

Confidential

Rossendale Stage 2 –  
summary comparison of bids

<b>Question : 1 a) Governance (see A4 sheets with questionnaires showing proposals in a diagram)</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	GVH new subsidiary of Aductus Housing Group. GVH to appoint three members to Parent Board (equal or greater than other subsidiaries) to include chair of GVH and two others. No parent representative on GVH Board. TMO represented on GVH Board.
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Three potential options suggested: Option 1 – GVH a division of the existing IVHA with its own Estate Committee. Option 2 – New Parent Group created with IVHA and GVH as separate subsidiaries (along with the existing “other five subsidiary companies”). Option 3 – GVH to become a subsidiary of IVHA. Option appears to be GVH’s choice. Irwell Valley’s Board would choose a representative to attend GVH Board meetings.
<b>New Charter</b>	GVH to join New Charter Housing Trust Group as an equal subsidiary. GVH to appoint two directors (but number subject to negotiation). Nominees from GVH to the parent will be a matter for GVH. May consider appointment from parent to GVH but only to help GVH better appreciate the workings of the Group.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	New group proposed comprising Pennine Housing and GVH as subsidiaries of new parent. Membership of the new parent to comprise two members nominated from GVH (one would be a Board Member of GVH and one would be nominated by GVH who is not a Board Member) (same representation from Pennine Housing). Those four Board Members would select two further Board Members. Parent will not seek representation on GVH Board.
<b>Twin Valley</b>	New group structure proposed with GVH as an independent stock owning RSL. The group would comprise Parent Board and two subsidiaries GVH and Twin Valley Homes with equal membership of two from each subsidiary to sit on the Parent Board and three jointly selected independent members. No Parent Board representation on GVH Board.
<b>Trowers &amp; Hamlins Comments</b>	
All responses put forward a stand alone subsidiary proposal for GVH which presentationally is very attractive.	
However, Irwell Valley have put forward 3 options some of which are arguably less attractive. Option 1 would appear to give GVH less autonomy i.e. no stock holding. Query whether IVHA have a preferred option – is GVH choice “real”? Need to clarify whether the Irwell Valley representative would be an observer or a Board director. New Charter’s method for GVH representation at Parent Board level is less clear than the other proposals.	

<b>Question : 1 b) Business Plan Approach and c) Consents from other parties</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	b) Common Business Plan for Group with local variations in objective and action planning. Current business planning process includes reports to all boards, away day for board members, environmental and risk assessment, review local objectives with individual boards, draft narrative reported to all boards and final approval. c) No local authority consent required
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	b) Detailed consultation with residents, the Shadow Board and the Council. Surveys and open meetings to identify key priorities and issues. Use of finance team and external consultants to advise and draw up a business plan for approval by the Shadow Board and then submission to Irwell Valley and funders. c) No local authority consent required
<b>New Charter</b>	b) Tenants groups consulted on Business Plan proposals along with employees. Clear objectives reflecting customer satisfaction surveys and continual improvement subject to GVH Board independently deciding its own Business Plan. The Business Plan then consolidated with other subsidiary's Business Plans. The Business Plan will form part of the Group Consolidated Business Plan to be approved by the Parent and the funders. c) Consultation with Tameside required but no specific consent needed, No problem envisaged
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	b) Business Plan could be prepared by staff under instruction from GVH and passed to parent for approval. Parent only question approval if material difference from original plan and revised plan which conflicted with the Group Business Plan c) Consent of Calderdale MBC required. Informal discussion have indicated no problem anticipated
<b>Twin Valley</b>	b) Business Plan drawn up by Shadow Board with advice from officers/advisers and other agencies. Business Plan approved by GVH and Parent Boards. c) Blackburn and Darwen consent is probably required – not explicit from answer. Answer confirms that Council is very supportive of proposed partnership with GVH
<p><b>Trowers &amp; Hamlins Comment b)</b> Business planning process in all responses appears to be inclusive and provides for local autonomy: However, Irwell Valley's response additionally provides explicitly for resident involvement and indicates that external consultants are offered to assist. New Charter also explicitly provides for resident involvement in the business planning process. <b>Other comments</b> – unclear if all have addressed response as in the ordinary course of business as opposed to initial business plan. i.e Irwell offer of consultants; and references to Shadow Board</p> <p><b>Trowers &amp; Hamlins Comment c)</b> No real points of difference between responses although consent required for Twin Valley &amp; Pennine 2000 does present a risk – although this would only be properly regarded as low</p>	

<b>Question : 1 d) Intragroup Agreement 1 e) Removal of Board Members</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	d) Draft Intragroup Agreement provided but content to be re-negotiated with GVH. e) Parent may intervene if subsidiary fails to meet the expectations of the Business Plan or through action or inaction which prejudices the image or reputation of the Group. Anticipated only to be used in extremist where prospect of serious financial instability or incompetent governance. Arbitration process incorporated in Intra-group Agreement.
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	d) No standard Intragroup Agreement. e) Agreement not to use powers except in extreme e.g. where Board are bankrupt, convicted of an offence or where RSL considers there has been serious misconduct or propriety. Irwell Valley acknowledges Housing Corporation good practice note that the Parents' power of removal and appointment cannot be contractually binding but have confirmed that they would, as a matter of honour, be happy to indicate it would be contractually binding. Acknowledgement that the Housing Corporation would require parent to exercise step in powers in circumstances where financial or regulatory integrity of either GVH or the Group was threatened.
<b>New Charter</b>	d) Standard Intragroup Agreement is provided although not considered "standard" as negotiated to meet local needs. e) Intervention by parent as a "very last resort". e.g. repeated failure to prepare a Business Plan which places the group funding in jeopardy; direction from the Housing Corporation material and non compliance with the rules; material adverse external audit.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	d) No standard Intragroup Agreement but do have a draft which is subject to negotiation. e) Agreement from Pennine Housing only to exercise power in extreme with exact circumstances subject to agreement some examples given.
<b>Twin Valley</b>	d) No standard Intragroup Agreement. e) A light touch approach suggested. Acknowledgement of Housing Corporation good practice note 11 and information that it would be Twin Valley's intention only to intervene in circumstances identified in that good practice note e.g. – Financial stability – where financial procedure was failing and monitoring indicated that financial viability was in question. Governance – where the Board of GVH had been unable to operate in a manner conducive to making decisions in the interest of the company. .Management, where the performance of the organisation was detrimental to customer satisfaction and the viability of the company.
<b>Trowers and Hamlins Comments</b> d)No real differences between responses. Where draft intragroup agreements have been provided the responses have confirmed that the detail is negotiable. e) No real differences in responses	

<b>Question :1 f) Charitable and Company Status 1 g) Control methods</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	f) Charitable status viewed as more tax efficient. No objection to GVH being charitable g) No membership/shareholding controls apart from group parent being a shareholder of GVH.
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	f) Either IPS or CLG would be appropriate. Irwell Valley is IPS with charitable status and put in place VAT shelter for recent stock transfer. No objection to another charitable company within group. Opportunity to explore options of a “community fund” for use of VAT receipts. g) Controls compliant with good practice note 11.
<b>New Charter</b>	f) Welcome benefits of GVH being a charity – benefit from VAT shelter – New Charter Building Company’s surpluses could be gift aided to the new charitable entity in the group. Would like to discuss the best route of achieving charitable status i.e. either IPS or CLG.  g) Housing Corporation expectation of – terms of reference for board and committees; Specific committees with defined areas of responsibility. Scheme of delegation, Intragroup Agreement defining the internal controls responsibilities and powers. Requirement to comply with good practice and regulatory requirements of primary importance to meet expectations of all stakeholders.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	f) Up to GVH to decide on structure i.e. IPS v CLG and charity v non charity. No objection to charity forming part of group. Tax and VAT planning and advice to be bought by the group. Suggest some vehicle in the group to undertake non charitable activities in Rossendale. g) No methods of control identified
<b>Twin Valley</b>	f) No objection to charity as part of group and no objection to either IPS or a CLG model. g) External constituency model proposed namely Council, tenants and independents both at shareholding level and Board Member level. No reference to Parent membership
<p><b>Trowers &amp; Hamlins Comments</b> f) No substantive differences between responses - couple of points all worth highlighting. Response from New Charter highlights a potential financial advantage to GVH with gift aid of surpluses from Business Company to GVH. Pennine Housing 2000 response flags up potential for non charitable activity within Rossendale and Group purchased VAT advice. Irwell Valley’s response highlights opportunity for a type of “community fund” for use of VAT funds. Presumably this would be for objectives jointly agreed between the Council and GVH but this should be clarified.</p> <p><b>g)</b> No real differences in response although New Charter demonstrates clear understanding of the various ‘controls’ – the question only asked for detail of controls at “membership/shareholding” level</p>	

<b>Question :1 h) Core policies – do they have any they would they expect GVH to adopt</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	<p>No group imposed policies.</p> <p>All group policies reviewed by group members annually. A series of group policies have been agreed.</p>
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	<p>A series of group policies have been agreed. “Reviewed and updated on a regular basis” (how would Green Vale Homes input into existing policies)?</p> <p>All policies and procedures will be available to GVH which would be tailored by officers and residents to meet the needs of Rossendale.</p>
<b>New Charter</b>	<p>Any GVH policy developed at the time of joining New Charter would be respected and preserved.</p> <p>New Charter’s policies to be reviewed to reflect incorporation of GVH into group.</p> <p>Each subsidiary has a right to submit local variations to group policies or to promote its own policies subject to the parent approval.</p>
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	<p>Full range of policies available to be adopted by new parent and GVH if it wanted to.</p> <p>Any core polices would be decided in partnership with GVH</p>
<b>Twin Valley</b>	<p>No policies would be imposed on GVH although there are a number of core polices which could be used across the group and modified to suit each subsidiary.</p> <p>GVH could adopt any Twin Valley policy to assist with registration and day to day running of the company.</p>
<b>Trowers and Hamlins Comment</b>	
No real difference in responses	

<b>Question : 2 Pre Ballot Costs Offer a) financial b) non financial</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	<p>a) Budgeted for costs of £250,000. Available to Green Vale Homes to assist with pre-ballot costs. Not expect this grant to be repaid.</p> <p>b) Provide 5 staff (Snr Manager; TPO; Housing Officer and 2x admin staff. Make available services of PR company to assist in developing PR strategy for ballot or to contribute to existing strategy. Team to work with GVH staff to develop branding for GVH; including new publications, newsletter, website etc</p>
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	<p>a) Support with pre-ballot costs funded by Irwell Valley. Not form part of residual loan to GVH. Financial support pre-ballot with costs of legal advice; key funding set up fees; resident surveys; property surveys; set up of show homes; joint publications; office and staff</p> <p>b) describe series of events they have funded and provided in previous transfers – will pay for costs associated with these e.g. open days; training; focus groups; etc Detail in bid.</p>
<b>New Charter</b>	<p>a) Will meet projected expenditure for pre-ballot costs , £450,000, as a gift. At risk to New Charter, no liability attaching to either Rossendale Council or GVH .</p> <p>b) Work with tenants to help shape offer doc and local policy development; offer suite of policies to draw on to achieve registration. Open local base within 6 weeks; assist with mobile; offer ASB service to resolve immediate problems; additional staff for regeneration; help formalise investment programme; board and governance training; specify IT to run on day one; train in new IT systems. Provide project members and managers to join team.</p>
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	<p>a) Pre-ballot – non repayable costs met by Pennine Housing – pay for legal fees on establishing new group structure est£30k; contribute to communication consultants £20k; staffing support in b) costed at 100k</p> <p>b) Make staff available for pre and post ballot. Dedicated project manager – their CE; members of tenant participation team; access to finance team incl. business planning consultant; support for Board incl. policy development and registration; manager with experience of delivering investment programme with partnering contracts; HR team ; senior management team; Board member for support; etc.</p>
<b>Twin Valley</b>	<p>a) Fund, at risk, costs prior to ballot. Include show home. If ballot unsuccessful will bear costs. If successful expect costs to be met from ODPM and reimbursed to Twin Valley.</p> <p>b) second senior manager to team; board member for support; policies for registration; developing business plan and securing finance; developing IT infrastructure for day one. CE to take hands on approach in pre-ballot work</p>
Comment/Queries : further checking re costs if unsuccessful ballot and other options re contributions	

<b>Question : 3 DLO Arrangements – how do they see the role of the DLO and its development</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	Future direction of GVH DLO matter for GVH to decide. However Adactus's principal subsidiary has large DLO that undertakes majority of repairs – tenants value service and is expanding size and range of activities. Believe well run DLO can deliver higher levels of tenant satisfaction for better price. So Group would support GVH DLO if it wished to develop and flourish
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	See working with DLO at GVH as exciting business development opportunity – vital part of their service delivery plan. Have developed operating structure and integration plan to enable IVHA to retain the DLO at GVH and incorporate into their existing structures to develop operational flexibility. Detail in bid refers to modernise and develop DLO into 3 star service. New business opportunities cited – growth potential; proposals to enhance employment and training opportunities via partnership with improvement programme partners.
<b>New Charter</b>	See Rossendale's DLO being a major player for GVH but with support and advantage that partnering with NC Building Company can bring. Share best value practices and help open up new markets for DLO. Comment re savings they can demonstrate and these being ploughed back into GVH. Encourage DLO to make best use of local skill base, apprentice intake. Refer to jointly targeting wider Social Housing Market, have assurance that any profit is retained for investment in the Valley.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Role of DLO core to new organization. Detail refers to their experience since transfer in expanding teams and partnership with provider for supply of materials and reducing cost – the benefits of this could be extended to GVH. Have increased size of in house workforce since transfer – sustainable throughout the life of the business plan. Feel its important that DLO participates in responsive repairs, voids and investment programme. See opportunities for marketing service to wider community, also be used to fulfil some Council contracts.
<b>Twin Valley</b>	Propose DLO remains under management of GVH. After initial transfer consideration could be given from both organisations to the expansion of the DLO as capacity and skills allow in conjunction with the partnering arrangement currently employed by TVH. Proposed arrangement provides opportunity for the DLO to carry out responsive and re-let repairs across group for both organizations – 11,500+ homes. Over time opportunities to use skills and capacity of DLO to also expand into other areas of investment programme.
<b>Comment/Queries</b> Different responses according to position of RSL as regards their arrangements for repairs and improvements. May want to explore further some responses in terms of extent of local control vis a vis partner or parent body. All see provision of DLO services, potential for expansion.	

<b>Question :4 Improvements to stock – how can they help accelerate</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	On information received to date aware of shortfall in undertaking stock improvement. Can fund the shortfall. Have 2,000 units un-mortgaged and asset value of £200million. Group indicate can raise £30million to fund the 'shortfall'. Refer to approaches to asset management and supply chain management/procurement; experience in planned maintenance contracts and in-house stock condition survey.; asset management software. Indicate GVH may wish to buy into these to gain efficiencies
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Detail establishing Framework Contract for pre-selection of consultants/contractors; cost reductions through partnerships; use of 'whole house' and elemental works; arrangements to minimise/mitigate against disruption to tenants. Detail how accelerated loan drawdown to deliver accelerated programme can be offset e.g price advantage given volume across wider base; VAT shelter and use of capital receipts from RTB sales.
<b>New Charter</b>	Will offer experience in raising finance – have increased their loan facility. Delivered majority of programme two yrs earlier than originally promised. Plan to spend £42m of their resources increasing the Groups housing stock over next few year – Opportunities in Rossendale can be a first call on this money. Can provide expertise of their property services team. NC deliver over £25m each year in improvement and repairs. Detail their partnering approach. In house windows manufacturing plant (uVPC) would have capacity to deliver to GVH. Will buy in Occupational Therapist services to reduce waiting times for adaptations for GVH tenants with special needs, and tailor investment to adaptations.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Pennine current investment programme exceeds £100m over past 4 yrs. Have successful partnering relationship with contractors. Can be replicated to ensure timescales for GVH can be planned for and met. Detail cites how they have negotiated additional funding to accelerate own programme – £20m accelerated to £92m in fist 3 years. Will use Groups funding resources and security to negotiate with funders to achieve advancement. Make their experience available to GVH.
<b>Twin Valley</b>	TVH have delivered over £100m investment in its stock. Well placed to provide full design and project management service and be able to develop existing partnering arrangements. Could transfer their contractor partnering arrangement across the group. Will second member of property team and utilise SCSurvey date to meet Rossendale Standard. Having mechanisms in place before transfer to ensure programme commences on day one – tenants to see difference immediately.
<p>Comment/Queries</p> <p>Check if New Charter mean £42m. for 'increasing ' stock or should this read '<i>improving</i>'. Addressing Corporation query re Adactus reference to their funding the 'shortfall'.</p>	

<b>Question : 5 Central Support – what assistance can they offer</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	Provide a menu of services which Adactus provide to members – GHV can choose services from this. Includes finance; legal; IT; marketing and PR; Human Resources; statistics and business analysis; company secretarial advice and admin etc. Detail in submission.
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Can provide all central support – incl. accountancy; treasury management; business planning; rent collection and minimising arrears; IT; HR; training; internal audit; PR and marketing; colleague development programmes etc. Provided via SLA's customised to GVH requirements.
<b>New Charter</b>	Indicate GVH can concentrate on local service delivery and they can provide corporate support. Offer this expertise pre-ballot. Offer IT structure and systems; financial planning and control; tenancy compliance team/ASB; governance secretariat; HR; advice with Health and Safety; business improvement.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Indicate range of services that GVH can choose from. Includes finance; HR; IT; Stock Condition via bespoke piece of software; other services – includes tenant participation; ASB; Board admin etc. Detail in the submission
<b>Twin Valley</b>	Indicate GVH can benefit from being part of group with TVH. Cite range of financial services; information technology; personnel; and business services. Detail in submission
<b>Comment/Queries</b>	
Little difference in responses. New Charter appear more direct in terms of their providing these services, others more explicit in terms of suggesting choice from menus. So may want to clarify expectations.	

<b>Question : 6 Value for Money – how can GVH be satisfied they get VFM on services the parent/partner provides</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	Menu of SLA's, group members choose which to purchase and negotiate a price. Performance against delivery specified and reported each year in April and price may be reviewed in May/June. Ensures members satisfied they are achieving best value
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Together would establish SLA indicating level of service and costs. IVHA are monitored by Corporation and Audit Commission and must prove cost effective and efficient. Every year customer satisfaction levels increase whilst operational costs reduce
<b>New Charter</b>	Success founded on continual improvement – means savings directed toward GVH front line services. Lead RSL in delivery of ODPM value for money agenda. Operating cost index in line with national average and better than many similar RSL's. All other indicators demonstrate VFM. Services provided would be benchmarked against outside orgs; have agreed and detailed service standards; clear and transparent costs; regularly monitored with capacity to challenge. Cite their savings this year and where this is being redirected to. Detail in submission.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Cite Audit Commission statement , report May 2005, re focus on VFM. Expect to see group develop a culture of seeking out continuous improvement on VFM by reviews whilst maintaining or improving services to customers. Cite examples of what achieved to date. Detail in submission. Have partnership in place with external experts in VFM and would recommend this to group. Member of bodies to provide access to benchmarking and collective purchasing deals.
<b>Twin Valley</b>	As founder members of group TVH and GVH in position to set the standards required; agree SLA for group services; agree costing structure; establish monitoring arrangement for verifying delivery. Envisage providing services at cost to each subsidiary. Agreed at outset in service agreements and economies of scale to both. Intend that parent regularly benchmark costs.
<b>Comment/Queries</b>	
No significant variations – some refer more explicitly to processes such as benchmarking than others.	

<b>Question : 7 Why Choose Rossendale - benefits to their organisation of partnering GVH</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	Fits with business vision; would lower unit cost of central services and enable continued efficiency gains; enable Adactus to influence regional issues; able to pursue development opportunities and regeneration initiatives in Rossendale area; provide opportunity for shared learning and service improvement; enhance reputation as organisation people want to work with and be involved with
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Generate additional mutual benefits e.g. strategic work in East Lancs. ; dynamic procurement and supply chain partnerships; open up opportunities for enhanced service/business opportunities; financial strength; contribution to efficiency. Expanded on in submission
<b>New Charter</b>	In business for neighbourhoods – believe there are significant advantages to NC growing over time. Sold many houses over first 5 years – will happen to GVH too. Joining together gives both strength to respond to the effect this has for the business. GHV will help develop critical mass – economies of scale; managing overheads and costs of borrowing. All gain. Potential investment and repair work will allow development of the Building Company’s capacity in new direction, new markets. Combined size help access SHG. Provide opportunities for their staff to develop skills in new ways; organisation expertise will grow.
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Recognised need for medium term strategy to manage impact of stock reduction. Rossendale partnering meets the criteria they set for opportunities to grow business; spread costs; share experiences and plan future work opportunities. Common culture and strategies; spreading served support costs; opportunities for business and individuals to learn – particularly around works with EMB/TMO and Elevate. Potential to increase resources and provide better services; new ideas, wider housing market and support development of tenant involvement and stable communities
<b>Twin Valley</b>	As key providers in East Lancs. number of similarities between TV and GVH. If form group benefits include – improved efficiency; economies of scale; regeneration; profile. Expanded on in submission. TVH indicate firm belief in providing services for local people and in providing East. Lancs with viable, dynamic and community focused organisations , making use of local skills, knowledge and experience
<b>Comment/Queries</b>	
Similar responses – vary according to position of organisation.	

<b>Question : 8 Tenant Benefits – from the potential partnership</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	GHV access to funds which should reduce pressure on rents; efficiency gains; Rossendale Standard before 2010; assurance and security of joining established with good track record with Corp and Audit Commission and financial capacity to deliver on promises; GHV control management and maintenance – local accountability; Support to TMO's; GHV as equal partner and influence business planning and future strategy; due to Group existing and having done this before – less staff embroiled on transfer process and more time to concentrate on delivering the day job; access Groups central services – added value; shared learning will bring service improvements
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Successful track record in dealing with ASB and expert Positive Behaviour Officers – work on enforcement and prevention. Provide, through skilled Supported Housing Teams, opportunities to develop specialist services. Alongside refurbishment will commit substantial budgets to improving quality of life. Experience in delivering projects in areas such as crime, health etc. Refer to Local Community Regeneration Team providing activities and projects; youth workers for diversion. Work will bring people together and support local people in transforming neighbourhoods.
<b>New Charter</b>	Services delivered locally; ASB expertise; continuation of TMO principles and groups; dedicated and experienced Building Company focused on delivering high quality repair and investment work; continuously improving services; increasing tenant participation/involvement; achieve Council vision; economies of scale and infrastructure to deliver to tenants from day 1. Capacity to deliver investment programme; professional trained workforce; partnership working to deliver regeneration and sustainable neighbourhoods
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Commitment to resident involvement that creates culture of innovation, continuous improvement and VFM. Access to range of involvement options. More than Bricks and Mortar approach. State examples of opportunities created, joint working, partnerships etc. Wide range of types of tenant involvement in the transfer; investment programme; setting and monitoring service standards.
<b>Twin Valley</b>	Will help Rossendale improve services to tenants; have award winning customer services – able to share extensive resources to continue to improve. Cite their levels of customer satisfaction. Key reason for selecting Rossendale as partner is potential efficiency savings through shared services – tenants will benefit. Can help re-establish tenant activist roles and purpose in new regime. Detail in submission
Comment/Queries – similar responses with slight difference in emphasis. Partners offer experience and potential for additional capacity, shared resources.	

<b>Question : 9 Benefits to Council - of the partnership now and beyond transfer</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	Achieving Decent Homes Standard; safeguarding jobs of workforce and economic benefits of this to area; Group has partnering status with Corporation and be able to bring Approved Development Programme funding in to meet strategic needs; continued influence on GVH and therefore on Group
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Council and IVHA can work together to ensure major financial investment enhances the social and economic fabric of borough. Includes both direct benefits such as joint agreement on using potential VAT receipt; or indirect such as use of local labour and training schemes during improvements. Association wants to be key partner in LSP and has key role to play in providing affordable housing now and in future to improve quality of life. Work with Council to ensure vision for area’s long term housing market renewal becomes a reality through coordinating improvements, employment and local services.
<b>New Charter</b>	Immediate benefit of huge increase in capacity to deal with transfer. Post transfer to contribute fully to future prosperity of the Valley; via LSP and Community Strategy; joint work on Crime and Disorder; Local Area Agreements. Offer extensive experience to housing aid and homelessness services and supported housing schemes. Want to contribute fully to 8x8by2008
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Help Rossendale achieve objectives in community safety; health; education; environment; housing, economy; community network and culture. Detail in submission
<b>Twin Valley</b>	Transfer delivers benefits of inward investment; creation of jobs and training skilled workforce. TVH ideally placed with local experience to ensure Council and region benefit from proposed partnership. e.g.regeneration; development; promises to tenants; timescales. Detail in submission. Cite continued dialogue following transfer and meetings to monitor progress against promises
<p>Comment/Queries</p> <p>Similar responses</p>	

<b>Question : 10 What other potential partnerships are they involved in</b>	
<b>Adactus</b>	Bid to Manchester City for PFI on estate. Part of consortium – role to provide housing management and maintenance services. Not require capital from Adactus. Decision expected late summer and financial closure in 12 months. Advise that success in this will have no impact on their bid to Rossendale.
<b>Irwell Valley</b>	Cite success in delivering stock transfer projects with partners. April 2005 927 homes Haughton Green in Tameside. 5yr programme of stock and community improvement plans. Short-listed for Pendle. State they have the funding financial capacity and expertise to deliver all existing and future stock transfer submissions
<b>New Charter</b>	No other involvement in stock transfer arrangements or discussions with other LA's. Akxa HA is joining the group – November. Say will not affect ability to deliver positive ballot and successful transfer. In discussion with several other RSL's which have partnering status with Corporation with view to joining consortia to give improved access SHG. State that Rossendale is focus of attention
<b>Pennine 2000</b>	Have management contract to supply interim Housing Director for Preston City Council – ended May but extended for 3 months to allow for new recruit and the transfer. Asked to submit proposals for some small stock transfers in Sheffield. First bid submitted. State this will not effect what have offered to Rossendale
<b>Twin Valley</b>	Board took strategic decision only to concentrate on partnering with other organisations in the region. Currently on short-list for Pendle. Confirm not managing transfer process of any other organisation.
<b>Comment/Queries</b> 2 on list of Pendle too. Unclear on timing of Pendle decision. Need to ensure get commitment from chosen partner re the extent of their continued involvement in any other bids.	

15 June 2005

C:\Roberta Norris\Rossendale\stage 2\Stage 2 bid summary.doc