

Meeting of the Executive
Monday 9th October 2006 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Lorber (Chair), Councillor Blackman (Vice Chair), and Councillors Allie, D Brown, V Brown, Castle, Colwill, O'Sullivan and Wharton.

Councillors Ahmed, Arnold, Dunwell, Fernandes, Fox, Hashmi, Jones and Thomas also attended the meeting.

Apologies for absence were given on behalf of Councillor Van Colle.

1. Reg Freeson

It was with regret that Councillor Lorber informed the Executive of the death of former councillor Reg Freeson following a short illness. Members observed a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

2. Councillor Van Colle

The Executive wished Councillor Van Colle a speedy recovery following his recent hospital stay.

3. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interest

Councillor Blackman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item relating to the approval of the selection of Preferred Bidder for the Non HRA Housing and Social Care PFI Project and would leave the room for the item taking no part in the discussion. Councillors O'Sullivan and Thomas declared personal interests in the item relating to Stonebridge Housing Action Trust as board members of Fortunegate Housing.

4. Minutes of previous meeting

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13th September 2006 be approved as an accurate record.

5. Matters Arising

John Billam Sports Pavilion – Disposal of Long Lease to Gujarati Arya Association (London)

The Director of Finance and Corporate Resources updated the Executive on discussions with GAA. There were still a number of outstanding issues and the organisation was due to come back with an offer the following day. Should this offer not be acceptable, the previously agreed legal action would be taken.

6. Deputation - Approval of the selection of Preferred Bidder for the Non HRA Housing and Social Care PFI Project

The Executive received a deputation from Mr Knight, a relative of a resident of Melrose House, who set out concerns at the proposals to change the

care provision to a campus style accommodation. Mr Knight spoke in favour of a design that would have residents in separate houses but all on one site which he felt would allow them to be able to be secure and able to travel within the site without staff assistance. Mr Knight also felt that having the accommodation on a single site would be more cost effective as there could be only one registered manager supported by deputies. Mr Knight asserted that neither the residents' relatives nor their carers agreed with the proposals and circulated to members extracts from the Government White Paper 'Valuing People' which referred to the objective of allowing people with learning disabilities and their families to have greater control over where and how they lived. He urged the Executive to facilitate, and not frustrate choice.

In response Councillor Lorber, stated that Mr Knight's concerns related to one aspect of the report from the Director of Housing and Community Care. He had also received representations from Brent Advocacy Consortium where there was a concern for making provision for the future and where residents were keen for accommodation that would facilitate greater independence and hence may have made different choices to those put forward by Mr Knight.

7. Approval of the selection of Preferred Bidder for the Non HRA Housing and Social Care PFI Project

This report described developments in the prospective PFI scheme since the Executive last considered the item on 14th November 2005. It proposed that the Brent Co-Efficient Consortium be appointed as the preferred bidder for the scheme for the purpose of further detailed negotiations. It also sought agreement to exclude the care services from the specification for the PFI and to authorise the Director of Housing and Community Care to develop options for the future provision of care services, such options to be reported back to members in due course.

The Director of Housing and Community Care, in response to the deputation received earlier in the meeting, stated that efforts would be made to achieve a high level of support for the changes. He accepted that there would be differences in the requirements of the new residents to the premises and existing residents of Melrose House and that any change would be difficult. He sought members' approval for detailed negotiations to take place with interested parties, to include carers and relatives of residents of Melrose House, up until March 2007. A discussion on the precise location would take place at a later date.

In discussion, Mr Knight and other members of the public cast doubt on the ability of residents to engage in meaningful consultation, as many residents were not capable of expressing their wishes, even through an advocate, such was the extent of their disability. The Director of Housing and Community Care responded to concerns that the PFI process would result in the removal of the social care element endangering government credits and assured that this would not be the case. A new provision could possibly increase costs however he would report further on this. He agreed that the project could take years to come into fruition however he emphasised the

need for careful planning and for the right decisions to be made. Councillor Colwill having visited the premises, concurred with views regarding the residents' decision making capacity and re-affirmed the need for further consultation. He proposed that the subsequent report include information on costings for 4 units as suggested at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the information contained in the exempt supplementary report also submitted to this meeting be noted;
- (ii) that approval be given to exclude the provision of social care from the specification for the PFI and to a further report back from officers on the future options for provision of those services;
- (iii) that the Brent Co-Efficient Consortium be appointed as preferred bidder for the Non HRA Housing and Social Care PFI scheme and the Director of Housing and Community Care be authorised to enter into detailed negotiations with the Consortium in respect of:
 - up to 300 affordable dwellings
 - up to 200 dwellings for letting to homeless households at market rents
 - up to 20 registered care home places
 - up to 15 supported living units and
 - up to 15 respite care beds.
- (iv) that it be noted that further consultation will be carried out with residents and carers on the type and location of accommodation to be provided for use by adults;
- (v) that a further report be submitted seeking agreement to award the PFI contract in due course;
- (vi) that this report include costings of alternate accommodation arrangements put forward at this meeting, with a clear understanding that consultation will continue.

(During the discussion of the above two items, Councillor Blackman declared a personal and prejudicial interest, took no part in the discussion and left the meeting).

8. The Future of Dollis Hill House

This report provided members with an update on proposals to reinstate Dollis Hill House, Gladstone Park, as a community facility and on future options for the House. The Director of Environment and Culture outlined the proposals for renovation, the history of the development including past efforts by the Dollis Hill House Trust (DHHT) to reinstate the house as a community facility, an expression of interest from the Brent tPCT, subsequently withdrawn, to convert the site into a health clinic with a community centre and also interest shown by the GLA. A revised viable

business plan from the DHHT has yet to be received. The Director outlined the four options before the Executive as set out in his report: Option 1 to redevelop the site, meeting all costs; option 2 to continue to progress the DHHT option; option 3 to sell the site for commercial development; option 4 to demolish the remainder of the house and make good with either landscaping or by creating a feature for the site. The Director stated that as the Council did not have revenue nor capital funding available apart from the remainder of the insurance fund he was recommending that the site be marketed openly for a three month period to anyone that would be likely to renovate in a manner which was likely to gain planning permission.

Martin Redston (Director and Company Secretary of the DHHT) addressed the meeting and outlined events over the past years referring to the PCT's withdrawn expression of interest, the business plan submitted in 2003, how changes to the Heritage Lottery rules impacted on plans and the search since that time for a partnership model. He added that the GLA had indicated that they would like to support and referred to an offer from the Mayor of London to fund up to 50% of the capital costs provided this was match-funded by the Council. Mr Redston also indicated that additional expressions of interest had been received from community groups using a business model. He urged the Executive adopt a more positive approach and to allow more time for the Trust to formulate proposals with assistance from Council and GLA officers. Mr Chambers, a local resident, contributed to the debate and referred to a perceived lack of consultation, the need to take into account the Local Development Framework, public transport access and what expenditure could be counted as match funding.

The Director was pleased that expressions of interest were coming forward and argued that consultation would take place on the plans received. He also felt that it was not feasible to wait for the LDF to be adopted and would be willing to use any eligible expenditure as a contribution towards funding should this be necessary.

In discussion, reference was made to the intervention from the Mayor of London which appeared to offer match funding and the need for the precise terms of this offer to be clarified. Different opinions were offered by ward councillors on public perception of the project on the one hand reminding of alleged promises made to the electorate to facilitate the redevelopment and on the other arguing that a significant number of residents were indifferent to the site, having other priorities. Other views expressed referred to surveys indicating that the majority of residents were in favour of renovation and urged the Executive to take a lead on the proposals.

The Executive would not accede to the request from DHHT for officer time to assist with the development of their business plan. Councillor Lorber (Leader of the Council) expressed the need for the Council not to be exposed to revenue and capital risk and also referred to the offer of capital funding from the Mayor of London and the need for the precise terms of this to be clarified. Councillor Blackman advised that the issue would be raised formally with the Mayor of London during his question time session.

RESOLVED

- (i) that the following future options for Dollis Hill House, all of which are considered in more detail in paragraph 3. 7 of the report be noted:
 - (a) To redevelop Dollis Hill House and for the Council to contribute to costs, both capital and revenue.
 - (b) To continue to wait for the Dollis Hill House Trust to finalise and submit a business plan.
 - (c) To sell the site for commercial development.
 - (d) To demolish the building, following the procedure laid out in the main body of the report.
- (ii) that it be noted that the Dollis Hill House Trust have written to the Leader of the Council asking Brent Council:-
“that it pledges matched funding towards the capital costs” that it “provides full time officer with suitable expertise to work with the Trust”
- (iii) that officers, in relation to (i) above market openly the site for a period of three months to anyone (including any community based Trust) who can renovate the listed building and provide it with a viable future, in a manner which is likely to gain planning permission and protect the park setting, and to report back to the Executive before option (d) is considered.
- (iv) that in light of the detail outlined in paragraph 3.2 of the report, members instruct officers not to pursue option (i) (a) nor the request in (ii) above.

9. Award of Domiciliary Care Services for Disabled Children and Young People

This report requested authority to award the contract for the provision of domiciliary care services for disabled children and young people as required by Contracts Standing Order 88. This contract was for a period of 3 years, commencing on 4 December 2006, with an option to extend the contract for a further two-year period. This report summarised the process undertaken in tendering this contract and following the completion of evaluation of the tenders, recommended to whom the contract should be awarded.

The Executive also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

that the contract for domiciliary care services for disabled children and young people be awarded to Servicescale Limited (trading as Personnel and Care Bank) for a period of 3 years commencing on 4th December 2006 with an option to extend the contract for a further two-year period.

10. The Amalgamation of Islamia Primary School and The Avenue School

The governing bodies of Islamia Primary School and The Avenue School jointly with Brent Council were proposing to expand Islamia Primary School from one form of entry (1FE) to two forms of entry (2FE), to close The Avenue School and transfer its pupils to Islamia Primary School by the end of the current school term. This report outlined the reasons why this action was needed, summarises the outcome of the initial consultation and seeks approval to issue statutory notices for the formal consultation. Circulated at the meeting was an addendum which set out the outcome of the informal consultation, the deadline for which had been 29th September.

Michael Lyon former lead member of Children and Families spoke in favour of the proposals and was pleased that there was a process in place to rescue the situation. He also suggested that the Council should take the opportunity to affirm a policy on faith schools but felt that these should be always publicly accountable.

Councillor Lorber emphasised the need at this stage for good quality schools, supported by the DFES to safeguard education provision in both establishments. The Director of Children and Families indicated that staff at the Islamia had some concerns however officers were working with them.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to issue the statutory notices on 19th October 2006 to start the formal consultation on the amalgamation of Islamia Primary School and The Avenue School;
- (ii) that approval be given to the reallocation of funds from The Avenue to Islamia as detailed in paragraph 4.2 of the report from the Director of Children and Families, subject to no objections from the Schools Forum.

11. Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Preferred Options

The report from the Director of Environment and Culture presented a draft Core Strategy, the key document of the new Local Development Framework (LDF). The Council was required to consult with the local community on its 'Preferred Options' for the Core Strategy. The preferred options for the Core Strategy had been drawn up after a round of public consultation in September/October 2005 and the options and the alternative options have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal. Members were required to agree

the draft Core Strategy for public consultation commencing on October 30th 2006.

The Director of Environment and Culture outlined the consultation process which had included approval by the Planning Committee (Policy) held on 5th October and an extract of the minutes was circulated at the meeting. He outlined the terms of a motion in the name of the Lead Member, Highways and Transportation, which reflected the decisions of the Planning Committee.

Councillor Blackman (Deputy Leader, Lead Member, Resources) proposed further amendments to the plan namely in CP SS5, (Wembley as a Focus for Growth), line 4, to add after schools 'or schools provision' to allow more flexibility. In Section 8.0.1 (Reducing the need to travel) line 3, it was proposed to add after private car 'in a socially acceptable and friendly manner' and after 'cycling' in line 4 'motor cycles, including scooters'. In Section 8.0.5 (Parking and Traffic Restraint) it was suggested that the second sentence be deleted so as to remove the suggestion that car usage would be reduced by reducing parking provision. Finally it was proposed to remove from the 8th line, the sentence 'Consequently, parking standards levels are low' in the light of recent experience on planning applications. Councillor Allie (Lead Member, Housing and Customer Services) suggested an addition to in Section 7.0.22 'where appropriate, the option of 100% shared ownership development'. The Director of Housing and Community Care confirmed that this was the intention providing the 70-30 split was not adversely affected.

The Director of Environment and Culture in reference to the proposed changes to Section 8.0.1 stated that there was a statutory obligation to adhere to the London Plan and the Mayor of London had powers to ensure that local Council's policies remained in line. He added that limiting availability of parking at the end of a journey was a means of reducing car usage and cited the example of CPZs in the Queens Park area. Additionally, parking standards were designed to take into account the availability of alternative means of transport.

The Executive discussed the role of the London Plan, the degree to which it was feasible to try to limit car usage artificially and the necessity of providing additional parking facilities at train stations. The Executive agreed the proposed amendments to CP SS5 and Section 8.0.1. In Section 8.0.5 line 3, it was agreed to substitute 'managing' for 'reducing' and in line 8 to insert "Consideration will be given to relating" in place of 'Consequently, parking standards will be related'. The Executive also discussed funding provided to meet the cost of the LDF exercise and the Director advised that the grant provided was based on performance and figures quoted in the report indicated what it was hoped would be received. However, he also pointed out that as the timetable had slipped the position was now less clear. Councillor Lorber suggested and it was agreed that representations be made to central government for 100% of costs to be met through grant funding.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the draft Core Strategy Preferred Options, be approved for public consultation between 30th October and 11th December 2006;
- (ii) that approval be given to the proposed changes to the timetable for LDF preparation for inclusion in a revised Local Development Scheme for submission to the Secretary of State;
- (iii) that decisions of the Planning Committee on 5th October 2006 be noted and approval given to the following changes being made to the Core Strategy Preferred Options agreed by that Committee:
 - (a) Para 1.0.6:- add “general” before “conformity” in final sentence.
 - (b) CP SS1, 3rd bullet point:- re-instate wording “with particular emphasis on the improvement of bus services” so that it reads ‘Alongside growth will be the improvement of transport nodes, mainly stations and bus/rail interchanges, improvement of travel corridors around and linking growth areas, with particular emphasis on the improvement of bus services, and improvement of walking and cycling.’
 - (c) CP UD2, point c.:- delete “within Brent”
 - (d) Para 9.1.26:- add “ and public transport” between “road” and “network” in final sentence.
 - (e) CP TC1:- add “new” after “Major” and add “sequentially preferable” between “no” and “sites” in second sentence so that it reads “Major new retail or leisure development will only be permitted in other town centres or edge-of-centre locations if it can be demonstrated that no sequentially preferable sites are available in Wembley and the preferred location order set out in policies CP TC2 AND TC3 is followed.”
 - (f) CP CF1:- add “the visual and performing arts, music and drama” after “opportunities for”
- (iv) that the following additional changes to the Core Strategy Preferred Options be also agreed:
 - (a) CP SS5:- line 4 after “such as schools” add “or school provision”
 - (b) Para 8.0.1 line 3:- after private car insert “in a socially acceptable and friendly manner” and in the fourth line after “cycling” insert “, motor cycles (including scooters)”
 - (c) Para 8.0.5 line 3:- delete “reducing” insert “managing”

- (d) Para 8.0.5 line 8:- delete “Consequently, parking standards will be related” and insert “Consideration will be given to relating”
- (e) Para 7.0.22 add to end: “Within Brent this could include, where appropriate, the option of 100% shared ownership development.
- (v) that the Director of Planning be authorised to make non-material changes to the Core Strategy Preferred Options as necessary prior to publication for public consultation;
- (vi) that officers make representations to Central Government requesting that the costs of delivering the LDF should be 100% grant funded.

12. **Implementing the Contaminated Land Strategy**

The Director of Environment and Culture introduced his report which set out the Council's statutory duty to inspect land in the Borough and identify potentially polluted land which could pose a risk to human health. A significant number of potentially contaminated sites had been identified as high priority sites requiring further investigation to determine the risk to health however under existing resources only 7 intrusive site investigations per annum could take place. Consequently the Director was seeking additional resources to be subject to approval during 2007/08 to accelerate this process and ensure adequate financial provision was made for potential legal costs.

A motion circulated in the name of Councillor D Brown (Lead Member, Highways and Transportation) proposed that investigations be carried out within a reasonable period of time and that option 3 in the report from the Director of Environment and Culture be adopted calling on the government to make additional funding available.

Concern was expressed on the length of time it had taken for the Council to exercise its responsibilities given that the legislation came into force in 1990 and the Director clarified that the legislation was challenging and detail had only recently been agreed. Pilots had also been taking place. He agreed to provide information on the areas affected across the borough and assured that a communication strategy would be in place to avoid unnecessary public concern. The Director agreed to investigate means of raising additional funding provision through search fees.

The Executive agreed the motion in the name of Councillor D Brown.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the content of the background paper in Appendix 1 and detailed information in Appendix 2 of the report from the Director of Environment and Culture be noted;
- (ii) that the number of potentially contaminated sites identified as a high priority for further investigation be noted and that investigations be

completed within a reasonable period of time to limit any risk to human health and provide reassurance to residents;

- (iii) that this work be progressed in line with option 3 in the report from the Director of Environment and Culture set out in paragraph 4.6, namely investigating 25 sites per annum, subject to approval as part of the 2007/2008 budget process and calls on the government to provide additional revenue support, possibly through ring fenced grant, to make this possible.

13. Consideration of extension of contract for the supply of Revenues and IT support service

This report sought members' agreement for the future provision of the Revenues service and IT provision for Revenues and Benefits from May 2008, when the existing contract with Capita expires. Councillor Blackman, (Lead Member, Resources) reminded the Executive that performance had improved, relatively, and that officers would continue to monitor closely.

The Executive also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to exercise the contractual provision to extend the existing Revenues and IT contract with Capita for 3 years from May 1 2008 to 30 April 2011 on the basis set out in Appendix 1, subject to satisfactory conclusion of contract negotiations;
- (ii) that subject to recommendation (i), above, delegated powers be given to the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to finalise discussions with Capita through to and including contract extension award, subject to there being no significant increase in the proposed contract price submitted by Capita or significant variation to the proposed contract terms, conditions and arrangements.

14. London Authorities Mutual Insurance and Procurement of Insurance Services

This report described the proposal to establish a "Mutual" insurance company controlled by, and run for the benefit of, participating London authorities. They would pool their risks and the costs of administration, whilst retaining the current levels of self-insurance. The Mutual will reinsure high-level risk and issue policies to its members annually. It would register with the Financial Services Authority as an insurance company and it will need to capitalise (by guarantees from member authorities) and appoint experienced non-executive directors as well as London Finance Directors to

ensure it was run appropriately. The report asked for approval to explore further the option of joining the proposed Mutual. Officers would report back to the Executive once the options have been explored further and legal advice has been obtained. It also asked for approval for the carrying out of a tender process in parallel with examination of the Mutual, should the Mutual proposal not proceed or not be ready to issue insurance contracts by 1st April 2007.

The Borough Solicitor referred to an addendum, circulated at the meeting, which amended section 5 of the report relating to the procurement timetable so that the process commences following the submission of a further report requesting final approval to be presented to the November meeting of the Executive.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given in principle to participating in the Mutual but subject to receiving a further report back from officers once they have fully explored this option and once external legal advice is obtained;
- (ii) that it be noted that the proposal is that the Council would become a full member of the company and would agree to purchase Brent's corporate Property, Liability and Motor insurance requirements for a minimum period of one year through the Mutual with effect from 1st April 2007. In the event that the Mutual is unable to assume risk by that date the Council would obtain interim cover through the tendering process described below;
- (iii) that it be further noted that the proposal also is that the Council would participate in capitalising the company by way of a financial guarantee of no more than £1m;
- (iv) that approval be given to officers to inviting tenders for insurance services as an alternative to joining the London Authorities Mutual on the basis of the pre-tender considerations set out in sections 3 – 5 of the report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources and approval be also given to officers to evaluating tenders on the basis of the evaluation criteria set out in section 5 of the report.

15. Access of Older People to Sports and Leisure Facilities – Final report of Scrutiny Task Group (Adult Social Care Scrutiny Panel)

This report presented the findings of the *Access of Older People to Sports and Leisure Facilities* Task Group to the Executive. It provided officer comments and information on the legal, financial and diversity implications of its recommendations. The recommendations from the task group report require implementation by the following units: sports services, community care and Brent Adult and Community Education Services.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the recommendations made in this review (listed on page1 of the task group report) be noted and the Task Group thanked for its work;
- (ii) that the relevant service areas monitor progress in relation to the task group recommendations and to report back to the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee as appropriate.

16. Community Access to Schools

This report outlined the work, findings and recommendations of the Overview task group's investigation into community access to schools. The task group membership comprised of Councillor Arnold (chair), Councillor Wharton and former Councillors Kabir, Gladbaum, and also Mr Lorenzato (Education co-optee). The group met on six occasions between September 2005 and February 2006 and their final report was agreed by the Overview Committee on 23rd March 2006.

Councillor Arnold addressed the meeting and emphasised the importance of community access referred to in the Task Group's report. She recognised that the budget was limited however felt that expenditure in this area provided added value. Councillor Arnold drew attention to the recommendations in the Task Group's report particularly the call for one co-ordinator to be attached to each cluster of schools, for the steering group to be proactive, for the Standards Fund to be used in a like manner and for charges to be affordable.

Councillor Wharton (Lead Member, Children and Families) indicated support for the aim of community access and pointed out that it was the intention for there to be a review of the outcomes of the extended schools project. He felt that the report to the Executive confused the issues of the extended schools project and community access more generally. The Director of Children and Families stated that available funding did not allow smaller clusters and the Standards Fund was insufficient. He confirmed that the report would address community access and also plans, problems and options. He would also pilot arrangements and report back on typical costs and sample information.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the recommendations made in this review be noted the Task Group thanked for their work;
- (ii) that officers bring a separate report to the Executive detailing progress on and outcomes of the Extended Schools project;
- (iii) that officers report back on progress towards ensuring that school buildings are available for public use, the report to include sample information of funds allocated and associated provision costs.

17. **Stonebridge Housing Action Trust – Tenants’ Choice of Successor Landlord**

This report concerned the right of Stonebridge tenants to choose between the council and Hillside Housing Trust as their future landlord, when Stonebridge HAT is wound up in 2007; and sought members’ agreement to the terms of the council’s offer to Stonebridge tenants. The Director of Housing and Community Care advised that the ballot would now be in May 2007 instead of January/February as required by the decanting process. The arrangements for Newcroft remained the same. The Director set out the effect of the proposals on right to buy and the terms and conditions of transfer. He also set out the reasons for presenting available options and why trickle transfers were not being recommended at this time. He also confirmed that the Council would not be inheriting outstanding rent arrears and that assurances had been given that the housing stock would be inspected.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the statutory right of Stonebridge Housing Action Trust (HAT) tenants to choose between the council and Hillside Housing Trust (Hillside) or the council and Willow Housing and Care (Willow) in the case of Newcroft House, as their successor landlord when the HAT is wound up in 2007, be noted;
- (ii) that it be noted that there will be a form of ballot in November for the tenants of Newcroft in January/February 2007 and for the bulk of Stonebridge tenants in May 2007 to enable tenants to make that choice; and that there is a need for the council to inform the tenants in writing (the ‘offer’) of the terms under which they would return to the council;
- (iii) that it be noted that the council has entered into a ‘PFI style’ management contract for Hillside to manage any properties which may return to the council; that this impacts on the terms of the offer the council may make; and that tenants should be informed of this fact.
- (iv) that approval be given to the terms and conditions under which Stonebridge tenants may choose to return to the council being, as far as possible, the same as for all other council tenants in the borough; and that, if for legal reasons it proves necessary, immediately on succession the council will begin the processes required to move tenants from the form of tenancy terms and conditions inherited from the HAT to the council’s current terms and conditions;
- (v) that tenants returning to the council pay the target rent for their new homes as soon as possible; that officers review the financial impact of any tenants transferring to the council subject to the HAT’s rent phasing scheme, where this brings the rent charged below the management fee due to Hillside, with a view to minimising any possible deficit; that officers to take all possible steps including

setting up advice surgeries to give information to affected tenants on available benefits; and that tenants be made aware of these matters in the offer document;

- (vi) that, as an exception to the approach at (iv) above, if tenants of Newcroft return to the council they be offered rent phasing, as this can be financed from the projected surplus arising in the event of these tenants transferring to the council;
- (vii) that it be agreed that the council's normal policy with respect to tenancy terms and conditions, including succession and assignment rights will apply to Stonebridge tenants;
- (viii) that the position in relation to Hillside's intended windfall payment be noted and it be agreed that the council will not make a similar offer;
- (ix) that the position in relation to Hillside's intended 'Homebuy' incentive be noted and agreed that the council will not make a similar offer;
- (x) that the position in respect of building defects in some new properties be noted and also the agreement by Hyde to honour the principle that the council transferred this risk with the PFI style contract and that therefore no costs will fall to the council;
- (xi) that, at this time, it be agreed not to offer to Hillside the 'trickle transfer' of council properties at Stonebridge, as they become vacant;
- (xii) that the position in relation to Newcroft House be noted and agreed that Willow Housing and Care will be the council's agent and provide management, maintenance and care services to elderly tenants, in the event that a majority of HAT secure tenants at Newcroft choose the council as their landlord;
- (xiii) that members delegate to the Director of Housing and Community Care the authority to agree the form of tenancy agreement to be offered to the tenants of Newcroft House, on condition that the agreement be substantially the same as that of other council tenants in the borough;
- (xiv) that delegated authority be given to the Director of Housing and Community Care to agree, on legal advice, the basis on which Willow will manage any Newcroft properties transferring to the council, if it does not simply novate on transfer of those properties;
- (xv) that delegated authority be given to the Director of Housing and Community Care to finalise and issue an offer document which commends Willow as a landlord to the tenants, but gives adequate information and a welcoming message to tenants who may wish to transfer to the council;
- (xvi) that approval be given in relation to Newcroft to 'trickle transfer' council properties to Willow, as tenancies terminate and the

properties are vacated, as this is in line with the earlier transfer of council sheltered stock to Willow; and that members delegate to the Director of Housing and Community Care the authority to agree, on legal advice, the terms and conditions of those transfers;

- (xvii) that should the 27 HAT units in Newcroft House transfer to the council, officers should attempt to protect them from being lost from the housing stock through right to buy, by negotiating with Willow Housing an appropriate amendment to the lease.

18. **Temporary Accommodation Update**

This report sought members' approval for a change to the Locata banding scheme for households in temporary accommodation who accept a qualifying offer of private sector accommodation. This report provided members with an update on progress against the Government's target to halve the number of homeless households in temporary accommodation by 2010, including an update on trends in homelessness and current numbers in temporary accommodation. The Director of Housing and Community Care clarified that the change to Locata was being proposed so as to incentivise people to take settled accommodation and not become homeless.

RESOLVED

- (i) that approval be given to the change to the Locata banding scheme for households in temporary accommodation who accept a qualifying offer of private sector accommodation, as detailed in paragraph 3.3.20 of the report from the Director of Housing and Community Care;
- (ii) that the update on progress against the temporary accommodation reduction targets be noted.

(Councillors O'Sullivan and Thomas declared personal interests in this item as board members of Fortunegate Housing.)

19. **Supporting People Contracts**

This report asked the Executive to agree that a number of specific Supporting People contracts due to 'good operational and financial reasons' need not be let in accordance with the tendering requirements as ordinarily required by the Council's Contract Standing Orders.

The Executive also had before them an appendix to the report which was not for publication as it contained the following category of exempt information as specified in Schedule 12 of the Local Government (Access to Information Act) 1972:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the following Supporting People services should not be tendered for good operational and financial reasons and that 3 year contracts be awarded to the existing providers following a full contract review:

Willow Housing Association (sheltered housing services) (contract start date April 1st 2007)

ECHG Single homeless (hostel) (contract start date October 10th 2006)

ECHG mentally ill homeless hostel (contract start date October 10th 2006);

- (ii) that the Hestia Housing and Care (Offenders) Supporting People service should not be tendered at the present time for good operational and financial reasons and that the contract with the existing provider is extended for 2 years from January 10th 2007 to ensure stability of the service and enable the council to tender the services in the longer term;
- (iii) that the St Mungo's (Single Homeless Hostel) Supporting People service should not be tendered at the present time for good operational and financial reasons and that two year contract be awarded to the existing provider from October 10th 2006 on the basis that it implements the recommendations of the full contract review of the previous provider;
- (iv) that the English Churches Floating Support Supporting People contract should be extended by 8 months from December 1st 2006 to allow a review of future procurement to be concluded;
- (v) that it be noted that the Supporting People team is currently developing, in consultation with providers and other stakeholders, a revised review procedure and a programme of strategic reviews of Supporting People services which will take place over a period of 3 years;
- (vi) that officers report back within the next 6 months regarding the future procurement strategy for Supporting people Contracts.

20. **Items called in for Scrutiny**

(i) 2006/7 Revenue Budget Monitoring

The Executive received an extract from the minutes of the Forward Plan Select Committee meeting held on 26th September 2006 commenting on the decisions taken by the September Executive in relation to the budget which was noted. Councillor Blackman apologised for not being able to be present at the meeting and re-emphasised that consideration was being given to those areas where the 2% savings had not been agreed. He also considered the efficiency savings and was satisfied that they did not equate to reductions in services to users.

(ii) Promoting Day Opportunities for Adults with Disabilities

The Executive received an extract from the minutes of the Forward Plan Select Committee meeting held on 26th September 2006 in connection with this item considered at the September Executive which was noted.

21. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting would take place on Monday 13th November 2006.

The meeting ended at 10.00 pm.

P LORBER
Chair