Executive – libraries transformation project supplementary report

Monday, 11 April 2011 at 7.00 pm
Council Chamber, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9HD

Membership:

Lead Member Councillors:	Portfolio
John (Chair)	Leader/Lead Member for Corporate Strategy and Policy Co-ordination
Butt (Vice-Chair)	Deputy Leader/Lead Member for Resources
Arnold	Lead Member for Children and Families
Beswick	Lead Member for Crime Prevention and Public Safety
Crane	Lead Member for Regeneration and Economic Development
Jones	Lead Member for Human Resources and Diversity, Local Democracy and Consultation
J Moher	Lead Member for Highways and Transportation
R Moher	Lead Member for Adults, Health and Social Care
Powney	Lead Member for Environment, Planning and Culture
Thomas	Lead Member for Housing and Customer Services

For further information contact: Anne Reid, Principal Democratic Services Officer
020 8937 1359, anne.reid@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:
www.brent.gov.uk/committees

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Agenda – libraries supplementary report

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members.

In November 2010 the Executive agreed to a three month consultation of proposals contained within the Libraries Transformation Project. This report proposes a renewed Library Strategy, centred around a clearly defined library offer and driven by the Councils responsibilities and resources, the assessment of needs and consultation. It also addresses the potential implications for six buildings should the recommended strategy be agreed.

Ward Affected: **Lead Member**: Councillor Powney
All Wards;   **Contact Officer**: Sue McKenzie, Arts, Libraries
                             and Heritage
                             Tel: 020 8937 3144 sue.mckenzie@brent.gov.uk

---

📱   Please remember to **SWITCH OFF** your mobile phone during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.
- Toilets are available on the second floor.
- Catering facilities can be found on the first floor near The Paul Daisley Hall.
- A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

---

Executive – 11 April 2011

Supplementary report from Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services

Agenda item 6 – Libraries Transformation Project

1. **Introduction**

This supplementary report addresses the following issues, none of which are considered to make a significant difference to the findings of the main report. The information is provided to give Members a complete set of information against which to make a decision.

   a. **Appraisal of a submission for a community library at Preston.** This proposal was not received due to a technical problem. Officers accept that it was submitted within the deadline and it has therefore been considered in the same way as other submissions
   b. **Inclusion and analysis of remaining consultation responses:** as noted in the main report, a large number of paper questionnaires were received at the very end of the consultation period. These have now been analysed and the main consultation statistics reviewed in the light of the additional information
   c. **Errata:** a few errors have been noted, which are set out below.

2. **Recommendations**

The additional material covered in this supplementary report has been carefully considered, but is not considered to make a difference to the recommendations in the main report. Accordingly, there is no change to the recommendations.

3. **Preston library submission**

3.1   A proposal was received for Preston Community Library which did not arrive in the inbox for the designated email address until after the main report was published. That report did not address this proposal and its authors alerted officers to its absence. Officers have taken steps to investigate when the email was sent, and this suggests that the email was sent before the close of the consultation on 4 March. Officers therefore agreed to appraise the proposal using the same process and guidance as that used on the other nine proposals. That process is set out in paragraph 12 and Appendix Six of the main report.

3.2   The detailed appraisal is at Annex S1 to this Supplementary Report. It is clear from this appraisal that the latest proposal does not represent a viable business case. A significant element of the proposal is a further argument against closing Preston Library, primarily on grounds of transport and disabled access; these issues are addressed in paragraph 9 and Appendix Four of the main report. Although there is very limited financial information in the proposal, it appears to assume that there will be ongoing subsidy from the Council, at least in premises costs, the risks relating to buildings and assets would remain with the Council, and the proposal shows very little evidence of relevant expertise in the group, or its longevity. Officers therefore do not recommend further engagement with this proposal.

4. Additional consultation responses

4.1   A fuller explanation of the effect of the latest analysis on the overall statistics is at Annexe S2 to this Supplementary Report

4.2   A total of 1517 questionnaires were submitted by 4th March – 705 online submissions (46%) and 812 paper copies (54%)

4.3   Of this total 372 paper copies were submitted in the last few days of the consultation period and have subsequently been inputted and analysed. These responses have been carefully considered, and are summarised below. The vast majority of these returns were from residents who cited Preston as being their nearest library within their questionnaire response.   As the main report explains, this large number of paper submissions could not be input and studied in time to inform the analysis in the main report. (para 5.1 of Appendix Three of the main report refers to this point.)

4.4   The final topline data analysis shows only a few instances of significant variation from the final interim analysis produced for the Executive report. For the purpose of this update report, plus or minus 2% is used to indicate significant variation.

4.5   The significant variations can be summarised as follows

Ethnicity equality stream – the number of respondents belonging to the white group has dropped by 3% to 57% while the Asian group has increased by 5% to 26%. These variations are a significant change to the number of Asians responding and it means that some 41% of the respondents identify as from black and minority ethnic communities, 57% identify as white, and 2% as 'other'. Before the later questionnaires were analysed, the respondent population was 60% white. This compares to the population figures which show that 29% of active borrowers identify as white. The change from 60% to 57% needs to be set against the overall disparity between the ethnicity of active borrowers and the ethnicity of respondents, as members consider the weight they give to the consultation responses in considering the recommendations.

Nearest Brent library – the number of respondents citing Preston as their nearest library (31%) has overtaken Kensal Rise (28%). 59% of respondents cited either Kensal Rise or Preston as their nearest library, a marginal increase of 1%. 82% of respondents cited one of the six libraries proposed for closure as their nearest library, a marginal decrease of 1%

Library used most often- the number of respondents citing Preston (32%) has overtaken Kensal Rise (27%).

Proposal to rationalise services – the number of respondents who don't accept that this is a reasonable course of action has fallen by 2% to 80%. 12% of respondents accept the proposals as being reasonable, a marginal increase of 1%.

Future service delivery options – the most significant variations are contained within the set of questions relating to future use of libraries, volunteering and charging for services. These will be reflected in the detailed planning for implementation of the new library offer set at paragraph 4 of the main report.

Additional comments – a large number of respondents submitted additional comments which are consistent with the main themes in the summary table within the Executive Report.

Correspondence from schools local to Preston Library

The Head of Libraries, Arts and Heritage received approximately 50 letters from Preston Library campaigners, written by school students local to Preston Library were dismayed at the closure proposals and felt that, if it went ahead, it would have an effect on their ability to both study and read for pleasure. Additionally 400 letters from students at Preston Park Primary School protesting against the closure were delivered to Brent Town Hall on April 4th. Members will note that the main report, particularly at paragraph 4 (the library offer) and Appendix Four (the EIA) contains important steps to mitigate the impact on children and young people, including targeting outreach and related services on schools most affected by closure.

5.   Errors in the report

Section	Published	Correction
Annexe 4.1 below table 5 (page 90)	This equates to 79 individuals across the 6 libraries.	This equates to **48** individuals across the 6 libraries.
Annex 4.1 below table 5 (page 90)	Annex 4.4 shows a pictorial representation of this demographic strand using the active borrowers' data	Annex 4.4 shows a pictorial representation of this demographic strand using the **2007 population estimates**
Executive Report Section 8.6 (page 27)	60% of respondents identified as white (45% white British), compared to 32% of active borrowers.	60% of respondents identified as white (45% white British), compared to **29%** of active borrowers.
Annexe 4.1 1. Age Equality (page 87)	Kensal Rise Library…11% were 65 to 74	Kensal Rise Library…11% were **60** to 74
Annexe 4.2 Page 134 Mosaic reference	Whilst this assertion maybe true, the Mosaic data shows that majority of households have a higher likelihood than the national average to have broadband access at home.	The Mosaic table was changed to include the most up to date profiles. The assertions remain the same.

Section	Published	Correction
	Almost 90% of households in Brent fall under eight Mosaic types which collectively indicate that the likelihood of having broadband access at home is at least 1.5 times higher than the national average for these households. All the affected wards fall in one of the top eight Mosaic types which indicates that the likelihood of having broadband access at home is higher than the national average. <table><tr><th>Affected Wards</th><th>Top three Mosaic types</th></tr><tr><td>Dollis Hill</td><td>C20, D27, F36</td></tr><tr><td>Kensal Green</td><td>D27, E28, C20</td></tr><tr><td>Mapesbury</td><td>E28, D27, E29</td></tr><tr><td>Preston</td><td>C20, D27, C19</td></tr><tr><td>Sudbury</td><td>C20, D27, E28</td></tr><tr><td>Tokyngton</td><td>C20, D27, E28</td></tr></table>	<table><tr><th>Ward</th><th>1</th><th>2</th><th>3</th></tr><tr><td>Sudbury</td><td>E20</td><td>H36</td><td>G29</td></tr><tr><td>Mapesbury</td><td>G31</td><td>G28</td><td>I39</td></tr><tr><td>Tokyngton</td><td>E20</td><td>G29</td><td>H36</td></tr><tr><td>Welsh Harp</td><td>E20</td><td>H36</td><td>G29</td></tr><tr><td>Preston</td><td>E17</td><td>G29</td><td>H36</td></tr><tr><td>Kensal Green</td><td>N62</td><td>G29</td><td>I39</td></tr></table>
Annexe 4.1 Table 3 and Table 6 (page 89 & 91)	Neasden active borrowers - 2,336 Total active borrowers 11,874	Neasden active borrowers - **2,366** Total active borrowers **11,904**
Annexe 4.1 below table 4 (page 89)	197 of the 952 respondents across the 6 libraries are over 60 years old.	197 of the **1,286** respondents across the 6 libraries are over 60 years old.
Annexe 4.1 Table 6 (page 91)	Cricklewood – Total Number of active borrowers 1341. Number under 19- 698 and 42%	Cricklewood – Total Number of active borrowers 1341. Number under 19- 698 and **52%**
Annexe 4.1 (pages 105, 106) under Barham and Cricklewood)	Barham – 24% did not disclose this information Tokyngton- 55 did not disclose this information	Barham- **20% in fulltime employment and 2% did not disclose this information** **Tokyngton – 5%** did not disclose this information
Appendix 1 5.4.1 (page 44)	The number of *visits*, measured by the electronic counters, in 2010/11:	**2010/11** **Libraries** **Visits** Barham Park 32,851 Cricklewood 45,087

Section	Published	Correction
	Library 2010/11 visits* Willesden Green 508,599 Ealing Road 212,548 Harlesden 187,972 Kingsbury 174,843 Town Hall 157,803 Neasden 117,131 Kilburn 92,037 Preston 87,508 Barham Park Closed part year Cricklewood 45,266 Kensal Rise 41,420 Tokyngton 40,807 *March visits are estimated	Ealing Road 212,840 Harlesden 187,988 Kensal Rise 41,540 Kilburn 93,269 Kingsbury 174,544 Neasden 117,228 Preston 87,415 Tokyngton 40,416 Townhall 158,482 Willesden Green 508,790 *Actuals*
Appendix 1 5.4.2 (page 44)	**Library 2010/11 loans*** Willesden Green 273.808 Ealing Road 180,151 Kingsbury 164,394 Town Hall 102,404 Preston 84,659 Kilburn 62,484 Neasden 42,762 Barham Park Closed part year Cricklewood 38,430 Kensal Rise 31,545 Tokyngton 29,182 *March visits are estimated	**Libraries** **2010/11 Loans** Barham Park 23,072 Cricklewood 37,938 Ealing Road 168,898 Harlesden 87,764 Kensal Rise 31,962 Kilburn 62,798 Kingsbury 161,896 Neasden 41,747 Preston 83,785 Tokyngton 28,318 Townhall 101,853 Willesden Green 239,998 *Actuals*

6. Contact details

Sarah Tanburn, Interim AD Neighbourhood Services ext 5001
Sue McKenzie, Head of Libraries, Arts and Heritage, ext 3149

Sue Harper
Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services

ANNEXE S1

APPRAISAL OF FINAL ALTERNATIVE PROPOSITION FOR THE LIBRARY SERVICE

PROPOSAL : PRESTON COMMUNITY LIBRARY: CATEGORY 1

Issue for appraisal	Proposition	Summary comment and appraisal
Viability of the group making this proposal	A group becomes a Charitable Trust, runs the library with volunteers and provides some additional services.	New formation, and not even clear whether this is the Friends of Preston Library or a different group. Refer to donations and volunteers, so there is current support. Will this last? No costs included for running the group (eg accountancy, audit etc)
Viability of proposals	To run on a volunteer basis only,	No costings are given to run or maintain the building; appears to assume Council will give or lease the building at nil cost, including covering insurance, utilities etc. Dependency on contributions/donations unclear and no figures given based on local experience. (Only reference is to a US structure.) Income of £7-8K from fines and rental is optimistic. No costs given to management of volunteers eg training, or of stock etc. Proposal also includes a club for stroke victims but no consideration of any adaptations that might be required and associated costs.
Quality of the Proposals	Starts similar hours etc to current offer, but extensions.	*Volunteers*: unclear how volunteers will be identified trained, managed and supported. *The Trust* – who runs it and where are the costs of its management? *Stock and services* – the proposal appears to assume that the Preston Community library remains part of the LBB library ecology for the purposes of membership. This would mean remaining linked to the LBB system for issuing cards, access to returns and renewals and acquiring new members. It also ties the Trust to LBB penalties etc to ensure fairness. LBB users have access to 14 boroughs' libraries through the Consortium, so protocols must be developed and enforced for data access within government guidelines on security.. *Stock buying*- No money has been identified for stock.
Promotion of diversity and inclusion.	Little is said in the proposal.	Proposals for volunteer management and recruitment must also reflect the local communities.
Delivering the Council's savings.	The proposal makes no statement about Council subsidy except asking the Council to keep it open 'for at least six months'	The continued operation of the library would be an ongoing cost to the Council. The proposal is largely silent on proposed costs, but appears to assume that all premises and stock costs remain with the Council.

Issue for appraisal	Proposition	Summary comment and appraisal
Acceptability of contractual terms and transfer of risk	Not clear whether the group proposes to take over the building and on what terms	Unknown but appear to assume that building risks stay with the Council.
Risk to the Council in proposed route	Unclear as insufficient financial information.	If assumes all risks stay with the Council there may be risks in the arrangement, but impossible to be sure from the proposal.

<u>LTP Consultation questionnaire final topline analysis</u>

Total responses

1517 submitted – 705 online (46%) and 812 paper copies (54%)

372 paper copies were submitted in the last few days of the consultation period, the vast majority of these were from residents who cited Preston as being their nearest library within their questionnaire response.

The final topline data analysis shows only a few instances of significant variation from the final interim analysis produced for the Executive report. For the purpose of this update report, plus or minus 2% is used to indicate significant variation.

Equality Streams

Gender – no significant variation

Female 63% (+1%)

Male   37% (-1%)

Age – no significant variation

35-44 – 26% (-1%)

0-24 – 10% (+1%)

Ethnicity –significant variation for two ethnic groups.

White group 57% (-3%)

Asian group 26% (+5%)

Black group 8% (NC)

There were no significant variations across the remaining equality streams other than for respondents citing Hinduism as their religion (14%, an increase of 2%)

Frequency of visits

Marginal variation – 88% (+1%) of respondents have visited a Brent library at least once a month in the past year.

Only 2% of respondents have never used a Brent library

Nearest Brent library

Significant variation –Kensal Rise and Preston responses have flip flopped.

Preston 31% (+7%)

Kensal Rise 28% (-6%)

Preston or Kensal Rise 59% (+1%)

Library proposed for closure 82% (-1%)

Library used most often (respondents were able to cite more than one library)

Significant variation –Kensal Rise and Preston responses have flip flopped.

Preston 32% (+8%)

Kensal Rise 27% (-8%)

WGLC 14% (-1%)

Town Hall 12% (+3%)

Method of travel (respondents were able to cite more than one method)
Increases for car and bus and a decrease for walking to library.
Walk 89% (-1%)
Car 19% (+2%)
Bus 17% (+3%)

Reason for using libraries (respondents were able to cite more than one use)

For pleasure/follow up interests 84% (-3%)
Connection with studies/learning 43% (+1%)
Connection with work 24% (+1%)
Other reasons (predominantly related to use by children) 27% (NC)

Services used (respondents were able to cite more than one service)
Very marginal variations across the 14 options – borrow books (89%), find something out
(59%) and read magazines (51%) remain as the highest response rates and show no changes
in percentages compared to the final interim analysis.

Online services used (respondents were able to cite more than one service)
Very marginal variations across the 10 options – look for and request books at 65% (NC) and
renew items at 59% (+1%) remain the highest response rates.

Agreement with proposals
Marginal variation on the broad proposal that libraries become community hubs with
revised service delivery and funding principles.
25% (+1%) agree or strongly agree with the proposal
61% (NC) disagree or strongly disagree

Significant variation on the proposal to rationalise services, including the closure of libraries.
12% (+1%) accept that the suggested course of action is reasonable.
80% (-2%) don't accept that this is a reasonable course of action.

Future use of library services
Marginal variation across the 8 suggested future scenarios with the exception of
Library buildings also used as community meeting places 76% (-3%)
Fewer, better, bigger libraries 14% (+2%)

Volunteering
With the exception of general volunteering at 61% (+1%), all other volunteering options
varied downwards by either 1or 2% apart from
Being a member of a Community Management Board 38% (-4%)

Charging for selected services
Significant downward variation on 5 out of the 6 suggested services for which respondents
indicated they would pay /might pay a reasonable charge.
Events and activities for adults 50% (-4%)
Use of computers/Internet 38% (-3%)

Events and activities for children 31% (-3%)
Posting books to homes 41% (-2%)
Posting multimedia items to home (-2%)

Additional Comments
A large number of respondents submitted additional comments which were consistent with the main themes identified in the summary table in the Executive Report.