



General Purposes Committee

Tuesday, 3 November 2009 at 6.30 pm

Committee Room 3, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane,
Wembley, HA9 9HD

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

John (Chair)
Blackman (Vice-Chair)
Bessong
Beswick
Butt
Colwill
Dunwell
Lorber
Sneddon
Wharton

first alternates

Councillors:

Powney
Kansagra
V Brown
R Moher
Arnold
Baker

Dunn
Tancred
Green

Second alternates

Councillors:

Long
Van Colle
Clues
Moloney
Mrs Bacchus
Detre

Hirani
Matthews
Corcoran

For further information contact: Elly Marks, Democratic Services Officer
020 8937 1358, elly.marks@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

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

Item	Page
1 Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests	
Members are invited to declare at this stage of the meeting, any relevant financial or other interest in the items on this agenda.	
2 Minutes of the previous meeting	1 - 4
3 Matters arising (if any)	
4 Deputations (if any)	
5 Polling District Review	5 - 20

The 1983 Representation of the People Act as amended places a duty on the Council to divide its area into polling districts for parliamentary and other elections. These districts must also be kept under review so as to ensure that electors are given reasonable facilities for voting.

This report proposes alterations to polling district boundaries bringing them into line with the new parliamentary constituency boundaries that come into effect at the next General Election. Some further alterations to boundaries are also proposed to rationalise the existing layout and also to the names of polling districts to recognise the new constituencies.

The polling district maps are attached separately.

Ward Affected: All Wards; **Contact Officer:** Peter Goss,
Democratic Services Manager
Tel: 020 8937 1353
peter.goss@brent.gov.uk

6 New Post - Assistant Director - Building Schools for the Future (BSF), Children and Families 21 - 38

This report concerns the creation and grading of a new post of Assistant Director – Building Schools for the Future (BSF) to lead the BSF transformation programme.

Ward Affected:

Contact Officer: John Christie, Director of Children and Families

Tel: 020 8937 3130

john.christie@brent.gov.uk

7 Appointments to Sub-Committees/Outside Bodies (if any)

8 Any Other Urgent Business

Notice of items to be raised under this heading must be given in writing to the Democratic Services Manager or his representative before the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 64.

9 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the General Purposes Committee is scheduled for the 24th November 2009.



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 Grand Hall.
- A public telephone is located in the foyer on the ground floor, opposite the Porters' Lodge

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 2

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE Tuesday, 30th June 2009 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor John (Chair), Councillor Blackman (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Beswick, V Brown (for Bessong), Butt, Colwill, Dunn (for Lorber), Dunwell, Sneddon and Wharton.

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Bessong and Lorber.

1. **Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

None declared.

2. **Introductions**

Members welcomed Shahida Nasim (Audit Commission) to the meeting.

3. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meetings held on 12th and 18th May 2009 be approved as accurate records.

4. **Deputations**

None at this meeting.

5. **2008/09 Statement of Accounts**

The Accounts and Audit Regulations required the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts to be approved by Committee. The report before members presented the legal and accounting requirements for the accounts and the Audit Commission's audit opinion plans. The Statement of Accounts was circulated as a supplement to the main report in advance of the meeting, having only recently been completed, and which the Chair certified as urgent as approval was required by 30th June 2009.

The Director of Finance and Corporate Resources introduced his report and referred to the plans for the Pension Fund which had previously been approved by the Audit Committee, and were now before members for noting. On the Statement of Accounts, the Director began by thanking colleagues for their efforts in compiling the accounts. Information had been included in the Brent Magazine to inform residents of the position. The Director of Finance and Corporate Resources drew specific attention to the position of the General Revenue Account the outturn for which was better than expected at the start of the financial year. He also highlighted the council's responsibilities, the governance statement and income and expenditure accounts. The Director outlined the reasons for the decline in the net value of assets and liabilities to £158M since March 2008. The position on the Housing Revenue Account and the General Fund was largely as anticipated. . On the Pension Fund Accounts, members noted

that these had been considered by the Pension Fund Sub-Committee the previous week and would be reported back following the audit. The Director drew attention to the two minor corrections to the Statement of Accounts namely, that in the notes to the core financial statements (pg 104, line 3) '2007/8' should read '2008/9' and in the notes to the Housing Revenue Accounts (pg 109, line 2) '144 dwellings' should read '120 dwellings'. In summary, the Director advised that it was now for members to agree the report for submission to the Audit Commission for approval. Any material changes would be reported back as revisions for approval.

Members of the committee requested that efforts be made to circulate the Statement of Accounts earlier given the level of detailed consideration they felt was required. Concerns were expressed at the absence of an overall cost collection system, the effect of Financial Reporting Standard 17 (FRS 17) on pensions and the impact of the economic downturn on the evaluation of assets.

The Director responded that it had been anticipated that the Statement would be made available earlier and it was hoped that planned changes to the accounting system would help this in the future. He added that members were required to understand the main principles of the accounts, responsibility for accuracy rested with him. On the accounting system, a single system was planned to be introduced by April 2010. Regarding FRS 17 the Director explained that it was an annual calculation affected mainly by staff longevity and asset values, which varied yearly, but did not impact directly on Council Tax payers. The Director also responded that the council was not able to opt out of final salary schemes but advised that a consultation document had been circulated recently on how to ensure the Local Government Pension Scheme remained affordable in the medium and long term.

The committee noted that the Audit Committee had detailed discussions on the issues, that adequate systems were in place and arrangements were being made for public consultation. The committee agreed the report.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the Audit Commission's Audit Opinion Plans be noted;
- (ii) that the 2008/09 Statement of Accounts be approved and forwarded to the Audit Commission for audit;
- (iii) that the Chair sign the Statement of Accounts.

(In accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders, Councillor Dunwell asked that his dissent from the above decisions be recorded).

6. **Flexible and early retirement**

The report from the Director of Business Transformation introduced a new policy for flexible and early retirement which brought together and

amended existing retirement provisions for employees that are members of the Local Government Pension Scheme and set out new proposals for a new Flexible Retirement policy for such employees. Councillor Sneddon (Lead Member, Human Resources and Diversity, Local Democracy and Consultation) advised that the policy was part of an on-going review and that, following a standard application process, the final decision would rest with the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources.

The Pensions Manager set out the advantages and disadvantages of the existing policy which was cost neutral. With the introduction of tax changes in 2006, it was now felt to be in both the council's and staff's interests for a flexible retirement policy, for which robust procedures would be in place. The policy would require the employee to remain under the terms of the flexible retirement policy for a minimum 12 month period.

Members sought views on the recent European Court judgement that the compulsory retirement age of 65 was not in breach of EU rules on age discrimination, given the current financial position of the pension fund and increasing age longevity. The Pensions Manager responded that consultation was currently taking place at a local and national level, which contained a number of options including the extension of retirement and additional employee contributions. Questions were also raised on how consistency in the decisions on flexible retirement would be ensured, what advice would be available for staff and whether sabbaticals were being considered. Members were advised that a database would be established to allow the drawing of comparisons and individuals could consult payroll for information on what would be in their best interests. It was agreed that a report back on the operation of the policy be submitted in a year's time.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the Flexible and Early Retirement policy and procedure appended to the report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources be approved;
- (ii) that the policy statement, set out in paragraph 4.11 of the report relating to the operation of the policy, be approved. .

7. Brent Council's representation on Outside Bodies

The report from the Borough Solicitor set out the conclusions of the review of appointments made by the council to outside bodies. The report set out a number of recommendations to assess requests for council appointments and a process for members to report back on the activities of the outside body.


RESOLVED:

- (i) that the findings of the review of appointments to outside bodies be noted;

- (ii) that it be noted that as a result of the review the Council no longer appoints representatives to a number of outside bodies which are set out in appendix 2 to the report from the Borough Solicitor;
- (iii) that the process for assessing new requests for appointments to outside bodies as set out in paragraph 3.10 of the Borough Solicitor's report, be approved;
- (iv) that updated guidance for members appointed to outside bodies be circulated to members following consideration of the guidance by the Standards Committee;
- (v) that the annual reporting procedures take effect for the 2009/10 municipal year.

The meeting ended at 8.10 pm.

A John
Chair

 <p>The logo of Brent Council, featuring a central coat of arms with a shield, a crown, and two lions, surrounded by the words 'BRENT COUNCIL' in a circular arrangement.</p>	<p>General Purposes Committee 3 November 2009</p> <p>Report from the Democratic Services Manager</p>
For Action	Wards Affected: ALL
<p>Polling District Review</p>	

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The 1983 Representation of the People Act as amended places a duty on the Council to divide its area into polling districts for parliamentary and other elections. These districts must also be kept under review so as to ensure that electors are given reasonable facilities for voting.
- 1.2 This report proposes alterations to polling district boundaries bringing them into line with the new parliamentary constituency boundaries that come into effect at the next General Election. Some further alterations to boundaries are also proposed to rationalise the existing layout and also to the names of polling districts to recognise the new constituencies.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That polling district boundaries be re-drawn as set out in this report.
- 2.2 That polling district names be amended to reflect the new parliamentary constituencies following the principle that the first letter denote the parliamentary constituency and the next two the ward in which it is situated.

3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 This report proposes a small reduction in the number of polling stations which will reduce the costs of elections as fewer staff and polling station locations will be required. These savings will only accrue to the Council in the case of its own elections as all other polls are funded by the government or the Greater London Authority.

4.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

4.1 None specific for Council staff.

5.0 DETAIL

5.1 Following the re-drawing of ward boundaries by the Local Government Commission which came into effect for the 2002 municipal elections, the new wards were used as building blocks to create new parliamentary constituencies. These new constituencies come into effect for the next General Election which must take place by 4 June 2010. Locally the allocation of wards to new constituencies is as follows:

5.2 Brent North Constituency

The wards of Alperton, Barnhill, Fryent, Kenton, Northwick Park, Preston, Queensbury, Sudbury and Wembley Central.

5.3 Brent Central Constituency

The wards of Dollis Hill, Dudden Hill, Harlesden, Kensal Green, Mapesbury, Stonebridge, Tokyngton, Welsh Harp and Willesden Green.

5.4 Hampstead and Kilburn Constituency

The wards of Brondesbury Park, Kilburn and Queen's Park together with the London Borough of Camden wards of Belsize, Frognal and Fitzjohn's, Fortune Green, Hampstead Town, Kilburn, Swiss Cottage and West Hampstead.

5.5 Currently a number of our wards cross existing parliamentary constituency boundaries. However polling districts within those wards have had to be drawn so as not to cross parliamentary boundaries because of the possibility (however slim) of a parliamentary by election. As a result some districts are unusually small. EST7 in Stonebridge ward for example is entirely non-residential but is the only part of the ward in Brent East and has had to be preserved as a separate district in the event of residential properties being built there.

5.6 Proposals for these districts are set out below. In addition, some consideration has been given to other polling districts which are felt to be suitable for review. Given that the ratio of elector to polling place is lower than in other London boroughs, some of the smaller districts could be merged with their neighbours without inconvenience for electors. Proposals are set out in the relevant paragraphs below.

5.7 The current names of our polling districts indicate by their first letter the parliamentary constituency, and the next two letters the ward, in which they are situated. Each district within a ward is also individually numbered. Thus the five districts in Brondesbury Park ward in Brent East are named EBP1-EBP5. It is proposed that this practice continue and that “N” become the first letter of each polling district in the new Brent North, “C” for Brent Central and “H” for Hampstead and Kilburn. Ward codes would remain the same (see Appendix B).

5.8 Proposals for polling district boundaries in each ward follow. All electorate figures are those applying at 1 September 2009 (see Appendix A). Any changes made to polling districts will be incorporated into the electoral register before its next publication on 1 December 2009. Maps of the existing wards and the current electorate for each polling district are attached as appendices.

5.8.1 **Alperton Ward**

This ward has five polling districts ranging in size from 1206 electors to 3727. No alteration to the existing boundaries is considered necessary although it is possible to merge the two smallest districts (SAL3 and SAL5) to create a district of 2432 electors. Alperton Community School on Ealing Road would be a suitable polling station location for the merged district while Middlesex House on Northwick Road would no longer be used.

A ward councillor has written in favour of the proposed combination of these two districts.

RECOMMENDED:

That polling districts SAL3 and SAL5 be combined into a single district and that Alperton Community School be the polling station for the new district.

5.8.2 **Barnhill Ward**

The layout in this ward of six polling districts, currently straddling Brent North and Brent South is considered to be acceptable in electoral terms. No comments about this ward have been received and no proposals for change are being made.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.3 **Brondesbury Park Ward**

No alterations to the boundaries in this ward are being proposed. No comments about this ward have been received and no proposals for change are being made.

RECOMMENDED:

No change.

5.8.4 **Dollis Hill Ward**

There are four polling districts in this ward. The smallest, EDO2, has just 987 electors. It would be possible to enlarge this district by transferring some electors in Brook Road and Dollis Hill Lane from the biggest district (EDO3 with 2743 electors) but for most, having to vote at John Kelly Girls High School on Crest Road instead of Our Lady of Grace Juniors on Dollis Hill Lane would necessitate a longer journey. Consequently no changes to the existing boundaries are proposed for Dollis Hill.

No comments about this ward have been received and no proposals for change are being made.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.5 **Dudden Hill Ward**

There are six districts in this ward. Two of them (EDU2 and EDU3) have electorates of less than 1,000. Electors in EDU2 currently vote at a temporary hut placed in the grounds of St Catherine's Memorial Hall on the corner of Tanfield Avenue and EDU3 electors vote at Northview School at the end of Northview Crescent. The latter premises' location is remote from many electors in that district and turnout tends to be low (20% at the European elections this year). While a merged EDU2 and EDU3 would create a suitably sized district, the site at St Catherine's Memorial Hall cannot accommodate two polling stations and no alternative location has been identified. Moreover electors on one side of Dudden Hill Lane would have to cross this busy road to reach the polling station.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.6 **Fryent Ward**

There are eight relatively small districts in Fryent ward, the largest being NFR1 with 1571 electors. Two of these, NFR6 and NFR7, share Fryent School as a polling place. It is proposed that these be merged to create a district of 1833 electors.

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

That polling districts NFR6 and NFR7 be combined and that Fryent School be retained as the polling station for the enlarged district.

5.8.7 **Harlesden Ward**

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.8 **Kensal Green Ward**

This ward is almost wholly within Brent South constituency although two small patches (one containing 128 electors, the other 14) are in Brent East. These can now both be subsumed into their neighbouring district SKG5 whose electors vote at St Mark's Church Hall on All Souls Avenue. The enlarged district would comprise 1448 electors. No other change to the existing boundaries is proposed.

A ward councillor has written in favour of the proposed merger.

RECOMMENDED:

That polling districts EKG7 and EKG8 be merged with SKG5 and that the polling district for the new district be St Mark's Church Hall.

5.8.9 **Kenton Ward**

It is proposed that the neighbouring districts NKE4 and NKE5 be merged as electors in both these districts vote at St John's United Reformed Church Hall.

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

That NKE4 and NKE5 be merged into a single polling district and that St John's United Reformed Church be retained as the polling station for the new district.

5.8.10 **Kilburn Ward**

The districts in this ward reflect almost exactly the boundaries in the former Kilburn and Carlton wards. Three of these districts in what was Carlton are very small. EKi4 has 881 electors, EKi5 has 958 and EKi6 has 908. In view of their proximity to each other, it is proposed that all three be merged into one district. EKi4 and EKi6 already share the same polling place (Salvation Army Goodwill Centre on Chichester Road) while electors in EKi5 vote at the nearby Oxford/Kilburn Club on Neville Close. The change would create a net reduction of one polling station.

One ward councillor has written in support of the merger of EKi4, EKi5 and EKi6 proposing that the Oxford Kilburn Club would be the most suitable polling station. Another ward councillor has supported the merger of the two districts voting at the Salvation Army Goodwill Centre but retaining EKi5 as a separate polling district on the grounds of distance from the polling station for some electors. Additionally such a merger could depress turnout at elections in an area that traditionally has lower than average turnouts. These are important considerations but, unlike the Salvation Army Centre, the Oxford Kilburn Club is considered to be central and convenient for all electors in these three districts.

RECOMMENDED

That polling districts EKi4, EKi5 and EKi6 be merged into a single district and that the polling station location for the new district be the Oxford Kilburn (OK) Club.

5.8.11 **Mapesbury Ward**

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.12 **Northwick Park Ward**

Polling District NNP2 encompasses the accommodation for students at the University of Westminster and staff at Northwick Park hospital. Its polling station is located within the grounds of the hospital. Members have previously considered the merit of this polling district in view of the consistently low turnout (less than 10% at the European elections this year). It is proposed that the district be merged with either NNP1, itself a small district, to create a new district of 1582 electors or with the larger NNP4 creating a new district of 3101 electors. Voters in NNP1 vote at a temporary hut in Rushout Avenue and those in NNP4 attend St Cuthbert's Church Hall at the corner of Watford Road and Carlton Avenue West. Of the two, the latter is considered to be the more convenient option for electors in the current NNP2 district.

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

That NNP2 be merged with NNP4 and that the polling station for the new district be St Cuthbert's Church Hall.

5.8.13 **Preston Ward**

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.14 **Queen's Park Ward**

This ward currently has seven polling districts and straddles Brent East and Brent South. The ward will be part of the new Hampstead and Kilburn constituency.

Polling districts EQP3 (1714 electors) and EQP7 (444 electors) share Kensal Rise school as a polling place and could be merged to make a suitably sized district.

It is also proposed that the districts EQP4 (786 electors) and EQP5 (2022 electors) be merged. Salusbury School would be a convenient polling place for electors in both districts which could be served by 2 polling stations rather than the existing three.

A ward councillor has proposed more extensive alterations to part of the ward which it has not been possible to examine as yet. It is intended that the proposal be properly considered in 2010.

RECOMMENDED:

- (i) that polling districts EQP3 and EQP7 be combined and that Kensal Rise School be retained as the polling station for the new district;
- (ii) that polling districts EQP4 and EQP5 be combined and that Salusbury School be the polling station for the new district.

5.8.15 **Queensbury Ward**

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.16 **Stonebridge Ward**

No changes are being proposed for this ward, save for the absorption of polling district EST7, which has no electors, into SST1.

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

That EST7 be merged with SST1 and that the Children's Centre at Pitfield Way be retained as the polling station.

5.8.17 **Sudbury Ward**

Electors in districts NSU5 and SSU7 (2069 in total) vote at St John's Evangelist Church Hall on Crawford Avenue. The districts which are on either side of the Brent North and Brent South boundary could be merged.

Consideration could also be given to merging SSU3 (1252 electors) and SSU6 (966 electors). Electors in SSU6 currently vote at Barham School on Danethorpe Road and those in SSU3 attend Sudbury Baptist Church Hall on Station Approach. The central location of the latter, close to bus and underground links, would make this a suitable polling place for electors in a merged district. The danger of potential confusion would also be removed as

Barham School is also used as a polling station for a polling district in Wembley Central ward.

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

- (i) That polling districts NSU5 and SSU7 be combined into a single district and that St John's Evangelist Church Hall be retained as the polling station for the new district;
- (ii) That polling districts SSU3 and SSU6 be combined and that Sudbury Baptist Church Hall be the polling station for the new district.

5.8.18 Tokyngton Ward

Voters in NTO6 (1205 electors) and STO2 (1160 electors) currently vote at St Joseph's Social Club, Empire Way. It is proposed that these two districts be merged, now that they are to be part of the same constituency. Polling district STO1, serving Danes and Empire Courts on North End Road, has just 468 electors but is physically separated from the rest of the ward by the non-residential areas surrounding Wembley Stadium. For this reason it is felt that this polling district should be retained in its present form.

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

That polling districts NTO6 and STO2 be combined into a single district and that St Joseph's Social Club be retained as the polling station for the new district.

5.8.19 Welsh Harp Ward

No comments about this ward have been received.

RECOMMENDED:

No change

5.8.20 Wembley Central Ward

Polling district NWC1 (384 electors) is the only part of this ward in the old Brent North constituency. Electors there share Copland Community School

as a polling place with electors in SWC5 (2374 electors). It is proposed that this arrangement continue although it has to be acknowledged that the school is remote from some electors in NWC1.

A ward councillor has made proposals for revising the boundaries in this part of the ward and suggested a new polling station location. It has not been possible to examine the proposal but it is intended that they are properly considered in 2010.

RECOMMENDED:

No change but that further consideration be given to the boundaries of polling districts in this ward.

5.8.21 **Willesden Green Ward**

Polling district SWG6 (546 electors) can be merged with its neighbour EWG5 (2502 electors). Kings Hall on Harlesden Road, the current polling place for EWG5, would serve as a convenient location for the enlarged district.

EWG7 comprises just two properties based at Willesden Sports Centre. They have both been empty for some years. This district too can be merged with SWG6 and EWG5.

There is scope for further mergers of the districts in this ward. EWG1 (1579 electors) might be merged with EWG2 (1023 electors) with electors voting at either Learie Constantine Centre on Dudden Hill Lane or St Andrew and St Francis School on Belton Road. Similarly EWG3 (1719 electors) could merge with EWG4 (1465 electors). As their polling stations, St Mary Magdalen's School and the Convent of Jesus and Mary, are in neighbouring streets, the amalgamation of these districts should not cause undue inconvenience to electors.

Two ward councillors have written in support of the proposal to merge SWG6 and EWG5 and the other two mergers have raised no objection on the understanding that electors are not unduly inconvenienced. It is understood that St Andrew and St Francis School hold staff training on election days and would not be inconvenienced by the need to close for the day.

In the other proposed merger, the newly rebuilt St Mary Magdalen's School is preferred to the Convent of Jesus and Mary for reasons of access within the premises.

RECOMMENDED:

- (i) That polling districts EWG1 and EWG2 be combined and that St Andrew and St Francis School be the polling station for the new district;
- (ii) That polling districts EWG5, SWG6 and EWG7 be combined and that St Mary Magdalen's School be the polling station for the new district.

6.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Electoral Register for the London Borough of Brent.
Comments received in response to consultation with councillors and MPs.

Contact
Sean O'Sullivan
Electoral Services Manager
Tel: (020) 8937 1370
Email: s.osullivan@brent.gov.uk

APPENDIX A

POLLING DISTRICT ELECTORATES AS AT 1 SEPTEMBER 2009

WARD	PD	NO OF ELECTORS	WARD	PD	NO OF ELECTORS
ALPERTON	SAL1	2225	KENSAL GREEN	SKG4	2076
ALPERTON	SAL2	3727	KENSAL GREEN	SKG5	1306
ALPERTON	SAL3	1226	KENSAL GREEN	SKG6	1656
ALPERTON	SAL4	1605	KENSAL GREEN	EKG7	128
ALPERTON	SAL5	1206	KENSAL GREEN	EKG8	14
BARNHILL	NBA1	1201	KENTON	NKE1	1910
BARNHILL	NBA2	1614	KENTON	NKE2	1680
BARNHILL	NBA3	1953	KENTON	NKE3	1184
BARNHILL	NBA4	3071	KENTON	NKE4	1122
BARNHILL	SBA5	1165	KENTON	NKE5	1728
BARNHILL	SBA6	1776	KENTON	NKE6	1743
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP1	1826	KILBURN	EKi1	2149
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP2	1279	KILBURN	EKi2	2463
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP3	2205	KILBURN	EKi3	1713
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP4	2092	KILBURN	EKi4	884
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP5	1552	KILBURN	EKi5	958
DOLLIS HILL	EDO1	3210	KILBURN	EKi6	908
DOLLIS HILL	EDO2	987	KILBURN	EKi7	1681
DOLLIS HILL	EDO3	2743	MAPESBURY	EMA1	2501
DOLLIS HILL	EDO4	1462	MAPESBURY	EMA2	2067
DUDDEN HILL	EDU1	1702	MAPESBURY	EMA3	1275
DUDDEN HILL	EDU2	965	MAPESBURY	EMA4	2563
DUDDEN HILL	EDU3	912	MAPESBURY	EMA5	1520
DUDDEN HILL	EDU4	2939	N'THWICK PARK	NNP1	761
DUDDEN HILL	EDU5	1738	N'THWICK PARK	NNP2	821
DUDDEN HILL	EDU6	1461	N'THWICK PARK	NNP3	1672
FRYENT	NFR1	1571	N'THWICK PARK	NNP4	2280
FRYENT	NFR2	1155	N'THWICK PARK	NNP5	2040
FRYENT	NFR3	1250	N'THWICK PARK	NNP6	1820
FRYENT	NFR4	1132	PRESTON	NPR1	3522
FRYENT	NFR5	1129	PRESTON	NPR2	2180
FRYENT	NFR6	1005	PRESTON	NPR3	1406
FRYENT	NFR7	828	PRESTON	NPR4	3241
FRYENT	NFR8	1076	QUEEN'S PARK	EQP1	2002
HARLESDEN	SHA1	1211	QUEEN'S PARK	SQP2	1759
HARLESDEN	SHA2	1632	QUEEN'S PARK	EQP3	1714
HARLESDEN	SHA3	1953	QUEEN'S PARK	EQP4	786
HARLESDEN	SHA4	2091	QUEEN'S PARK	EQP5	2022
HARLESDEN	SHA5	2619	QUEEN'S PARK	SQP6	1120
KENSAL GREEN	SKG1	1001	QUEEN'S PARK	EQP7	444
KENSAL GREEN	SKG2	1606	QUEENSBURY	NQY1	3259
KENSAL GREEN	SKG3	1207	QUEENSBURY	NQY2	1059

QUEENSBURY	NQY3	1862	TOKYNGTON	STO5	2010
QUEENSBURY	NQY4	1354	TOKYNGTON	NTO6	1205
QUEENSBURY	NQY5	1795	WELSH HARP	NWH1	1124
QUEENSBURY	NQY6	1487	WELSH HARP	NWH2	1373
STONEBRIDGE	SST1	2120	WELSH HARP	SWH3	14458
STONEBRIDGE	SST2	922	WELSH HARP	EWH4	1606
STONEBRIDGE	SST3	2893	WELSH HARP	EWH5	1594
STONEBRIDGE	SST4	1486	WELSH HARP	EWH6	864
STONEBRIDGE	SST5	692	WELSH HARP	NWH7	1177
STONEBRIDGE	SST6	2118	WEMBLEY CEN	NWC1	384
STONEBRIDGE	EST7	0	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC2	3357
SUDBURY	NSU1	2244	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC3	1656
SUDBURY	NSU2	1066	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC4	2234
SUDBURY	SSU3	1252	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC5	2374
SUDBURY	NSU4	2531	WILLES DEN GN	EWG1	1579
SUDBURY	NSU5	1495	WILLES DEN GN	EWG2	1023
SUDBURY	SSU6	966	WILLES DEN GN	EWG3	1719
SUDBURY	SSU7	574	WILLES DEN GN	EWG4	1465
TOKYNGTON	STO1	468	WILLES DEN GN	EWG5	2502
TOKYNGTON	STO2	1160	WILLES DEN GN	SWG6	546
TOKYNGTON	STO3	2316	WILLES DEN GN	EWG7	0
TOKYNGTON	STO4	2461			


RE-NAMED POLLING DISTRICTS

NB: This re-naming is based on existing polling districts. If the current arrangement is altered, the list will be amended accordingly.

WARD	OLD PD NAME	NEW PD NAME	WARD	OLD PD NAME	NEW PD NAME
ALPERTON	SAL1	NAL1	HARLESDEN	SHA5	CHA5
ALPERTON	SAL2	NAL2	KENSAL GREEN	SKG1	CKG1
ALPERTON	SAL3	NAL3	KENSAL GREEN	SKG2	CKG2
ALPERTON	SAL4	NAL4	KENSAL GREEN	SKG3	CKG3
ALPERTON	SAL5	NAL5	KENSAL GREEN	SKG4	CKG4
BARNHILL	NBA1	NBA1	KENSAL GREEN	SKG5	CKG5
BARNHILL	NBA2	NBA2	KENSAL GREEN	SKG6	CKG6
BARNHILL	NBA3	NBA3	KENSAL GREEN	EKG7	CKG7
BARNHILL	NBA4	NBA4	KENSAL GREEN	EKG8	CKG8
BARNHILL	SBA5	NBA5	KENTON	NKE1	NKE1
BARNHILL	SBA6	NBA6	KENTON	NKE2	NKE2
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP1	HBP1	KENTON	NKE3	NKE3
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP2	HBP2	KENTON	NKE4	NKE4
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP3	HBP3	KENTON	NKE5	NKE5
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP4	HBP4	KENTON	NKE6	NKE6
BRONDESB'Y PK	EBP5	HBP5	KILBURN	EKi1	HKi1
DOLLIS HILL	EDO1	CDO1	KILBURN	EKi2	HKi2
DOLLIS HILL	EDO2	CDO2	KILBURN	EKi3	HKi3
DOLLIS HILL	EDO3	CDO3	KILBURN	EKi4	HKi4
DOLLIS HILL	EDO4	CDO4	KILBURN	EKi5	HKi5
DUDDEN HILL	EDU1	CDU1	KILBURN	EKi6	HKi6
DUDDEN HILL	EDU2	CDU2	KILBURN	EKi7	HKi7
DUDDEN HILL	EDU3	CDU3	MAPESBURY	EMA1	CMA1
DUDDEN HILL	EDU4	CDU4	MAPESBURY	EMA2	CMA2
DUDDEN HILL	EDU5	CDU5	MAPESBURY	EMA3	CMA3
DUDDEN HILL	EDU6	CDU6	MAPESBURY	EMA4	CMA4
FRYENT	NFR1	NFR1	MAPESBURY	EMA5	CMA5
FRYENT	NFR2	NFR2	N'THWICK PARK	NNP1	NNP1
FRYENT	NFR3	NFR3	N'THWICK PARK	NNP2	NNP2
FRYENT	NFR4	NFR4	N'THWICK PARK	NNP3	NNP3
FRYENT	NFR5	NFR5	N'THWICK PARK	NNP4	NNP4
FRYENT	NFR6	NFR6	N'THWICK PARK	NNP5	NNP5
FRYENT	NFR7	NFR7	N'THWICK PARK	NNP6	NNP6
FRYENT	NFR8	NFR8	PRESTON	NPR1	NPR1
HARLESDEN	SHA1	CHA1	PRESTON	NPR2	NPR2
HARLESDEN	SHA2	CHA2	PRESTON	NPR3	NPR3
HARLESDEN	SHA3	CHA3	PRESTON	NPR4	NPR4
HARLESDEN	SHA4	CHA4	QUEEN'S PARK	EQP1	HQP1

QUEEN'S PARK	SQP2	HQP2	TOKYNGTON	STO1	CTO1
QUEEN'S PARK	EQP3	HQP3	TOKYNGTON	STO2	CTO2
QUEEN'S PARK	EQP4	HQP4	TOKYNGTON	STO3	CTO3
QUEEN'S PARK	EQP5	HQP5	TOKYNGTON	STO4	CTO4
QUEEN'S PARK	SQP6	HQP6	TOKYNGTON	STO5	CTO5
QUEEN'S PARK	EQP7	HQP7	TOKYNGTON	NT06	CTO6
QUEENSBURY	NQY1	NQY1	WELSH HARP	NWH1	CWH1
QUEENSBURY	NQY2	NQY2	WELSH HARP	NWH2	CWH2
QUEENSBURY	NQY3	NQY3	WELSH HARP	SWH3	CWH3
QUEENSBURY	NQY4	NQY4	WELSH HARP	EWH4	CWH4
QUEENSBURY	NQY5	NQY5	WELSH HARP	EWH5	CWH5
QUEENSBURY	NQY6	NQY6	WELSH HARP	EWH6	CWH6
STONEBRIDGE	SST1	CST1	WELSH HARP	NWH7	CWH7
STONEBRIDGE	SST2	CST2	WEMBLEY CEN	NWC1	CWC1
STONEBRIDGE	SST3	CST3	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC2	CWC2
STONEBRIDGE	SST4	CST4	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC3	CWC3
STONEBRIDGE	SST5	CST5	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC4	CWC4
STONEBRIDGE	SST6	CST6	WEMBLEY CEN	SWC5	CWC5
STONEBRIDGE	EST7	CST7	WILLESDEN GN	EWG1	CWG1
SUDBURY	NSU1	NSU1	WILLESDEN GN	EWG2	CWG2
SUDBURY	NSU2	NSU2	WILLESDEN GN	EWG3	CWG3
SUDBURY	SSU3	NSU3	WILLESDEN GN	EWG4	CWG4
SUDBURY	NSU4	NSU4	WILLESDEN GN	EWG5	CWG5
SUDBURY	NSU5	NSU5	WILLESDEN GN	SWG6	CWG6
SUDBURY	SSU6	NSU6	WILLESDEN GN	EWG7	CWG7
SUDBURY	SSU7	NSU7			

This page is intentionally left blank

 <p>The logo of Brent Council, featuring a central coat of arms with a shield, a crown, and two lions, surrounded by the words 'BRENT' at the top and 'COUNCIL' at the bottom in a circular arrangement.</p>	<p>General Purposes Committee 3rd November 2009</p> <p>Report from the Director of Children and Families</p>
For Action	Wards Affected: NONE
<p>New Post – Assistant Director- Building Schools for the Future (BSF), Children and Families</p>	

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report concerns the creation and grading of a new post of Assistant Director – Building Schools for the Future (BSF) to lead the BSF Transformation Programme.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The Committee is requested:
- (a) to note creation of a new post of Assistant Director – Building Schools for the Future in the Children and Families department.
 - (b) to approve the grading of the post at Hay Grade 3 (£91,869 - £108,084).

3 DETAILS

- 3.1 The Executive approved the submission of the Building Schools for the Future programme for approval to the Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) in November 2008. The Executive report is set out at Appendix 1. The programme provides for funding from the Government of up to £300 million for the rebuilding and transformation of secondary schools in Brent. The first phase is for funding of £80 million to cover the top four priority schools. It is expected that the Council will be approved to enter the scheme in January 2010. An announcement of the entrants to the next phase is imminent. It is intended that the post will be filled when and subject to approval to the scheme by the DCSF.
- 3.2 The scheme approved by the Executive provides for the appointment of a Project Director. The grading of the post has been assessed as Hay 3 which reflects the scale and complexity of the programme and advice from

Partnership for Schools. The Job Description and Person Specification for the post are attached at Appendix 2.

- 3.3 In accordance with the Constitution the terms and conditions and the grading structure of the proposed new post needs to be agreed by the General Purposes Committee.
- 3.4 The council has previously agreed, through a decision of this Committee, that the pay of senior managers will be determined in accordance with the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme and associated Brent pay scales (a copy of the pay scales is attached as Appendix 3). The draft job description has been evaluated using the Hay Scheme and has produced the grade set out in 2.1(b) above. The terms and conditions for this post will be those applicable to senior managers of the council on Hay grades.

4 FINANCIAL AND STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The annual salary cost including on-costs at the minimum of the grade is £122,185 and at the maximum of the grade £143,752.
- 4.2 The funding for this post has been included in the Council's Revenue Budget for 2009/10 onwards.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council's Constitution requires that the terms and conditions and the grading structure of the proposed new post is agreed by the General Purposes Committee. The Council's policy to apply the Hay scheme to determine the grades ensures that pay outcomes for senior managers are fair and consistent with equal pay legislation.

6 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS


- 6.1 The recruitment to this post will be in accordance with the Council's Recruitment policies.

7 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Report to the Executive on Building Schools for the Future November 2008
Brent's Readiness to Deliver statement September 2009

Contact Officer(s) details

John Christie
Director of Children and Families
Tel: 020 8937 3130
Email john.christie@brent.gov.uk

	<p style="text-align: center;">Executive 17 November 2008</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Children and Families</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p>Approval of Expression of Interest submission for Building Schools for the Future (BSF)</p>	

Forward Plan Ref: C&F-08/09-010

1.0 Summary

1.1 This report seeks approval to submit an Expression of Interest by the deadline of 30 November in order to attempt to gain entry into the Building Schools for the Future programme.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 That the Executive gives its approval to an Expression of Interest being submitted to enter the BSF Programme.

2.2 That the Executive approves the draft Expression of Interest shown as Appendix A (including the commitment to establishing a LEP) and delegates to the Director of Children and Families authority to finalise the EoI, in consultation with the lead member for Children and Families and to submit it to the DCSF.

2.3 That the Executive approves the provisional BSF Governance model shown as Appendix C.

3.0 Background

3.1 Building Schools for the Future is a national programme that represents the largest national investment in school infrastructure for over fifty years. Its aim is to transform secondary education by providing 21st Century learning environments that engage and inspire young people, their teachers and the wider community.

- 3.2 The programme began in 2003 and is a fifteen year programme that will invest round £45 billion to rebuild, refurbish or remodel nearly every secondary school in the country.
- 3.3 Although there were delays to the programme during the earlier years the programme is now moving forward at an accelerated rate. Twenty two BSF schools opened during September 2008 bringing the total to 35. By 2010/11 the total number of opened BSF schools is planned to be around 326.
- 3.4 There is also evidence that the transformation in education that is a key component of BSF is starting to be delivered. As of August 2008 there were five schools that were fully rebuilt and had been opened for a full academic year. The percentage of students awarded five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C increased on average by around 15%. A high achievement over the course of one year.
- 3.5 Brent Council, along with all other local authorities, submitted an Expression of Interest (EoI) in December 2003. This was a simple document setting out each local authority's context, educational vision and confirmation that it was interested in joining the BSF programme. At that time the DfES allocated each LA into BSF Waves based on educational need and social need. Brent was allocated into Wave 7-9, which is one of the last Waves and meant that funding was expected to flow after 2011.
- 3.6 A number of early wave local authorities experienced significant delays in their BSF programmes. It became obvious to the Government that need alone was not the best indicator for selecting entry to BSF; capability and readiness to deliver were just as critical. The DfES/DCSF's approach changed so that authorities that were able to demonstrate their readiness and capability to deliver were given the opportunity to join the BSF programme ahead of their original wave.
- 3.7 On 5 March 2008, the Council was invited to apply to the DCSF and Partnership for Schools (PfS) to be considered for early entry, which would have been onto the latter part of Wave 6. In order to do this, it had to submit a Readiness to Deliver Statement (RtD) by 11 April 2008. The RtD was in line with the requirements set out in the joint guidance from DCSF and PfS. There was a very short window of opportunity for submitting the RtD and unfortunately Brent's submission was unsuccessful. Ultimately it failed because it did not demonstrate sufficiently that Brent was ready to deliver this transformational change programme. The initial feedback from the DCSF was that the submission was weak in the following areas:

Areas requiring further development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14-19 Strategy in relation to BSF. • Plans for integrated services. • Raising performance of under-performing schools – strategies and link to BSF. • A lead member must sit on the Project Board. • New Academy numbers to be included with PPP. • LA to clarify the progress on consultation of the BSF proposals. • Commitment to LEP.

3.8 The DCSF has now held workshops for all LAs that were unsuccessful. The lead member for C&F, the Director of C&F and AD – Resources for C&F attended Brent’s workshop on 9 October 2008 to review in greater detail the weaknesses in the previous submission and to clarify the new approach for joining the BSF programme.

3.9 Following a summer long consultation, which was aimed at shaping the future BSF programme, the DCSF has now published new guidance for authorities still to enter the BSF programme i.e. those that were designated into Waves 7-9 and 10-15. Both those Waves have now been combined into a single Wave (Wave 7-15) and all of these authorities can now potentially enter BSF at the next possible opportunity. The guidance does mark a significant change in the way that BSF will operate from now on. The guidance can be summarised as follows:

- LAs wishing to join the programme are invited to resubmit an expression of interest (EoI) by **30 November 2008**.
- LAs must group their projects into a Priority 1 list (consisting of roughly 5 schools with a maximum value of £80m) and a Priority 2 list (consisting of around 5-6 schools and a value of around £80m - £100m. Large Authorities can have a priority 3 list and so on. This is very different to previous BSF Waves where an Authority wide programme had to be submitted rather than in smaller “bite-size” chunks.
- Projects put forward must have educational transformation at their heart and the Local Authority should select it’s Priority 1 list based on:
 - Social and educational need (particularly National Challenge schools)
 - Building need
 - Contributing to local regeneration and collocation with other public services e.g. PCT
 - School reorganisation
 - New housing and population growth
- The EoI, which is a short document of 2 sides, should also set out the authority’s education strategy and a statement on its readiness to deliver.
- Ministers hope to start all projects submitted on LAs Priority 1 lists as soon as is practicable and LAs will be prioritised based on the average social and educational need of the schools in the Priority 1 list.
- The DCSF will announce the prioritisation in early 2009 and Partnership for Schools will then invite a number of authorities with the highest need to demonstrate they are ready to deliver. The number of authorities invited to demonstrate their Readiness to deliver at this stage will be dependent on the funding identified in the next CSR round.
- All Priority 1 list schools will enter the BSF programme before any Priority 2 list schools and so on for Priority 3 lists etc.

4.0 Expression of Interest

4.1 Choosing the right schools to go into our Priority 1 list could be critical to being asked to provide readiness to deliver. Although LAs can choose locally to prioritise schools based on the criteria shown in paragraph 3.9 above, the DCSF will potentially adopt much narrower criteria for determining which LAs are asked to demonstrate their readiness to deliver. The DCSF guidance states that:

“Where the Department prioritises which authorities will be asked to provide evidence of readiness to deliver, we will use the average social and educational need of the schools in the project (i.e. priority list 1). Thus, for instance, authorities with initial projects will be invited to demonstrate readiness to deliver in the order of the ranking on average social and educational need of the schools in the project”

4.2 For educational need the DCSF will use the most recent data on the percentage of pupils in each school achieving 5A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths. For social need they will use the Tax Credit Indicator (TCI) rating for each school. Appendix B shows how Brent compares with other local authorities that are already in BSF and more importantly with those still to enter the BSF Programme. This shows that of the authorities that will potentially be submitting Expressions of Interest by 30 November 2008 (Wave 7-15), Brent ranks very highly on one of the measures to be used to assess if an authority is to be asked to demonstrate its readiness to deliver.

4.3 A high priority for Brent will be to begin working on the service delivery structures required for successfully delivering Brent’s BSF programme. The commitment and involvement of senior managers and members across the Council will be essential. That level of commitment and involvement is a key indicator that the DCSF and PFS will test to determine if Brent is ready to deliver. Turner and Townsend, our appointed programme management support, are currently developing proposals for a governance model and project management structure to achieve this. Attached as Appendix C are provisional models setting out what is likely to be needed.

4.4 There is certainly an opportunity, in fact a prerequisite, that the BSF programme should be “joined up” with the Council’s other capital developments such as regeneration, sports provision, community involvement and youth provision so that it is very much part of the Council’s overall strategic plans for all of its residents.

4.5 The preferred delivery model for BSF projects is a Local Educational Partnership (LEP). That is the assumed model unless the LA can demonstrate that an alternative approach is at least as cost effective. A LEP is a separate company that is established to deliver for the client (the client will be Brent Council) the various projects included within the BSF programme. It is a joint venture company comprising the local authority (10% stake), Partnership for Schools (10%) and a private developer (80%). Importantly the LA is the client and commissioner and therefore maintains control of the strategy and specifications of the BSF projects and through the LEP also has a stake in how the delivery side functions. Brent will need to demonstrate a commitment to establishing a LEP unless it can demonstrate it has available or can develop quickly an alternative delivery mechanism that offers at least the same benefits and value for money as a LEP. As a LEP is a recognised delivery model for BSF that has working examples across the country, the DCSF are confident that a local authority can establish one much more quickly than any alternative unless the local authority already

has an alternative delivery partner or a well developed strategy for developing one. Based on discussions with the DCSF there is a high risk that they would view anything other than stating in the Expression of Interest a full commitment to a LEP as demonstrating that Brent is not ready to deliver as an alternative model would take considerable time to fully explore and develop.

- 4.6 The other advantage of the LEP is that it can be the delivery partner for projects beyond BSF such as regeneration and sport development projects. Joining with other LAs to establish a joint LEP would be worth exploring as it may secure even greater efficiencies. During the feedback session with the DCSF it was made clear that the successful LAs tended to have very strong commitments to establishing a LEP within their submissions.
- 4.7 Schools must also embrace a managed ICT service which is radically different to current practises and likely to be a challenging concept.
- 4.8 The assumed method for rebuild schemes is PFI, which again represents significant change as essentially schools will need to handover responsibility for maintenance and facilities management to a private company.
- 4.9 Consultation with all stakeholders will be key and effective consultation with Headteachers has already begun but this will need to become much broader including consulting with school pupils as well as partner organisations like the PCT.

5.0 Financial Issues

- 5.1 The need for Brent to get into the BSF programme as soon as possible is critical to its ability to deliver extra capacity to cope with growing pupil numbers. BSF is the best and perhaps only way to secure the funding necessary to deliver the extra capacity needed. The current forecast is that an extra 16 Forms of Entry (FE) will be required by 2016.
- 5.2 There is a need to quickly bring in extra capacity and expertise to help guide the Council through the next two key milestones:
- Submission of a revised EoI by 30 November 2008
 - Submission of a RtD by early 2009, assuming the EoI and list of school's on our Priority 1 list is suitably prioritised by the DCSF
- 5.3 A mini-competition, off the Council's framework, has been successfully run and Turner and Townsend have been appointed to provide programme management support, school improvement expertise and to help produce both the EoI and the RtD submissions. The cost of this short term support is anticipated to be less than £100,000 and will be met from the Children and Families revenue budget. If Brent was to gain entry to the BSF programme there would be a need to develop a more permanent project management structure which would be contained within the budget established from 2009/10 by the Council of £500k per annum to cover BSF project management costs.
- 5.4 To truly achieve the transformation in educational outcomes expected and needed the BSF funding allocation, while substantial, is likely to be insufficient. That is certainly the

case in most other LAs that are already advanced on the BSF programme. Most LAs have supplemented the BSF funding with investment from the LA's capital resources, other funding sources such as regeneration, sports development, S106, asset disposals and from the Dedicated Schools Grant. It is highly likely that Brent will need to consider a combination of these additional funding sources as the BSF programme develops. Further detailed financial assessments will be reported to the Executive as they become clearer.

6.0 Legal Implications

- 6.1 The Executive agreed on 8 December 2003 to the submission of a broad framework for Brent entering into the BSF Programme as set out in the 2003 document, "*The Expression of Interest for Brent's Building Schools for the Future*". As explained earlier in this report, Brent was subsequently placed in Waves 7 to 9 of the programme and is now applying for entry as part of wave 7 to 15. The Council previously confirmed its readiness to be considered for early entry by letters and the submission of a Readiness to Deliver document on 4 March and 11 April 2008. The application for early entry was unsuccessful on that occasion and a fresh application is now proposed for submission by way of a further Expression of Interest. It is anticipated that a further report will be submitted to the Executive for a decision on whether or not to proceed once the DCSF has considered the Council's Expression of Interest and asks the Council to demonstrate its Readiness to Deliver.
- 6.2 In the event that the application were successful this time and a decision taken to proceed, the Executive should note that powers to enter into the BSF programme and the various associated arrangements and Agreements are contained in section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000, section 14 of the Education Act 1996, section 22 of the Schools Standards and Framework Act 1998 and section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 in order to enable investment in certain educational services and facilities for the Council is responsible.
- 6.3 Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 requires specific consideration. The section enables local authorities to do anything which they consider is likely to promote or improve the economic, social or environmental well-being of their areas. However, in determining whether or how to exercise this power a local authority must have regard to its community strategy (made under section 4 of the Local Government Act 2000). The Brent BSF programme will play a significant part in the delivery of the "Early Excellence" commitment of the community strategy.
- 6.4 DCSF and PfS are not proposing any specific consultation processes, but aim to highlight and encourage the use of best practice. This is in accordance with the obligation placed on local authorities to consult local stakeholders at appropriate times during their projects, in line with the general duty to consult and inform
- 6.5 Implementing a BSF Programme is complicated and legal involvement will be required at all stages. As the proposal is merely at the expression of interest stage, it would be premature to go into any more detail on these matters at this point. However, the engagement and commitment of internal or external legal resources to implementation is clearly something that will need to be taken account of very carefully at all stages.

- 6.6 A key entity that has been touched on earlier in this report is the Local Education Partnership (“LEP”). The LEP is a (yet to be established) local business which will provide long-term partnering services for the Council so that the aims of BSF can be realised.
- 6.7 One of the key purposes of the LEP is to reduce costs by reducing the number of competitive procurements that have to be carried out and by streamlining the procurement process and to group schools together into larger, higher value packages.
- 6.8 It will be important to ensure that the procurement of the PSP to be invited to form the LEP and to go on to deliver the BSF programme is undertaken in compliance with the requirements of the EU public procurement Regulations (Public Contracts Regulations 2006) and the Council’s Contract Standing Orders. [If the idea is to get authority to proceed with appointing a PSP and setting up the LEP under this report, a lot more work will be required on this section of the report.]
- 6.9 As explained above, Turner & Townsend Project Management Limited has been appointed under a Call Off Contract from the Council’s Consultancy Framework Agreement (Lot 1 – Programme Manager/Client Advisor Services) to provide BSF Programme Management services. The value of the contract is anticipated to be less than £100,000 and the award was therefore undertaken in accordance with delegated powers.
- 6.10 As indicated earlier, further reports will be submitted to the Executive at key future stages for decisions on whether or not to proceed with early entry to the BSF Programme, on procurement decisions and on other legal issues, as and when they arise.

7.0 Diversity Implications

- 7.1 Brent is a borough of stark contrasts in its economic, environmental, ethnic and social make-up. It has the second highest proportion of ethnic minority residents in the UK (54.7%) and is the most ethnically diverse borough in the country, with large Asian-Indian, Black-Caribbean, Black-African, Irish and refugee communities. Within our primary and secondary schools, the percentage of children of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) origin is 74%. No fewer than 59 of our 73 primary and secondary schools have a BME majority school population.
- 7.2 In some parts of the Borough parents and carers have limited access and choice of school places. Prioritisation of BSF investment will enable those areas to be prioritised thus helping address any imbalances in the incidence and opportunity of choice.
- 7.3 The Education Act 2006 further enables the Council to explore how choice and diversity can be increased particularly in its role as commissioner of school places.

7.4 Entry into BSF will further enable the Council to address current issues, in some schools, of physical access to school buildings and access to the curriculum for young people with specific needs.

8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

8.1 PfS recommend that authorities wishing successfully to secure BSF resources have as a minimum a full time in-house BSF Project Director, Project Manager and Administrative support. These posts are in addition to a project sponsor and other internal technical, financial and legal advisers.

Background Papers (essential)


- i) BSF Expression of Interest Guidance 19 September 2008
- ii) BSF – Readiness to Deliver : Guidance for Local Authorities in BSF Waves 4-6
- iii) Transforming Brent Education
- iv) School Roll Projections January 2008
- v) Brent Stakeholder Report March 2008
- vi) Correspondence from and with DCSF and PfS
- vii) Consultation : The Management of Building Schools for the Future Waves 7 to 15 (DCSF – 9 April 2008)

Contact Officers

Mustafa Salih, Assistant Director Finance and Performance,
Children and Families, Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane,
Wembley Middlesex HA89 7RW.
Tel: 020 8 937 3i910. Fax: 020 8 937 3093
Email: mustafa.salih@Brent.Gov.UK

John Christie
Director of Children and Families



	SERVICE AREA: CHILDREN&FAMILIES	LOCATION: CH HOUSE
	UNIT: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR	
	FUTURE (BSF)	SECTION: BSF
	JOB TITLE: ASSISTANT	
	DIRECTOR (Programme Director)– BULDING SCHOOLS FOR THE	
	FUTURE	CURRENT GRADE: Hay 3
RESTRICTED? Yes	POST NUMBER(S):	

PURPOSE OF JOB

Lead the overall management and coordination of Brent’s Wave 7 Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme, which is designed to transform learning in Brent. It includes creating a structure within Children and Families for the future management and coordination of the BSF programme. A key requirement will be working collaboratively and innovatively with colleagues from across the Council and Brent’s schools to realise Brent’s bold vision for Improvement and Efficiency and transformation of learning.

DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE TO (attach an organisation chart and indicate the position of the postholder).

Director of Children and Families

FUNCTIONALLY RESPONSIBLE TO (if applicable)

RESPONSIBLE FOR (indicate whether employees are directly, indirectly or occasionally supervised. The job titles, post numbers and number of employees supervised should also be indicated, unless shown on the organisation chart).

See Structure Chart

PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTABILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (indicate the main accountabilities and responsibilities of the post, starting with the most important and describing each in a separate numbered paragraph).

Lead and coordinate the BSF project to ensure that all key project milestones are met on time and to the required standard

Advise and support the Chief Executive and Director of Children and Families in their roles as project sponsor and project lead, Executive Members, C&F Scrutiny and working groups established as part of the BSF project governance structure.

Contribute to Brent Council's Improvement and Efficiency Plan.

Support the Project Board and other meetings established as part of the project governance arrangements, ensuring that the meetings are effectively organised and that the Board receives the information required to provide effective oversight of the BSF project

Lead the BSF Project Team to ensure that it supports the project effectively and that it is adequately resourced to deliver its objectives

Ensure that resources are available from other relevant Council departments and that key officers are briefed effectively on the project as required

Coordinate the Strategy for Change, parts one and two, leading the estates strategy section of the submission and assisting other senior managers to prepare other sections

Lead and coordinate the preparation of key project documentation, including the OJEU notice and the competitive dialogue, making appropriate use of standard PFS documentation

Lead and/or assist other senior managers to lead contract negotiations with bidders ensuring that the Council's interests are protected effectively

Ensure the effective engagement of headteachers and governing bodies of the schools in the programme

Lead and coordinate the evaluation of bids

Prepare and/or assist other senior officers to prepare reports to the Project Board, C&F Executive Member and the Executive seeking approval at key decision points in the project

Lead and coordinate the consultation and communication strategy, ensuring the effective engagement of stakeholders

Lead on property/estate planning aspects of the project, including site identification and options appraisals

Lead the school place planning for secondary schools ensuring that the borough's case for additional provision is effectively presented to the DCSF and working closely with the LGA's pan London group to maximise the borough's influence over place planning in Brent and the surrounding boroughs

Assist other senior managers to deliver the aspects of the project that they are leading

Procure external consultancy support as required to support the BSF project. This may be in the areas of project/programme management, technical, finance, legal, education or consultation work.

Manage and co-ordinate the activities of external consultants appointed to support the project.

Develop a structure and recruit an internal client function that is fully operational at financial close to enable the contract to be managed effectively

Lead on risk identification and risk management for BSF.

The postholder must at all times carry out her/his duties with due regard to the Council's Customer Care, Equal Opportunities and Best Value Policies and incorporating the Council's Core Competencies.

Corporate and Strategic responsibilities

The BSF Director will contribute to:-

- The corporate delivery of the Council's vision and values, providing a clear sense of direction and purpose
- Overall organisation development, through implementing of Council wide strategies and support for cross cutting activities as required
- The development of best practice across the council through the implementation of performance management and target setting processes
- The value of equality within the borough, both in the treatment of staff and the operation of services
- Contribute at a strategic level driving Children and Families initiatives to achieve service priorities

Service responsibilities

- To promote service excellence within the resources available
- To develop the means for consistent service improvement
- To establish effective working relationships across the council, partners, stakeholders, government offices and other bodies supporting the community
- To communicate effectively within teams to ensure the delivery of the Council's objectives
- To ensure that performance management processes are operating positively at team and individual level
- To meet all deadlines and raise queries within reasonable timescales

Jobholder's name:

Date:

Director's Signature:

Date:

**If the post is to be evaluated, send this form, together with form JE1, Person Specification & Organisational Chart to the Job Evaluation Team
Room 5, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane,
Wembley, Middlesex HA9 9HD**



Person Specification

JOB TITLE: BSF Project Director

Applicants should demonstrate, either on the application form (Part D) or a separate piece of paper, evidence of their ability to meet the following criteria:

Department : CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Section : BSF Project Team

Division / Unit : Resources

GRADE: Hay 3

Skills and Experience

1. Highly effective project management skills required to lead a major project with a value in excess of £300m ideally applied within a design and building context.
2. Significant leadership and managerial experience and skills, including the ability to manage professional and technical officers and managers effectively
3. A track record of successfully delivering, from initiation to commissioning, comparable major construction projects for either a public or private sector organisations, preferably in a client side project manager role.
4. Experience of multi-disciplinary working and managing complex procurement projects involving a number of internal and external partners
5. Ability to support the Project Sponsor and the Project Board by identifying key issues and recommending appropriate courses of action.
6. Successful record of achievement in managing, motivating and leading multidisciplinary teams within a performance management framework to achieve agreed outcomes.
7. A proven track record of successful liaison, negotiation and communication with the private sector and of having taken or advised on subsequent critical decisions and actions.
8. Highly developed political sensitivity, able to work closely and establish positive relationships with elected members, Chief Officers of the Council, external agencies,

head teachers, governing bodies and individuals, whilst being aware of political sensitivity.

9. Comprehensive knowledge of national policy, legislation, statutory obligations and current thinking on BSF and/or other complex forms of procurement or capital building schemes.
10. Successful experience of managing significant budgets and achieving successful construction outcomes within allocated resources.
11. Evidence of success in developing and delivering innovative and creative solutions to difficult issues, including sustainability and energy-efficiency.
12. High level influencing, negotiating and conflict-resolution skills capable of delivering functional or organisational goals.
13. A proven ability to analyse and interpret complex written and financial information.
14. Personal tact and resilience to deal with strict deadlines, budget constraints and a challenging delivery environment.



Grade	Salary Range		Grade	Salary Range		Grade	Salary Range	
1	N79	172935	2	N74	118893	3	N69	91869
	N80	178338		N75	124296		N70	95925
	N81	183741		N76	129699		N71	99978
	N82	189147		N77	135105		N72	104028
	N83	194550		N78	140508		N73	108084
4	N64	70254	5	N59	59445	6	N54	52422
	N65	74307		N60	62013		N55	54042
	N66	78360		N61	64581		N56	55662
	N67	82413		N62	67146		N57	57285
	N68	86466		N63	69714		N58	58908

This page is intentionally left blank