spending criteria

There are a number of points to be considered when assessing the suitability of particular projects to go forward for HEIP funding in whole or jointly funded:

ALL PROJECTS SHOULD BE EVALUATED ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS TO ENSURE THAT WORK IS WITHIN THE REMIT OF THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

Is the spending on housing land, property and customers?

If not, it can not be funded.

Does it benefit Tenants - all projects pursued must have clear and demonstrable benefits for tenants living in the locality. It is accepted that projects may also be to the benefit of other residents. The funding provided towards the overall scheme should be roughly proportionate to the number of tenants in the locality / ward depending on the scale of the project.

Projects which benefit only one individual should not be accepted.

Practicality - Projects which are clearly impractical should be filtered out. Council staff will be able to assist in determining the feasibility of any particular project.

Targeted - all suggestions should assist the Housing Department and Council in meeting its objectives such as reducing anti social behaviour or improving the physical characteristics of the estate / ward / city and should be sustainable.

No duplication - Projects should not be part funded if these are for work which should more properly be funded entirely from other sources e.g. road signs. Similarly, HEIP spending should not be used for work which will be covered in the ongoing housing services maintenance programme.

Maintenance - the ongoing costs associated with any suggestion need to be considered. High ongoing maintenance costs must be factor in determining whether a project is viable for funding.

Timescale - the suggested project will need to be completed within the four year administration period. Annual amounts can be brought forward within this period to complete a project within a shorter period.

Consideration must be given to any other projects e.g. roadworks, utilities that will have an impact on any scheme. The timing of the project may be affected by this.

Cost Effectiveness / Adding to workload - Is the project the best way of achieving the identified benefit? Are there other ways of doing the work which would represent better value for money or where the benefits could be even greater? Can the local community contribute to completing the project?

Schemes which put additional pressure on services subject to budget savings / reductions should not go ahead.

Enforceable- schemes that cannot be enforced such should not be agreed e.g. signs giving instructions that can't realistically be enforced. Problem parking areas on housing land can be put forward for parking enforcement where there are repeated problems and complaints over time. Residents and services should also work together to find complementary solutions.

Examples of acceptable projects

Projects which could be considered include:

- Improving parking facilities.
- Security measures to homes.
- Provision of fencing to improve security.
Creation of a play area for local children.
- Provision of drop kerbs in a street to improve off road parking thereby reducing local traffic congestion.
- Environmental works, landscaping and shrub planting to improve amenity to an estate / ward
- Improved storage facilities for blocks of flats.

Examples of Projects which should not be agreed

- Traffic calming measures (Highways responsibility)
- Bus stop seating

- Street lighting in areas that provide little benefit to council tenants
- Benches outside non housing owned shopping areas
- No Ball Games signs
- Improvements to areas where there are no council properties
- Improvements to Allotment Sites
- Improvement to community building that are not within the HRA
- New crockery or other equipment for a lunch club
- Provision of refuse skips