



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE NORTH WEST

Mr P. Seddon
Head of Financial Services
Rossendale Borough Council
Kingfisher Centre – Room 222
Futures Park
BACUP
Lancashire
OL13 0BB

Cunard Building
Pier Head
Water Street
Liverpool
L3 1QB

Tel: 0151 224 2940
Fax: 0151 224 6339

arnold.lee@gonw.gsi.gov.uk

9th October 2006

Dear Mr Seddon,

Rossendale Borough Council - Capital Strategy

I refer to the council's latest Capital Strategy dated August 2006 which has been submitted to the Government Office for assessment.

It is clear that much progress has been made by the council in its approach to asset management and I am pleased to inform you that the Capital Strategy has been assessed as **GOOD**.

The assessment has been made against the published primary and secondary criteria. There are three assessment bandings – Poor, Satisfactory and Good. All the Primary criteria have to be met in order to achieve a Satisfactory rating. To achieve a Good rating, at least 75% of the secondary criteria must be met, with at least one from each section, in addition to all the primary.

Capital Strategy Assessment - GOOD

The document is clear and concise with good use of appendices, making it easy to follow.

It not only sets out the systems the authority uses but also refers to actual programmes making it more of Rossendale's own strategy. It confirms the necessary corporate approach to the use of capital assets.

Primary criteria

Rossendale's strategy comfortably meets the primary criteria and is particularly clear on tying the capital objectives into corporate plans and explaining the approach to the prioritisation of project proposals.

Secondary criteria

The area of greatest weakness in previous strategies was in performance measurement and monitoring. This area has now been improved, particularly with the introduction of the new PMF, and enables the assessment to move from Satisfactory to Good. It is hoped that the new approach





GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE NORTH WEST

to put in place a thorough methodology for target setting and measuring outputs and outcomes will become embedded in the council's practices.

The only criterion where there is currently insufficient evidence is Secondary Criterion No. 8 where there could be more specific reference as to how performance measures relate to capital projects and the influence of grants and partnerships. Under Secondary Criterion No. 5 you could perhaps also ensure that the PMF system evaluates the longer term outcomes of projects as well as the immediate outputs but this may be covered in your Asset Management Plan.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like any more information about the assessment.

Yours sincerely

Arnold Lee
Cumbria & Halton Neighbourhood Renewal Team
Communities Group