



Executive

Monday, 12 April 2010 at 7.00 pm

Committee Rooms 1, 2 and 3, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9HD

Membership:

Lead Member Councillors:

Portfolio

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Lorber (Chair) | Leader of the Council |
| Blackman (Vice-Chair) | Deputy Leader of the Council |
| Allie | Lead Member for Housing and Customer Services |
| D Brown | Lead Member for Highways and Transportation |
| Colwill | Lead Member for Adults, Health and Social Care |
| Detre | Lead Member for Regeneration and Economic Development |
| Matthews | Lead Member for Crime Prevention and Public Safety |
| Sneddon | Lead Member for HR and Diversity, Local Democracy and Consultation |
| Van Colle | Lead Member for Environment, Planning and Culture |
| Wharton | Lead Member for Children and Families |

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

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 - 16

3 Matters arising (if any)

4 Deputations (if any)

Environment and Culture Reports

5 Parks Strategy for Brent 2010-2015 17 - 28

This report provides Members with an overview of Brent's Parks Strategy 2010 - 2015. This Strategy feeds down from the Cultural strategy. The scope of the strategy includes the following types of urban green space within the borough: *public parks* (including sports amenities within parks), *public open spaces*, *children's play areas* in parks and *allotments*. The Strategy has been informed by both local survey data and consultation with relevant local groups including the Brent Allotments Forum and Friends of Parks Groups. A twelve-week public consultation on the draft Strategy took place between October 2009 and January 2010. More detail on these findings is outlined in Section 3 of the report.

Ward Affected:
All Wards;

Lead Member: Councillor Faulkner
Contact Officer: Shaun Faulkner, Head of
Parks Services
Tel: 020 8937 5619
shaun.faulkner@brent.gov.uk

6 Brent's response to the Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy and draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy 29 - 74

The Mayor of London is consulting on two documents. The first concerns London's energy future: "The Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy" and the Mayor is consulting the London Assembly and functional bodies until 1st April 2010. The second document is "The draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for London Public Consultation

Draft". This report sets out for approval proposed responses by the council to the consultation.

Ward Affected:
All Wards;

Lead Member: Councillor Jeff Bartley
Contact Officer: Jeff Bartley, Environmental
Projects and Policy
Tel: 020 8937 5535 jeff.bartley@brent.gov.uk

Children and Families Reports

7 Children and young people - Youth Parliament survey 75 - 80

This report provides a summary of the results from a survey conducted by Brent Youth Parliament (BYP) between October and November 2009. The aim of the survey was to gather data from all ages about how young people are perceived and to gauge the way society views young people today.

Ward Affected:
All Wards;

Lead Member: Councillor Christie
Contact Officer: John Christie, Director of
Children and Families
Tel: 020 8937 3130 john.christie@brent.gov.uk

8 Redevelopment of SEN Provision at Hay Lane and Grove Park School 81 - 108

On 26 May 2009 the Executive authorised officers to proceed to the design phase to develop a scheme to rebuild Hay Lane and Grove Park Special Schools as one school and to re-provide the Borough's short break provision on the school site. This report updates the Executive on the progress made in developing the rebuild scheme and the funding arrangements required to cover the costs. It seeks the necessary authorities to progress the scheme to completion.

Ward Affected:
All Wards;

Lead Member: Councillor Christie
Contact Officer: John Christie, Director of
Children and Families
Tel: 020 8937 3130 john.christie@brent.gov.uk

Central Reports

9 Brent Equalities Monitoring 109 - 112

The Annual Equalities report provides a profile of the council's workforce by the six diversity strands, as well as information about the council's employment practices and achievements in the area of diversity, equality and community cohesion. The report which is a statutory duty is used in a variety of ways by the council and its stakeholders such as using it for comparison purposes on equality matters by service areas. This report is

Brent Council's eighth Annual Equalities report and covers the period from April 2008 to March 2009 and will be a key document used during the assessment for the Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG).

Ward Affected: All Wards;
Lead Member: Councillor Crook
Contact Officer: Jennifer Crook, Head of Diversity
Tel: 020 8937 1117 jennifer.crook@brent.gov.uk

10 Childhood Immunisation Task Group 113 - 118

The Childhood Immunisation Task Group report has been considered and agreed by the Health Select Committee. This report presents the task group's work to the Executive for approval.

Ward Affected: All Wards;
Lead Member: Councillor Davies
Contact Officer: Andrew Davies, Policy and Regeneration
Tel: 020 8937 1359
andrew.davies@brent.gov.uk

11 Task Group report - Services for women in and exiting Prostitution 119 - 130

This report brings to the Executive the work, findings and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's task group investigation into *Services for Women in and exiting prostitution*.

Ward Affected: All Wards;
Lead Member: Councillor Casson
Contact Officer: Jacqueline Casson, Policy and Regeneration
Tel: 020 8937 1134
jacqueline.casson@brent.gov.uk

12 Consultation Strategy 131 - 148

This report presents Executive members with a draft of the new Community Consultation, Engagement and Empowerment Strategy 2010/14. This strategy replaces the Community Consultation and Engagement Strategy 2006/09.

Ward Affected: All Wards;
Lead Member: Councillor Thomson
Contact Officer: Owen Thomson, Head of Consultation
Tel: 020 8937 1055
owen.thomson@brent.gov.uk

Housing and Community Care Reports

13 None

14 Reference of item considered by Forward Plan Select Committee (if any)

15 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.

16 Exclusion of Press and Public

The following items (circulated separately) are not for publication as they relate to the following category of exempt information as specified in the Local Government Act 1972 namely:

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

- **Appendix: Redevelopment of SEN provision at Hay Lane and Grove Park School (report above refers)**
- **Report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources - Pyramid House, Fourth Way, Wembley**

17 Pyramid House, Fourth Way, Wembley

This report seeks to obtain authority to renew the lease at Pyramid House, Fourth Way, or alternatively to lease suitable alternative accommodation.

Ward Affected:
Tokyngton;

Lead Member: Councillor Young
Contact Officer: James Young, Property and Asset Management
Tel: 020 8937 1398 james.young@brent.gov.uk

Date of the next meeting: the date of the next meeting will be agreed at the Annual meeting in May 2010



- 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



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE Monday, 15 March 2010 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Lorber (Chair), Councillor Blackman (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Allie, D Brown, Colwill, Detre, Van Colle and Wharton

APOLOGIES: Councillors Matthews and Sneddon

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Mistry and HB Patel

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

Councillor Detre declared a personal interest in the item relating to commissioning of the specialist Child and Mental Health Service as a member of the Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 February 2010 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. **Matters arising**

South Kilburn Regeneration - disposal of sites known as Albert Road and Carlton Vale roundabout

The Executive were pleased to note that the Homes and Communities Agency had awarded the full grant for the Albert Road development to allow the South Kilburn housing development to proceed.

4. **Order of business**

The Executive agreed to change the order of business to take early in the meeting those items for which non Executive members were specifically present.

5. **Climate change task group**

The Executive had before them the findings and recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny task group investigation into climate change in Brent, focusing on a review of the council's Carbon Management Strategy and Implementation Plan. Councillor HB Patel, chair of the task group, introduced the report and drew attention to the key message arising from the report namely to 'think globally and

act locally'. He felt that the council was making progress and efforts were being made to support the climate change agenda. Councillor Patel emphasised the need for more information to be available to residents and recommended the appointment of a climate champion. He was pleased that the council was using existing resources to target efforts and urged the council to set an example through school rebuilding programmes and council offices. Councillor Patel concluded by thanking his task group colleagues for their contributions and council staff for their support.

The Executive welcomed the report, thanked the task group for their work noting that specific reports would be presented on how to take forward the recommendations. Councillor Van Colle (Lead Member, Environment, Planning and Culture) was pleased to endorse the report.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the recommendations in the task group report and the service department response be noted;
- (ii) that the members of the task group be thanked for their work.

6. **Pupil safety on the journey to and from school**

Councillor Mistry (Task Group Chair), introduced the report which set out the findings and recommendations of the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny task group investigation into how to improve pupil safety as they travel to and from school. A number of young people had expressed concerns for their personal safety on their journeys and data had revealed incidence of anti social behaviour and bullying at locations such as bus stops and particular bus routes. Councillor Mistry drew attention to the recommendations which sought to bring about greater understanding between young and older people and adopting best practice. Councillor Mistry felt that the issue should be incorporated into schools' existing agenda accepting that curricula were already full and drew attention to where the council was being proactive, working with partner agencies such as Transport for London and the police. She drew attention to the 2006 neighbourhood working project initiative on travelling with pupils which was particularly successful. Councillor Mistry concluded by thanking colleagues on the task group for their contributions and council staff for their support.

Councillor Wharton (Lead Member, Children and Families) endorsed the report and assured that the recommendations would be taken on board. Councillor Brown added that action had already been taken on one of the recommendations to increase the 245 bus service at peak times. The Executive noted that safer transport teams continued travel on buses as part of a TfL initiative, engaging with children and improving relations with adults. The Executive approved the report.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the recommendations in the task group report and the service department response be noted;
- (ii) that members of the task group be thanked for their work.

7. Environment and Culture Capital Spend 2010/11: Highways Major Works programme

The report from the Director of Environment and Culture made recommendations to members detailing the prioritised programme for major footway upgrade projects, carriageway resurfacing schemes, improvements to grass verge areas and accessibility, renewal of marginal highway land, public realm improvements on primary routes, new street signage, gully maintenance, concrete roads, carriageway resurfacing – short sections, footway upgrades – short sections, the maintenance of road channels and footway boundaries to facilitate street cleaning, and highway improvements in the Park Royal area. The Executive were asked to approve the expenditure of the £4,000k capital budget allocation for the 2010/11 capital works programme, which has been included in the Budget Setting report submitted to the meeting of the Executive on 15th February 2010. The report also detailed for information, the Principal (A) Road programme for 2010/11, which utilise the £622k maintenance element of funding allocated by Transport for London (TfL), for improvements on the basis of the results of a London wide condition survey.

Councillor D Brown (Lead Member, Highways and Transportation) was pleased that the council was to improve the infrastructure. Reference was made to the current road surface problems and potholes caused by the cold weather conditions, the estimated cost of repair being in the region of £½M. Members noted that companies causing damage to pavements would be fined and noted that monitoring would continue to ensure that contractors were recalled to make good poor work.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that approval be given to utilise the main highways capital programme of £4,000k as follows:

| Footways | % budget | amount (£ 000's) |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| ▪ Major footway upgrade | 35 | 1,400 |
| ▪ Footway upgrades – short sections | 2.5 | 100 |
| ▪ Renewal of marginal highway land | 1.25 | 50 |
| ▪ Public realm improvements on primary routes | 2.5 | 100 |
| ▪ Improvement to grass verges and accessibility | 1.9 | 75 |
| ▪ New street signs | 1.25 | 50 |
| total | 44.4 | 1,775 |
| Carriageways | | |
| ▪ Major carriageway resurfacing of non-principal unclassified (borough road) network | 32.5 | 1,300 |
| ▪ Major carriageway resurfacing of non-principal classified (B & C) network (CAA NI169) | 7.5 | 300 |
| ▪ Gully replacement/maintenance | 1.9 | 75 |
| ▪ Concrete roads | 1.9 | 75 |

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| ▪ Carriageway resurfacing – short sections (including amendments for moving traffic contraventions) | 6.8 | 275 |
|---|-----|-----|

| | | |
|--------------|------|--------------|
| total | 50.6 | 2,025 |
|--------------|------|--------------|

Miscellaneous

| | | |
|--|------|-----|
| ▪ Maintenance of road channels and footway boundaries to facilitate street cleaning | 1.25 | 50 |
| ▪ Highway improvements in Park Royal (match funding to be provided by PRP) | 1.25 | 50 |
| ▪ Contingencies for TfL funded schemes | 2.5 | 100 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|------------|
| total | 5 | 200 |
|--------------|---|------------|

- (ii) that approval be given to the schemes and reserve schemes, as listed in Appendices 1 – 3 of the report from the Director of Environment and Culture.

8. Determination of proposals to discontinue Grove Park Special School and alter Hay Lane Special School

The Lead Member, Children and Families introduced the report which sought the Executive's determination of the statutory proposals (published on 31 December 2009) to discontinue Grove Park Special School and alter Hay Lane Special School. The representation period ended on 12 February 2010. The net effect of determining these proposals as recommended was to discontinue Grove Park Special School and to expand Hay Lane Special School so that all the children registered at Grove Park Special School can move to Hay Lane Special School. Councillor Wharton referred to joint working arrangements between the two schools that had increased over the recent past and that single management would prove more cost effective.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that approval be given to the statutory proposal published on 31 December 2009 to discontinue Grove Park Special School with effect from 31 August 2010;
- (ii) that approval be given to the statutory proposal published on 31 December 2009 to alter to Hay Lane Special School so that it:
- provides 210 places from 1 September 2010;
 - meets the range of needs set out in paragraph 3.2.11
 - can admit all pupils who would, but for these proposals, have continued their education at Grove Park Special School on and after 1 September 2010: and
 - provides 235 places dependent on the completion of the rebuilding of the school, which is expected to be completed by the Summer of 2013. A decision on the rebuilding of the resultant expanded Hay Lane School is anticipated in April 2010.

9. **Authority to tender works contract for a new build Intergenerational Children's Centre at Kingsbury High School**

The report from the Director of Children and Families concerned the procurement process for the new build Kingsbury Intergenerational Children's Centre. The report requested approval to continue the procurement process and to invite tenders in respect of the works as required by Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89. The initial estimated cost of the work was below £1 million and procurement was addressed as a medium value contract. A revised estimate prior to inviting tenders estimated the cost of the work at above £1 million; therefore a high value contract. Authority to tender was therefore requested post pre-qualification stage.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that approval be given the pre - tender considerations and the criteria to be used to evaluate tenders as set out in paragraph 3.6 of the report from the Director of Children and Families;
- (ii) that approval be given to the invite of tenders and their evaluation in accordance with the approved evaluation criteria referred to in (i) above.

10. **Commissioning of the specialist Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) in Brent 2010-11**

The Director of Children and Families in his report sought an exemption from the full tender requirements and approval from the Executive to commission Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust to deliver The Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service this service on a one year contract from 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011. By re-commissioning the existing provider, it was hoped that there will be minimal disruption to delivery for 2010-11.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to an exemption from the usual tendering requirements of Contract Standing Orders in relation to the joint Council and NHS Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, on the basis that there are good operational reasons for doing so as set out in section 3 of the report from the Director of Children and Families;
- (ii) that approval be given to award a contract jointly with Brent Primary Care Trust for the joint Council and NHS Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service to the current provider, Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust, for the period 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011.

Councillor Detre declared a personal interested as a member of the Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust.

11. **Building Schools for the Future - procurement of a Joint Local Education Partnership with Barnet and Enfield councils**

Councillor Wharton (Lead Member, Children and Families) advised that following discussions representatives from the London boroughs of Enfield and Barnet, officers had not been able to reach agreement on the proposed joint Local Education Partnership and it was no longer considered to be in the council's interest to proceed. It was noted that options to enter into LEP arrangements with other boroughs remained.

RESOLVED:-

that the verbal report from the Director of Children and Families be noted together with officers' advice that following detailed discussions with potential partners, it was considered to not be in the Council's interest to proceed with the Joint Local Education Partnership with the Barnet and Enfield councils.

12. **Supply and Demand and Temporary Accommodation**

Councillor Allie (Lead Member, Housing and Customer Services) introduced the report which sought approval to the lettings projections for 2010/11, and provided members with an updated supply and demand analysis for housing, including lettings performance in 2009/10 and progress against temporary accommodation reduction targets. He referred to the reduction in the number of homeless and in the number of households on the Housing Register. Councillor Allie also drew attention work taking place with Children and Families to progress the delivery of a co-located service for 16 and 17 year olds in housing need.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the updated supply and demand analysis for housing, including lettings performance in 2009/10, in Appendix A to the report from the Director of Housing and Community Care, be noted;
- (ii) that approval be given to the lettings projections for 2010/11, as detailed in paragraph 3.11 and in Appendix E of the Director's report.

13. **Authority to proceed with refurbishment of 8 St Gabriel's Road and 170 Walm Lane NW2**

The report from the Director of Housing and Community Care sought authority to proceed with the refurbishment and modernisation of two Council owned properties at 8 St Gabriel's Road NW2 and 170A Walm Lane NW2. This project was one of the work streams contained in Adult Social Care's Transformation Gold Project.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that approval be given to the refurbishment and modernisation of two council owned properties at 8 St Gabriel's Road NW2 and 170 Walm Lane NW2 for the delivery of services and accommodation to service users with mental health needs;

- (ii) that approval be given to the use of the Adult Social Care Single Capital Pot for 2009/10 and 2010/11 for the works and professional fees required to refurbish the properties referred to in (i) above.

14. Disposal of HRA freehold blocks/buildings (where leasehold interest of all the individual dwellings have been sold)

The report from the Director of Housing and Community Care addressed those freehold buildings owned by the Council where the long-leasehold interest for individual dwellings that comprise the freehold has been sold, in the main through Right to Buy. The Council's managing agent, Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) had concerns that the risks to the Council and the net costs of managing these properties far outweighed the benefits of ownership through the ground rent and so recommended that the Council should consider freehold disposals.

RESOLVED: -

- (i) that approval be given to the disposal of the freehold of buildings that are accounted for in the Council's statutory Housing Revenue Account (HRA) where 100% of the long-leasehold interest of the flats in those buildings have been disposed of, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report from the Director of Housing and Community Care;
- (ii) that the net capital receipt from the disposal be allocated within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) to fund Health and Safety works for dwellings in the HRA;
- (iii) that the Head of Property and Asset Management and the Director of Housing and Community Care, be delegated authority to approve future disposals of the freehold interest of buildings accounted for in the HRA, once the leasehold interest of 100% of those particular blocks has been disposed of;
- (iv) that the Head of Property and Asset Management and the Director of Housing and Community Care (in consultation with the Lead Member for Housing) be authorised to initially offer the freehold interest of the properties set out in Appendix 1 of the Director's report to the existing leaseholders who are occupying housing accommodation in those properties and such disposals are dependent upon the best price that can be reasonably obtained;
- (v) that If no disposal was made to existing leaseholders as set out in paragraph (iv) above, then authority be delegated to the Head of Property and Asset Management and the Director of Housing to make arrangements for the disposal of such properties and to obtain the best price that can be reasonably obtained, subject to consent from the Secretary of State for those disposals;
- (vi) that authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Community Care to apply to the Secretary of State under section 32 of the Housing Act 1985 to dispose of the freehold interest of the properties set out in Appendix 1 of the Director's report when it is necessary to do so.

15. **Authority to exempt from tendering a contract to provide a supported housing service at Livingstone House, 105 Melville Road**

The Director of Housing and Community Care's report asked for agreement to a proposed contract for supported housing services at Livingstone House, 105 Melville Road NW10 8UB to be exempted from the tendering requirements ordinarily required by the Council's Contract Standing Orders, for the good operational and financial reasons as set out in the report.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that approval be given for a contract for a housing support service for single homeless people at Livingstone House 105 Melville Road NW10 be exempt from the tendering requirements ordinarily required by Contract Standing Orders for good operational and financial reasons as set out in section 3 of the report from the Director of Housing and Community Care;
- (ii) that approval be given for three year contract for housing support services for hostel residents at Livingstone House 105 Melville Road NW10 be awarded to the existing provider English Churches Housing Group from 1 June 2010, with the option of a further two year extension, on the basis that the Council receives 100% referral and nomination rights to the service and accommodation units at the hostel.

16. **Local authorities new building programme**

Councillor Allie (Lead Member, Housing and Customer Services) introduced the report which advised members of steps being taken to progress the programme to develop 21 new affordable homes on the St Raphael's Estate under the Homes and Communities Agency Local Authority New Build for which a funding allocation of £2.047 million had been received. This project aimed to improve the physical environment for residents on the St Raphael's Estate through access to quality and appropriately sized family housing, and estate layout, play space, landscaping and environmental improvements. The report requested the grant of delegated authority to the Director of Housing and Community Care to sign a Grant Agreement with the Homes and Community Agency and to grant delegated authority to the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to prudentially borrow £1.689 million to be serviced by the rental income from the properties.

The Executive also had before them appendices to the report which were not for publication as they 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 authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Community Care, in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and the Director of Finance and

Corporate Resources, to enter into to a Grant Agreement with the Homes and Communities Agency in respect of the funding allocation of £2.047 million for the development of 21 new affordable homes on the St. Raphael's Estate under the Homes and Communities Agency Local Authority New Build programme;

- (ii) that the appointment of architects, quantity surveyor and project managers to progress the planning phase of the programme be noted;
- (iii) that officers' intention to procure building contract to develop the sites under a permissible framework agreement and to report back to the Executive seeking approval to award such contract be noted;
- (iv) that authority be given to the Director of Housing and Community Care, in consultation with the Lead Member for Housing, to submit further bids to the Homes and Communities Agency for schemes to be developed under the Local Authority New Build programme without prior Executive approval provided that Executive approval will be required before completing each scheme and/or entering into any Grant Agreement or other agreement for any such schemes;
- (v) that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to prudentially borrow £1.689 million to be serviced by the rental income from the properties referred to in paragraph 2.1 over a 30-35 year period, with the discretion to increase this sum by 10% to cover build cost and other contingencies.

17. Housing and social care non HRA PFI authority to award phase 2 of contract

The report from the Director of Housing and Community Care reminded the Executive that financial close on Phase 1 of the Housing and Social Care PFI project was reached in December 2008. This included the provision of 195 housing units and 20 units for people with learning disabilities. The project was developed to provide social housing and replacement residential facilities for people with learning disabilities with the aid of a government grant. Since December 2008, there have been negotiations on the provision of further housing units as part of Phase 2 of the scheme. Changes to interest rates and bank margins since December 2008 have required measures to be taken, as part of these negotiations, to ensure Phase 2 of the scheme remains affordable. One of these measures was a reduction in the number of planned units for Phase 2 from 185 reported previously to 169, reducing total units for both phases of the scheme from 400 to 384. Financial close on Phase 2 was scheduled for 31 March 2010.

Circulated in advance of the meeting was a supplementary report advising that the funders have requested that an additional Contract Act Certificate be given in respect of the proposed Procurement Deed and the Executive was therefore also asked to agree additional recommendations. 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:

- i) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information);
- ii) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings;

and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress on delivery of Phase 1 of the scheme in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.5 of the report from the Director of Housing and Community Care be noted;
- (ii) that approval be given to the revised total of 165 units at Phase 2 of the scheme – taking total units for Phase 1 and Phase 2 to 384 – as set out in paragraph 4.6 of the Director’s report;
- (iii) that authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Community Care, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources and the Borough Solicitor, to agree the variation to the PFI Project Agreement and all other related documents including those which shall be entered into by the Council with any of Brent Co-Efficient's funders or subcontractors, in order to enable financial close on Phase 2 of the project;
- (iv) that the Borough Solicitor, or a delegate on her behalf, be authorised, to execute all of the legal agreements, contracts and other documents on behalf of the Council in relation to Phase 2 of this project (and such other legal agreements and documentation which may be necessary to give full effect to the variation to the PFI Contract), subject to her receiving confirmation of credit approval from the Department for Communities and Local Government or, executing such contracts and other documentation with a pre-condition that they shall only come into full effect upon the issuing of such PFI credit approval by the CLG;
- (v) that the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources can issue, on behalf of the Council, such certificate or certificates under the Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997 in respect of:
 - a. the Deed of Amendment to give effect to the variations to the PFI Project Agreement;
 - b. the Direct Agreement Amendment Deed to give effect to the variations to the Direct Agreement entered into between the Council, the funders and Brent Co-Efficient; and
 - c. the Residual Value Amendment Deed to give effect to the revised Residual Value Deed to be entered into between the Council, Hyde Housing Association and the funders;
- (vi) that the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources will be fully indemnified by the Council in the event of any claim against him arising from the provision of any Certificate he may issue in accordance with recommendations/decisions in (v) above;

- (vii) that the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources can issue, on behalf of the Council, a Certificate under the Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997 in respect of the Procurement Deed to be entered into between the Council, Brent Co-Efficient and Hyde Housing Association;
- (viii) that the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources will be fully indemnified by the Council in the event of any claim against him arising from the provision of any certificate he may issue in accordance with recommendation/decision in (vii) above.

18. Housing and Community Care Social Care: partnership arrangements with NHA organisations under S75 Health Act 2010/11

The report from the Director of Housing and Community Care recommended an extension to the Council's existing partnership agreement with Central and North West London Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust for up to nine months from 1 April 2010. The report also set out the work in progress to put in place a new agreement within the next year for the services involved under recent legislation in line with the previous Executive decision 18 March 2008. A dedicated project was in place to deliver the recommendations for a new long term agreement within the next six months for consideration by the Trust Board and the Council Executive.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that approval be given to the temporary extension of the existing partnership agreement with the Central and North West London Mental Health Foundation NHS Trust for a period of up to 9 months from 1 April 2010;
- (ii) that authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Community Care, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources to resolve any outstanding issues with Central and North West London Mental Health Foundation NHS Trust prior to entering into the extension period detailed in paragraph (i) above;
- (iii) that progress in the fundamental review of the partnership arrangements with Central and North West London Mental Health Foundation NHS Trust and the intention of the Director of Housing and Community Care to report on the proposed replacement partnership agreement by 31 September 2010 be noted.

19. Performance and Finance Review Quarter 3

Councillor Lorber (Chair, Lead Member, Corporate Strategy and Policy Coordination) introduced the report which summarised Brent Council's spending, activity and performance in Quarter 3, 2009/10 and highlighted key issues and solutions to them. It took a corporate overview of financial and service performance and provided an analysis of high risk areas. The report was accompanied by appendices providing budget, activity and performance data for each service area, the Local Area Agreement, ring fenced budgets and the capital programme. Vital Signs trend data and graphs were also provided along with the council's overall budget summary. Councillor Lorber reminded members of the need to look at

areas of current under performance and take measures to bring them back on target.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the council's spending, activity and performance in the third quarter of 2009/10 be noted;
- (ii) that all directors ensure that spending is kept within budget and underperformance tackled, and that measures be taken, in consultation with relevant portfolio holders, to achieve this.

20. Authority to tender contract for insurance of leaseholder 'right to buy' properties

The report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources sought authority under Contract Standing Orders 88 and 89 for the invite of tenders for a single provider framework agreement for the provision of building insurance for private dwellings sold by the Council to tenants under the Right to Buy scheme. The framework agreement would commence on 1 August 2010 and would be for a period of 3 years.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to the pre-tender considerations and the criteria to be used to evaluate tenders for a framework for the provision of insurance for private dwellings sold by the Council to tenants pursuant to the Right to Buy scheme as set out in paragraph 3.4 of the report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources;
- (ii) that approval be given to the invite of tenders and their evaluation in accordance with the approved evaluation criteria referred to in (i) above.

21. Disposal of 79a and 79b Tubbs Road

Councillor Blackman (Lead Member, Resources) introduced the report which sought consent to the disposal of the property at 79a and 79b Tubbs Road on the terms detailed in the report from the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources. Councillor Blackman welcomed the opportunity for additional capital receipt that could be invested in housing.

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 and business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information):

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the Head of Property and Asset Management be authorised to acquire and then dispose of the property at 79a and 79b Tubbs Road in line with the following options:
 - a) to a Housing Association that has been nominated by the Director of Housing and Community Care
 - b) to Brent Housing Partnership as part of the ALMO Settled Homes Initiative
 - c) or in the event that disposal under options (i) or (ii) cannot be achieved; by way of public auction
- (ii) that authority be delegated to the Head of Property and Asset Management to determine the final terms of the disposal, provided that the consideration obtained should be the best that can, in his opinion, reasonably be obtained and the other terms shall be such as he considers to be in the best interests of the Council.

22. Authority to agree a extension to the Council's existing contracts for office supplies

The report from the Director of Business Transformation requested authority to agree a further three month extension to the Council's existing contracts with Office Depot (UK) Ltd and The Paper Company for the provision of office supplies.

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 there are good operational reasons for not tendering contracts for the provision of office supplies and approval be given to a three month extension of existing contracts with Office Depot (UK) Ltd and The Paper Company.

23. Reference of item considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee

*Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 9 February 2010
Willesden Junction Station – Councillor Call for Action request*

The Executive considered the request from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for support for initiatives to improve the condition of Willesden Junction Station and surrounding area in cooperation with the adjacent boroughs and Network Rail.

RESOLVED:-

that the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in response to the Councillor Call for Action request in respect of Willesden Junction Station be agreed.

24. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED:

that the press and public be now excluded from the meeting as the following report contains the following category of exempt information as specified in the Local Government Act 1972 namely:

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

25. Termination of Middlesex House and Lancelot Road Housing Scheme

The Director of Housing and Community Care introduced this report which provided details of a proposed settlement agreement in order to allow the revised arrangements the Council entered into with Network Housing Association, now Stadium, in 2000 to be terminated. The report requested the Executive's approval for the Director of Housing and Community Care in consultation with the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources and the Borough Solicitor to enter in an agreement with Stadium to effect the proposed settlement subject to the Council obtaining the Secretary of State's consent. The Borough Solicitor drew members' attention to the balances figure within the report at paragraph 3.41 which had been incorrectly stated and advised of the correct figure which was agreed.

In answer to a question, the Director of Finance and Corporate Resources explained the financial details of the settlement and how it would be funded. It would reduce financial risk to the council. The Director of Housing and Community Care confirmed that the agreement once in place would end the council's direct involvement in Middlesex House and Lancelot Road.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that approval be given to the negotiated settlement comprising full and final financial settlement between the Council and Stadium (including the financial payments from the Council to Stadium as set out in paragraph 3.40 and 3.41 of the report from the Directors of Finance and Corporate Resources and Housing and Community Care);
- (ii) that the Director of Housing and Community Care be authorised to enter into an agreement with Stadium and THFC to effect such a settlement and release the Council from any further financial obligations under the scheme (a draft settlement agreement is attached at Appendix 6 and draft Deed of Release is attached at Appendix 7 of the Directors' report) pursuant to the Council's powers under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972, section 24 of the Local Government Act 1988, section 22 of the Housing Act


1996 and section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 as set out in paragraphs 5.16 to 5.23 of the report;

- (iii) that approval be given for the Director of Housing and Community Care to seek consent from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government under section 25 of the Local Government Act 1988 for the payment of any agreed sum to Stadium as part of the financial settlement;
- (iv) that the correction to the balances total in para 3.41 of the Directors' report referred to by the Borough Solicitor at the meeting, be noted.

The meeting ended at 7.55 pm

P LORBER
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|--|---|
|  The logo of Brent Council, featuring a central coat of arms with a lion, a unicorn, and a figure holding a staff, surrounded by the words 'BRENT COUNCIL' in a circular arrangement. | <p style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Environment and Culture</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Wards Affected: ALL</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Brent's Parks Strategy 2010 – 2015</p> | |

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report provides Members with an overview of Brent's Parks Strategy 2010 - 2015. This Strategy feeds down from the Cultural strategy. The scope of the strategy includes the following types of urban green space within the borough: **public parks** (including sports amenities within parks), **public open spaces**, **children's play areas** in parks and **allotments**.
- 1.2 The Strategy has been informed by both local survey data and consultation with relevant local groups including the Brent Allotments Forum and Friends of Parks Groups. A twelve-week public consultation on the draft Strategy took place between October 2009 and January 2010. More detail on these findings is outlined in Section 3 of the report.

2.0 Recommendations

That the Executive:

- 2.1 Note the findings of the background research used to inform the development of this Strategy.
- 2.2 Agree the seven key themes as set out in paragraphs 3.10-3.18
- 2.3 Approve the action plan detailed within the Parks Strategy (attached as Appendix 1) and that the Council will lead on those actions identified as such.

3.0 Detail

Background

- 3.1 It is generally accepted that good quality parks and open spaces are important for enhancing the quality of urban life. Quality green spaces have been shown to support the local economy, enhance physical and mental health, benefit children and young people, reduce crime and fear of crime, support social cohesion, aid movement between spaces, and protect biodiversity and the environment (ODPM, 2005).¹
- 3.2 The Council, with support from residents and a range of stakeholders, has achieved many of the recommendations set out in the previous Parks Strategy that came to end in December 2009. For example:
- Annual visits to our parks have increased to nearly 16 million a year from 13 million five years ago²
 - Five of our parks - Gladstone, Roundwood, Barham, Preston, Mapesbury Dell and Queen's Park (in Brent and managed by the Corporation of London) - have received national ('Green Flag') recognition for the high standard of planting and facilities in these parks, and, in 2009 the Barn Hill Conservation Trust retained the 'Green Pennant' award for its work on the Roe Green Walled Garden
 - Our allotment service has been re-vitalised and the quality of several sites has been transformed (e.g. Gladstone Park Gardens and Townsend Lane)
 - A comprehensive range of sports facilities in our parks have been upgraded and new facilities provided in areas of need (for example pitch drainage works a multi use games area and new sports pavilions at Gibbons Recreation Ground, Gladstone Park, John Billam, and the GEC, in addition to pavilion upgrades at Northwick Park, Vale Farm and King Edward VII Park and new multi use games areas at Vale Farm, Hazel Road and Grove Park)
 - The results of the most recent annual Parks Survey show new approaches taken by the Park Warden Service have resulted in improved perceptions of security and safety in parks (including dog control, graffiti and vandalism), improved communications with users and greater community involvement; all issues identified as residents' priorities through the 'Best Value Review' consultation process in 2001
 - In terms of Biodiversity, since 2001 the Council has achieved increases in hay meadow, woodland, hedgerow and pond habitats at Fryent Country Park; and of marshland conservation at the Brent Reservoir where 'Local Nature Reserve' status has been declared
 - *In 2008-09, Brent Parks Service received a 'London in Bloom' Silver Gilt Award for Horticultural Excellence and 3rd Place in both the Community Garden and Parks Bedding in the Discretionary awards. We have an excellent record in the local completion and have represented London in the regional Britain in Bloom competition in which won a silver gilt and came second in category. We retained the*

¹ ODPM (2005), *How to Create Quality Parks and Open Spaces*. ODPM Publications.

² *Annual Brent Parks Surveys 2003 – 2008*

Silver Gilt in 2009-2010 and won an additional Silver Gilt for Gladstone Park in the Best Public Park discretionary award

- Brent Council Parks Service won the Beacon Status Award in 2002 under the theme 'Improving Urban Green Space'
- Our Parks Service has also secured a £1.2 million DCSF 'Playbuilder' grant to improve between 20-24 children's playgrounds across the borough. This project has resulted in improved working relationship with our Children and Families Departments and forged strong consultation networks with young people (For example, findings from the TELUS Survey 2009 shows that the young people of Brent have voted their local parks and playgrounds as the second best in the country. Results will be fed into the new NI199 indicator- 'Satisfaction with parks and playgrounds by young people')

3.3 Despite these successes, we know there is still much to achieve; not least how to address spatial deficiencies in open space, play and sports facilities to meet local needs in some of the most densely populated parts of the borough and, looking to the future, how best to provide and sustain new areas of open space and facilities to meet the needs of the growing population linked to our area regeneration plans. We also know that many of our established park facilities are out-dated and inadequately maintained while improving residents' sense of security in our un-staffed parks and open spaces continues to be a priority. So too is the achievement of further Green Flag awards at Welsh Harp Open Space, King Edward VII Park - Wembley, Brent River Park and, in time, other sites. Now, a new plan is needed to guide the priorities for action in these and other areas of our work in the Parks Service for the coming five-year period.

3.4 Brent's Culture, Sports and Learning Forum has developed a Cultural Strategy for Brent. The Cultural strategy identifies eight principles:

1. Enhancing Cultural Vibrancy
2. Increasing Participation
3. Raising the Profile of Culture
4. Encouraging Young People to Take Part
5. Developing Public Spaces
6. Making the Most of London 2012
7. Supporting the Cultural Economy
8. Promoting Health and Wellbeing

It is considered that these are key to the successful delivery of the vision to; *"develop a range of cultural opportunities that are engaging, accessible and enriching for all local communities."* Brent's parks strategy has themes and priorities that link with these Cultural strategy principles and delivery of the parks activity actions will contribute to achieving the vision of the Cultural strategy.

3.5 To develop the strategy recent consultation and research has also been analysed including:

- Annual Parks Survey 2000-2009
- Active People Surveys 1 and 2
- Playbuilder Surveys with 8-13 year olds
- Youth Parliament Survey 2008
- Club Surveys
- London Parks Benchmarking Surveys
- The Place Survey 2008
- Residents Attitude Survey 2009
- Mosaic information and the Council's evidence base

In addition, internal and external influences were reviewed that may affect the development of parks and open spaces in Brent. The external influences are summarised according to key policy areas where parks and open spaces have the greatest impact i.e. land use planning and regeneration, health and sport (including the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games and Legacy plans), climate change and biodiversity, and, across all these areas, equality of opportunity. All this information informed the content of the strategy.

- 3.6 Public consultation on the draft strategy took place from October 2009 to January 2010. The draft Strategy was available in Brent's libraries and remaining One Stop Shops. It was also available to download from the Parks Service's website and was on the Council's Consultation tracker inviting people to feedback via the online consultation questionnaire. A web link and flyers were sent to members of the Council's User Consultative Forums and the Brent Magazine ran an article on the draft strategy. The Youth Parliament considered the draft strategy and provided detailed feedback which will inform delivery of the actions within the strategy.
- 3.7 Letters and/or emails were sent to the following individuals and organisations together with copies of the draft Strategy and Executive Summary asking for their comments and feedback:
- Senior Council Officers and Members
 - Local Friends of Parks and Open Spaces
 - All of the listed Residents Associations
Youth Parliament
 - Greater London Parks Benchmarking Group
 - Greenspace
 - Council's User Consultative Forums which include Brava, BME, Disability and Older People's Forums
 - All local Schools through the Schools Extranet
- 3.8 The responses from the consultation process have informed the final version of the Strategy. The majority of comments supported the key themes and objectives.

Key Findings

3.9 From the background research and consultation it has been possible identify a number of headline findings which have influenced the key themes and priorities. These findings include:

Patterns of use of Brent's Parks

- Users of the Council owned Parks tend to live locally and visit regularly (31.5% at least three times a week on average)
- 15% always visit alone, whilst 35% always visit in a group – i.e. with a partner, children, other family, friends or a combination of these.
- The average number of people in a group is 3.8.
- Users visit Brent's parks primarily to *exercise, let children play or relax* (these top three responses accounting for 85% of the total). Consequently, *play facilities, access and general atmosphere* came out as highly important aspects of the service. This is consistent with the findings of the Parks Survey in previous years
- 96% of respondents walk to their local Park. This is consistent with previous years' findings and supports the case for the local target for provision of local parks in line with the London Plan target of a 400m walk distance threshold

- Queens Park (a Corporation of London owned site) and Gladstone Park were identified as the most visited Parks in Brent
- The aspects of the service rated most highly were *staff helpfulness, cleanliness and overall maintenance*.
- 83% of respondents (slightly higher than the previous year's 80%) have some concerns with safety. Concerns about *'groups of youths hanging around'* stated by the majority of people, with *'lack of visible assistance in cases of emergency'* cited as the second 'fear inducing' factor.
- Recent consultation indicates that children are more concerned with the quality and variety of the play experience than safety. Children want areas filled with nature, from plants, trees, flowers, and water, to animals and insects. They want different things to do, and developmentally appropriate learning environments that hold their attention for hours.
- In addition there are some gender differences in terms of what improvements children would like to see: The boys wanted the more boisterous, exciting and adventurous play space with a strong emphasis on sport whilst girls preferred an area where they could socialise and be safe. They were also conscious about keeping fit and were interested in the Multi-Use Games Areas concept.

The most frequently cited improvements among adults were (in order of importance):

- A greater emphasis on **safety** – staffing, improved visibility across sites etc.
- Infrastructure **repairs** – including paths, toilets and pavilions

- Control of **dogs** and freedom from dog fouling
- Improved, **updated facilities** e.g. sports and a variety of ‘exciting’ play equipment e.g. sensory gardens, paddling pools etc
- Greater **variety of facilities** especially for youths
- Issues and needs arising from the assessment of the ‘supply’ of Brent’s parks are summarised in the following Table

Table 1: - Summary of Strategic Issues and Needs arising from Consultation Findings

| Issue | Needs by Service Area |
|---|---|
| Spatial provision and need for more open space | Parks – Spatial deficiency in a number of areas of the borough against the 400m walking distance standard taking into account accessible parks across borough boundaries, plus new provision needed in Growth Areas |
| | Play Areas – Spatial deficiency against Brent Local Standard in a number of areas not met by the ‘Playbuilder’ project roll-out of new and upgraded play areas |
| | Pitches - By 2016, there will be a need for 40 adult, 77 junior and 30 mini pitches to meet demand. This is almost double the existing pitch provision |
| | Allotments - Spatial deficiency in certain areas of the borough and unmet expressed demand (waiting lists). |
| Issue | Needs by Service Area |
| Quality of provision and need for improvement and/or restoration | Parks - Despite upward trend, 12 parks still have only ‘fair’ satisfaction ratings; Poor standard of toilets in most parks; Longstanding restoration projects in Roundwood Park (open air theatre), and Gladstone Park (Dollis Hill House) |
| | Play Areas – A number of play areas in parks are in need of improvement. 9 sites identified in recent needs assessment for major improvements in 2008/09 and 2009/10 to improve accessibility and others in future years |
| | Pitches - Poor quality of many park pitches and changing rooms |
| | Allotments - Quality issues at most sites |
| Issue | Needs by Service Area |
| Safety of Parks and Play Sites in Parks | Concern among parents of ‘ <i>stranger danger</i> ’ and need for greater mobile park warden presence and work with Safer Neighbourhood Teams at those sites without a permanent warden. |
| Community | Good level of community involvement in parks. |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Involvement | Need to identify local park volunteers in those locations where friends groups are not yet established and consider options for greater self-management of park service facilities e.g. allotment sites, sports facilities. |
| Information | Need for further development of both web-based and park-based information about facilities, programmes and habitats in parks |
| Maintenance | Need for development of 'green' horticultural maintenance specification Need to identify and secure maintenance budgets to support and sustain any new provision of parks, open spaces, play areas, sports pitches, and allotments. E.g. Playbuilder revenue budget, S106 agreements |
| Programmes | To achieve physical activity and child obesity reduction targets, need to find innovative ways to expand programme of Events, Health Walks, Cycle training etc within existing budgets and by maximising available grant aid |
| Bio Diversity | To meet targets of Brent's Tree Planting Programme, need to undertake a survey of tree planting densities in all Brent Parks and identify priority parks for tree planting Need to identify opportunities for hedges, small meadows and rough grassland in parks and open spaces |

The Vision

3.10 The overarching vision of this strategy is:

'To provide good quality, attractive, enjoyable and accessible green space which meets the diverse needs of all Brent residents and visitors'

3.11 In order to achieve this vision, seven themes have been identified arising from the consultation and research. These themes take account of the benefits that parks and open spaces can make to achieving wider social and economic objectives as well as improving the quality of life of Brent's residents.

Key Themes

3.12 The seven key themes are:

1 Improving Existing Parks and Open Spaces

2 Providing New Parks and Open Spaces

- 3 **Developing New Activity Programmes in Parks**
- 4 **Achieving Greater Community Involvement and Working towards Inclusivity**
- 5 **Maintaining and Improving Biodiversity in our Parks**
- 6 **Mitigating Climate Change Impacts**
- 7 **Promoting our Parks and Open Spaces and their Value**

Theme 1 - Improving Existing Parks and Open Spaces

3.13 In seeking to continue to improve the quality of Brent's existing parks and open spaces and user satisfaction we will concentrate on the priority public concerns i.e.

- *Safety and security.*
- *Infrastructure repairs and landscape improvements.*
- *General maintenance and upkeep.* Through our contract management policies and procedures and other actions, we will continue to strive to improve general standards of parks maintenance and upkeep. In the case of proposals and opportunities for new parks and open spaces and for new amenities in parks, a sustainable maintenance plan and allocated budget will be in place as a priority before proceeding.
- *Independent Auditing.* We will increase the number of independent park audits undertaken to assess improvement priorities (through the existing KMC Green Space Performance Management system).

Theme 2-Providing New Parks and Open Spaces

3.14 We will respond to opportunities where they arise in areas where there is evidence of need to create new public open spaces. We will focus on those areas where spatial mapping and survey evidence shows a significant level of deficiency against the London Plan standards, and on the population Growth Areas. We will also respond positively to opportunities to increase amenities within new and existing open spaces

Theme 3 - Developing New Activity Programmes in Parks

3.15 We will seek out and respond to opportunities to deliver new activity programmes aimed at increasing participation in sport and physical activity, particularly by children and young people. In particular:

- We will maximise opportunities for activity programmes in our Parks resulting from the London 2012 Olympic & Paralympic Games supported by the Mayor's Legacy Plan for 'A Sporting Future for London' (April 2009).

Theme 4 - Achieving Greater Community Involvement and Working towards Inclusivity

3.15 We will continue to work in close partnership with existing parks friends groups and similar organisations, encourage more community involvement in our parks and open spaces and work to ensure that our parks are accessible to all in the borough's diverse community by:

- *Inclusive Play Areas.* Ensuring all of the new and upgraded play sites under the 'Playbuilder' programme have inclusive play areas that can be used by disabled children, cater for a wide age group and accommodate parents, guardians and carers within a socially integrated setting. As part of this commitment and supported by the Transition Team Manager, a group of children with disabilities will work with designers and will be actively involved in the design, planning and evaluation of sites.
- *Broadening the User Profile of Allotment Sites.* Continuing to work with allotment holders, schools and other local groups to attract more use of the allotment sites by those groups identified in recent monitoring as non- or low-users i.e. young people, older females, disabled people and certain Asian minority ethnic groups.

Theme 5 - Maintaining and Improving Biodiversity in our Parks

3.16 Actions in this priority area will include:

- *Creating new hedges, meadows and rough grassland areas.* Continuing to protect existing valuable grasslands and habitats (informed by existing audit information and the Biodiversity Action Plan 2007) and undertake a survey to identify opportunities for hedges, small meadows and rough grassland in our parks and open spaces
- *Tree Planting.* Undertaking a survey of tree planting densities in all Brent Parks and identify priority parks for tree planting to meet targets of Brent's Tree Planting Programme

- *Grounds Maintenance.* Developing a ‘Green’ Horticultural Grounds Maintenance Specification to reduce the use of pesticides etc.
- *A Guide to Biodiversity in Brent’s Parks and Open Spaces.* To inform our residents and visitors to the borough about the tree, plant and wildlife species and habitats in the parks and open spaces and to aid people’s understanding of our rationale for adopting particular policies (e.g. around planting and maintenance regimes).

Theme 6 - Mitigating Climate Change Impacts

3.17 We will continue to improve our approaches to environmental sustainability and seek to mitigate the adverse impacts of climate change in all aspects of our work. Specific actions will include:

- *Trees.* In assessing tree densities and designing the Borough’s future tree planting programmes (including the selection of tree types), we will take into consideration the importance of trees in parks in providing areas of shade for both people and habitats.
- *Shrubs and Plants.* We will take into account climate change and sustainability considerations (e.g. shade value, water conservation and floodplains, maintenance requirements) in our selection of shrubs and plants for our parks and open spaces.
- *Water Conservation and Water Management.* We will continue to consider carefully the water conservation and water management implications in all areas of our work and, in consultation with other service areas, review regularly policies and procedures in all relevant areas (e.g. planting, watering, maintenance, water collection and recycling)

Theme 7 - Promoting our Parks and Open Spaces and their Value

3.18 We will continue to work to improve the promotion of our parks and open spaces, our canals and waterways, the Capital Ring and other walking routes in the borough. We will promote their value to everyone in our community as important resources for people’s health and wellbeing, for sport and play, for maintaining biodiversity and for mitigating the impacts of climate change. In particular, over the period of this strategy we will:

- *Website.* Develop more information material on the Council’s website about facilities, programmes and habitats in our parks and open spaces
- *Signage.* We will work to upgrade signage in parks to improve clarity and to make information more accessible to everyone in our diverse community
- *Interpretation.* We will strive to provide improved information both on our website and in the parks and open spaces themselves to help

people understand points of interest relating to the history and heritage of the spaces and features within them, cultural links, wildlife, plant and tree species etc.

- *Quality Assurance.* Work to retain the ISO 900/200, ISO14001 quality assurance accreditations and the Customer Service Excellence Award (formerly Charter Mark) currently held by the Council's Parks Service
- *National and Regional Competitions.* Continue to encourage and support local groups participating in the Britain / London in Bloom award scheme
- *Accreditations.* Identify the additional resources necessary to Increase the number of sites in the borough with Green Flag / Green Pennant awards through strategically focused improvements on the identified sites

Action Plan and Review

- 3.19 The Strategy contains an action plan which a number of both internal and external partners will play a role in delivering. It identifies the potential partners and lead organisations and shows how these actions link up to achieving the priorities within each theme. Progress against the action plan will be reviewed annually by Brent's Parks Service and a report produced which will be presented to the Culture, Learning and Sport Forum. A comprehensive review of the strategy will commence in 2014 to allow sufficient time for a subsequent strategy to be produced.

4 Financial Implications

- 4.1 Many of the actions within the action plan can be implemented within existing budgets. Some actions however such as the restoration of Barham Park and the Summer Theatre at Roundwood will require substantial Capital investment and no provision currently exists within the Capital programme. The Barham Park project is estimated to cost around £1.4million and the Roundwood Theatre anywhere between £100,000 and £500,000. Where opportunities arise additional or external funding will be sought to deliver specific elements of the strategy.
- 4.2 Any additional Council funding will be subject to approval during the annual budgetary process for both revenue and capital budgets.

5 Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Council has power pursuant to section 19 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to provide such recreational facilities as it thinks fit. This power includes the power to provide buildings, equipment and assistance of any kind.

- 5.2 Over and above these specific powers, the Council has the general power to do anything which it considers is likely to promote and improve the economic, social or environmental wellbeing of its area under Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000. In exercising this power it has to have regard to its Sustainable Community Strategy.

6 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 Brent's Parks Strategy identifies that additional development work should focus on a number of target groups that are currently under represented in terms of usage of parks. These groups are: young people, disabled people, women and girls.
- 6.2 Paragraphs 3.5 to 3.9 detail the consultation that was undertaken in the production of the draft strategy and the public consultation. This included consulting with Brent Youth Parliament, Friends and Consultative forums.
- 6.3 An Equalities Impact Assessment will be undertaken to ensure that the strategy does not adversely impact on Brent's communities.

7 Staffing/Accommodation Implications

- 7.1 None

Background Papers

Brent Parks Strategy 2005-2010

Planning for Sport and Active Recreation Facilities Strategy 2008 – 2021

Contact Officers

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Shaun Faulkner, Head of Parks Service, Ext 5619

Richard Saunders
Director of Environment and Culture

Shaun Faulkner
Head of Parks Service
Environment and Culture



Executive
12 April 2010

Report from the Director of Environment and Culture

Wards Affected:
ALL

Brent's response to the Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy and draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The Mayor of London is consulting on two documents. The first concerns London's energy future: "The Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy" and the Mayor is consulting the London Assembly and functional bodies until 1st April 2010. It is proposed that the Council comments to ensure that the borough is able to take advantage of the opportunities available. The Mayors' Vision by 2025 is that London is one of the world's leading low carbon cities, having minimised CO2 emissions, with a thriving low carbon economy, the world's most energy efficient buildings, a secure and efficient energy supply and low carbon transport. This report sets out for approval a proposed response by the council to the consultation.
- 1.2 The second document is "The draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for London Public Consultation Draft". It is proposed that the Council comments to ensure consistency between the council's approach and this London-wide strategy. The Mayor's draft strategy proposes a broad range of measures on how the Mayor believes London can manage the challenges climate change and extreme weather conditions will bring. The actions, to reduce the risks from flooding, drought and heatwaves and looking at the impacts on cross-cutting issues of health, environment, economy and infrastructure, will involve amongst others, the GLA, London boroughs, the NHS, Environment Agency, DEFRA, TfL, London water companies and the London Development Agency who will all need, to begin to adapt in preparation for predicted climate change. A roadmap to resilience is set out in the document.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The Executive is asked to approve the attached Appendices 1 and 2 as the Council's responses to the consultation on both documents.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Regional and National context

3.1.1 Both consultation documents have arisen from a number of past reports, draft and consultations and strategies from the Mayor of London and both strategies will be consistent with relevant policies and proposals in these documents. Since taking office the Mayor of London has consulted on a number of relevant key strategies including:

- Consultation draft replacement plan: London Plan - Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, October 2009
- The London climate change adaptation strategy: Summary draft report, August 2008

3.1.2 The Mayor of London has highlighted the following national policies as providing a context for these London's strategies;

- Climate Change Act, November 2008
- The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan, July 2009
- The Heat and Energy Saving Strategy Consultation, February 2009
- The UK Low Carbon Industrial Strategy, July 2009
- Warmer Homes, Greener homes: A strategy for Energy Management, July 2009

3.2 The Mayor's Proposals

3.2.1 "Delivering London's energy future: The Mayors draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy" covers a wide range of energy and carbon mitigation areas. The strategy covers the following mitigation areas;

- Reducing London's CO2 emissions overall
- Making London one of the world's leading Low Carbon Capitals
- Securing a low carbon energy supply for London
- London's homes: driving our energy future – retrofitting homes and tackling fuel poverty
- Cutting costs and carbon in London's workplaces
- Building towards a zero carbon London
- Moving towards zero emission transport in London

The Mayor highlights 16 overall policies to deliver the above mitigation areas. Within these policies are 154 'policies to action' which detail specific actions. The strategy also outlines GLA and LDA funding which organisations,

including the Council, can apply for in order to deliver specific projects and achieve the overall aim.

3.3 The Mayor's draft climate change adaptation strategy for London proposes a broad range of measures on how the Mayor believes London can manage the challenges climate change and extreme weather conditions will bring. The actions, to reduce the risks from flooding, drought and heatwaves and looking at the impacts on cross-cutting issues of health, environment, economy and infrastructure, will involve amongst others, the GLA, London boroughs, the NHS, Environment Agency, DEFRA, TfL, London water companies and the London Development Agency who will all need, to begin to adapt in preparation for predicted climate change. A roadmap to resilience is set out in the document. There are 34 actions listed in the roadmap to resilience section.

3.4 Officers have considered the two draft strategies in detail and are recommending that the Council respond to the two consultations as set out in Appendices 1 and 2.

3.5 **Key points of officers' recommended response**

- Brent welcomes the focus on low carbon energy supply and in particular Decentralised Energy (DE). The 25% target by 2025 is considered useful in focussing efforts in this approach to carbon reduction.
- It is likely that the realistic catalyst for realising DE opportunities will be new development that can provide, to an extent, the infrastructure needed. However, significant additional investment funding will be necessary to realise area-wide DE. The Mayor should agree to act with energy suppliers and the Government principally in order to secure investment funding to bring forward and secure key decentralised networks at an early stage of the development process.
- The GLA/LDA should also consider procuring Energy Supply Companies (ESCOs) at a London-wide level to attract the best investment and de-risk local schemes.
- Brent Council welcomes and supports the principle of Electric Vehicles and the need to expand the supporting infrastructure in anticipation of consumer take-up of these vehicles
- In a period when it is anticipated that public sector funding is going to be reduced post the election, the expectations that councils will be able to match fund the measures outlined in the consultation is going to place a real burden upon the council, and may not be realistic.

3.6 On March 18th 2010 London Councils approved a report at its Transport and Environment Committee which set out its response to the consultation. Overall, London Councils support the general direction, scope and policies contained within the draft – much of which contains the detail of existing programmes, commitments and actions that boroughs are already working

with the Mayor on. The report states that the draft Strategy has very few new issues of concern for boroughs other than the overall challenge itself of meeting large carbon reduction targets. It notes that a significant omission from the draft strategy is a clear indication of the financial implications of the proposals within the strategy. London Councils states that the strategy needs £60 billion for its delivery. Its response asks the Mayor to set out in a coherent way where he expects this funding to come from not least so that this significant market opportunity can be more easily identified and realised. It notes that there is an expectation by the Mayor that London boroughs are critical to the successful implementation of this Strategy and to meeting his proposed CO₂ reduction targets. It goes on to say that the policies themselves appear generally acceptable. A full copy of the London Councils' report is attached as Appendix 3.

3.7 Existing Council Commitments

3.7.1 Brent Council already has a number of policies, strategies and initiatives in place which are in line with the Mayors Draft Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation strategies. For example the inclusion of National Indicators 185 and 188 in the Council's Local Area Agreement illustrates the Council's commitment to cutting costs and carbon in the borough and adapting to the future impacts of Climate Change.

- In October 2009, the Executive approved the Carbon Management Plan Second review;
- As part of the One Council – Improvement and Efficiency plan, the council; had committed to the Bronze Project – Carbon Management Programme;
- The Executive approved the revisions made to the Corporate Environmental Policy statement;
- December 2009 saw the launch of the borough wide Brent Climate Change Strategy;
- Local Development Framework (LDF) – The Core Strategy is due to be adopted by the end of 2010. The LDF Site Specific and Development Plan Document (DPD) will be consulted and examined in public in 2010.

3.7.2 The LDF's Core Strategy highlights strategic sustainability and climate change mitigation and adaptation measures for major developments. Major proposals are required to submit a Sustainability Statement demonstrating, at design stage and construction, measures that are used to mitigate and adapt to climate change over the lifetime of the development. This includes for domestic buildings a minimum level for the Code for Sustainable Homes and for non domestic a minimum BREEAM rating. Reducing energy demand from current building regulation standards and achieving exemplar low carbon schemes will be a planning requirement. Other Climate Change mitigation actions addressed in the Core Strategy include;

- transport infrastructure by reducing the need to travel and improve transport choices,
- to protect and enhance Brent's open spaces and environment,
- and to treat waste as a resource

- 3.7.3 The council have identified a number of Growth Areas in the borough such as Wembley, Alperton, South Kilburn, Burnt Oak/Colindale and Church End where Decentralised Energy opportunities have been identified. Significant additional investment funding will be necessary to realise area-wide Decentralised Energy.
- 3.7.4 The Housing Strategy sets out the strategic objectives and priorities that the council will work to deliver over the five years from 2009 to 2014. Although its primary focus is on housing, it will operate in the context of the wider strategic priorities agreed by the council and its partners, which in turn aim to contribute to national, regional and sub-regional goals, including energy, fuel poverty, carbon and climate change.
- 3.7.5 Brent Council are currently taking part in the LDA London Heat Mapping project.
- 3.7.6 In Transportation the Council has recently been awarded “Biking Borough” status. Brent is actively involved on the TfL/London Council’s ‘Electric Vehicle Core Delivery Group’, which is assisting in the development/delivery of electric vehicle charging infrastructure across London. The Council also manages the delivery of a package of measures aimed at reducing car dependency.
- 3.7.7 The new Council Civic Centre which will be completed by 2013 aims to achieve BREEAM ‘Outstanding’ and have a 40% CO2 reduction based on the 14 properties to be disposed of.

4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1 Both strategies do not make explicit financial commitments on the Council but, as pointed out in paragraph 3.5, if matched funding is expected from the Council this will place a heavy burden on budgets, just at a time when the Council is anticipating a significant reduction in available resources.

5.0 Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Council has power under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 to do anything which it considers likely to promote the environmental well-being of its area. In exercising this power the council is required to have regard to its Community Strategy (known as the Community Plan).
- 5.2 Furthermore, ODPM Circular 03/2003 on Best Value and Performance Improvement reiterates that sustainable development and equity are fundamental to the Best Value regime. It states that the Government’s definition of Best value is the optimum combination of whole life costs and benefits to meet the customer’s requirements’.
- 5.3 The Council has a legal obligation participate in the Carbon Reduction Commitment and to ensure the transparent display on public buildings of Display Energy Certificates.

- 5.4 Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) is a mandatory emissions trading scheme covering non-energy intensive users in both public and private sectors. The Council will be looking to minimise financial penalties under the CRC and this will require the council to undertake some of the actions outlined in the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy.
- 5.5 Under the changes introduced by the Greater London Authority Act 2007, the Mayor now has a statutory duty to consider climate change, and is required to produce a statutory climate change mitigation and energy strategy and a climate change adaptation strategy. The Mayor also has statutory powers to implement the majority of actions in both strategies particularly through the London Plan and the Transport Strategy (revised versions of both are currently being consulted on).

6.0 Diversity Implications

- 6.1 Climate change affects everyone and particularly those who are physically vulnerable – the elderly and the young – as they will be exposed to greater temperature extremes and potentially new or increased threats of disease.
- 6.2 Climate change is predicted to be felt most acutely in areas of the world where communities are less able to adapt. These areas include countries in sub-Saharan Africa, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, and Australia. A number of residents have strong ties with these nations.
- 6.3 The Council's climate change strategy for the borough places emphasis on mitigating climate change; adapting to changes that are predicted for the future; and responding to severe weather events.

7.0 Environmental Implications

- 7.1 The overall recommendation to reduce the Council's CO₂ emissions will have a positive effect on the environment. Reducing CO₂ emissions (one of the main green house gasses which contribute to global warming) will help mitigate the effect of climate change at both a local and global level. It is expected that the environment will benefit in the long term by the council taking this action.

Adapting to Climate Change will ensure that the council is prepared for the effects of predicted extreme weather events. By making the necessary preparations the council will ensure its key services and the borough's infrastructure are not compromised.

8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

8.1 There are no specific staff/accommodation implications.

Background Papers

Appendix 1 - Delivering London's energy future: The Mayors draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy Consultation – Comments

Appendix 2 - The draft climate change adaptation strategy for London Public Consultation Draft

Appendix 3 - London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Consultation on the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy

Executive Report: Carbon Management Strategy – Second Review, 19 October 2009

Executive Committee Report: Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme, 15 February 2010

Contact Officers

Jeff Bartley – Environmental Projects & Policy Manager
Email: Jeff.bartley@brent.gov.uk
Tel: 020 8937 5535

Emily Ashton – Environmental Projects & Policy Officer
Email: Emily.Ashton@brent.gov.uk
Tel: 020 8937 5326

Richard Saunders
Director of Environment and Culture

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1

Delivering London's energy future: The Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy for consultation with the London Assembly and functional bodies

The GLA group comprises the Greater London Authority and its four **functional bodies**:

Transport for London (TfL), The London Development Agency (LDA), the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) and the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) (to which the Metropolitan Police Service is accountable). The bodies of the group are diverse in their operations, size and in what they deliver.

General comments

- Will there be a programme of communication for the various initiatives and funding streams? It can be quite confusing what is exactly available. For the general public confusion is probably greater.

All comments

| Section | Summary | Comments |
|----------------|--|---|
| 1.Introduction | <p>GLA will leverage significant funding for low carbon programmes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Homes Energy Efficiency Programme (retrofit 1.2million London homes by 2015)• Building Energy Efficiency Programmes (public sector retrofit)• Low Carbon Zones• Decentralised Energy, including energy from waste (London Waste & Recycling Board LWaRB set up) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The spread of cities is discussed along with the need to plan decentralised energy (DE) for new developments but no consideration is given to planning the spread of the cities themselves i.e. not placing unnecessary constraints which result in further dense population of already overpopulated city areas.• Milder winters are discussed but no consideration of the extreme weather that will occur within this climate pattern. This will include extreme cold in some areas at discrete times and may further impact on the fuel poverty of low income families. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric vehicle roll out (10,000 electric vehicles in the capital) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning evaluation of DE is undertaken on the basis of number of applications. It would perhaps be more relevant to look at the total numbers granted. The two figures together would provide an indication of the acceptance of such measures and the existence of NIMBYism (not in my back yard) as a barrier to development. There should be measures in place to prevent the rejection of applications due to NIMBYism expressed in the consultation process without fully justifiable reasons. • Acronyms used are sometimes not defined, particularly in the executive summary. • Box 1.1 (and body of text) discusses the need to CO2 levels to peak by 2015. Suggest that it should be made clear that this does not mean an increase up to this time is acceptable. • The embodied carbon in transport of fuels is not taken into account. • Page 19. Sentence appears to break at end of page and be incomplete. |
| <p>2. London's CO2 emissions</p> | <p>2006 – London's CO2 emissions were 47.5 million tonnes (46% from workplaces)</p> <p>Target – 60% reduction by 2025 Interim targets: 22% by 2015, 38% by 2020</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear if this emissions table includes aviation although aviation is included in the broad term of transport in the text • Aviation is not considered in the transport measures being implemented and expansion of this industry serves to produce an increase in emissions. Suggest that decreases in aviation capacity should be considered and the cost to the consumer reviewed to |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>reflect true cost including environmental cost. Accepting that this is not an area that the Mayor can directly influence it would be acceptable to include lobbying of central government as with other issues discussed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suggest that the tube network should be promoted at pioneering electric transport – many people would not recognise this connection and the decrease in emissions associated• Energy from waste is discussed as a primary solution but no detail is provided. It is unclear from the strategy how the Energy strategy and Municipal Waste Management Strategy are to be aligned• Increases in population are cited as key contributor of increased emission but no mention is made of the increase associated with the increasing prevalence of single occupancy dwellings. This is also not considered in the latter part of the strategy that relates to planning. Single occupancy currently benefits from tax relief and this should potentially be the reverse situation to decrease consumption particularly in energy.• Outsourcing of the manufacturing industry to other countries is not considered. UK based companies are therefore able to ‘hide’ emissions by putting the energy intensive parts of their operations elsewhere resulting in no net loss of global emissions. It is difficult to determine how this could be effectively managed in the strategy but does imply that savings shown may not reflect the global picture.• Additional government measures – It is unclear why these are maintained as separate from measures already outlined |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>3. Making London one of the world's leading Low Carbon Capitals</p> | <p>3 top level policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support inward investment & create conditions to drive low carbon growth • Stimulate demand, supporting research and development and influence behaviour change • creating jobs and low carbon skills training opportunities <p>London Green Fund – will invest equity in projects (£8million LDA seed funding, aim to create £100m pot) JESSICA - £100m pot by 2011 for potential projects to bid for</p> <p>London & SE to be Low Carbon Economic Area</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 3.1 – Investment in transport seems to be disproportionate compared with potential GVA and jobs. This also seems disproportionate in respect of Figure 2.1 which indicates that transport (including aviation) is responsible for only approx 20% of emissions with buildings being responsible for the rest. This figure shows that investment in commercial buildings offers the greatest potential return and the greatest carbon savings and jobs thus boosting the economy. Transport could be considered at a relatively low cost through the planning system, making conditions for transport planning measures in new developments and renovations of existing buildings to expand use. It is unclear if this allocation is due to the funding availability for selected streams of work. If so, suggest that this should be made clear. • In order to trial some of the technologies, planning permission and monitoring of these schemes on a preferential basis would be desirable. This would allow the trials to take place with little investment required. • There is no information on how proposed green enterprise districts will be integrated and benefit the surrounding area. • Retrofitting is clearly going to be a large part of the work with regard to buildings. Is there potential to develop local policies to encourage such retrofitting, especially through the planning system? • Implementation of renewable and microgeneration of energy on a payback from savings basis would be preferable to a) encourage people to take up the initiative rather than seeing the cost as prohibitive and b) discouraging suppliers from installations where |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>energy generation is unfeasible or of minimum load value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent Council welcomes 'making London one of the world's leading Low carbon Capital's'. However if this is going to work, there will need to be a coordinated, well structured approach with appropriate communications. There should be an all encompassing London wide branding or accreditation scheme which ties the various support and funding streams together. This will enable easy recognition across London. Possible something like Croydon's ENVIBE scheme http://www.envibe.co.uk/ or Richmond's 'go green at work' http://www.richmond.gov.uk/gogreen/gg_work.htm • How does the Mayor plan to prioritise inward investment? There seems to be a lot for big businesses but little for SMEs. Should there be a two tiered approach? • There is significant pressure on public sector resources across London. Brent Council welcomes the investigation on how London can use joint procurement to stimulate demand for low carbon products and services. Brent council would like to see a study into the various structures of all London Boroughs procurements teams to establish methods pest practice cross boroughs. The Council is already part of the West London Alliance and would like to see this used for greener procurement. • Would like clarity on the Low Carbon Skills forum, is this for manual labour only or will it be all encompassing? • Would like some clarity on how the public and private sector are going to link and share ideas. Currently there is a lack of coordination and communication. |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>4. Securing a low carbon energy supply for London</p> | <p>The mayor aims to secure 25% of energy from DE by 2025 through the following programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Heatmap • DE exemplar projects – London Thames Gateway HN, Pimlico, Whitehall • DEMap • LWaRB • JESSICA & London Green Fund • Dedicated centre of expertise <p>Gas, biomass & waste-fed CHP expected to be main fuel source, supplemented by wind, heat pumps & solar</p> <p>Through the planning system, the Mayor will work with boroughs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify DE opportunities ▪ Develop energy masterplans ▪ Detailed LDF policies on renewables (in particular large-scale) ▪ All new development to reduce CO2, connect to DE where feasible, consider site-wide CHP. ▪ Mayor will produce SPG on | <p><u>Decentralised Energy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent welcomes the focus on low carbon energy supply and in particular Decentralised Energy, the 25% target by 2025 is considered useful in focussing efforts in this approach to carbon reduction. • Whilst it may be that the overall cost of CO2 abatement is lower for area-wide DE schemes compared with stand-alone CHP plants, the upfront costs and difficulties of starting up and implementing an area-wide scheme need to be recognised. • It is likely that the realistic catalyst for realising DE opportunities will be new development that can provide, to an extent the infrastructure needed. However, significant additional investment funding will be necessary to realise area-wide DE. The Mayor should agree to act with energy suppliers and Government principally in order to secure investment funding to bring forward and secure key decentralised networks at an early stage of the development process. • The GLA/LDA should also consider procuring ESCOs at a London-wide level to attract the best investment and de-risk local schemes. • The GLA/LDA should also provide support for small community level organisations seeking to reduce carbon emissions. Funding |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|-------------------|---|
| | <p>renewables</p> | <p>opportunities and grant mechanisms should be made clear.</p> <p><u>Energy from Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GLA should tie together its Waste Strategy and ‘Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy’ in terms of energy generation in a more lucid manner i.e. showing exactly how they overlap. • Developing markets for recycled waste should be promoted. • The costs of providing not just infrastructure for transferring energy should be made explicit in the documents and where developers/councils/RSLs can get funding. • The issue of land/locations to site Energy from Waste facilities is a problem and is not adequately addressed. Currently sites for waste tend to be in industrial areas which are not very accessible in terms of energy transfer to public buildings and residences. Equally there are problems associated with locating waste facilities closer to these land uses. It may be the question of scale of facilities that needs to be assessed. For example, the strategy needs to clarify whether small energy from waste facilities are best, or whether large facilities are better? Perhaps illustrate how a biodigester can be retrofitted to a housing estate? If this is feasible and viable. Behavior change of residents and users also needs to be addressed for these schemes to be successful. |
|--|-------------------|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Payback periods for DE should be calculated and monitored using realtime cost savings rather than savings based on historical costs. This would mean that the financial viability of proposals is not dependant on wholesale price of fuel.• Figure 4.7 – It is unclear if the projected increase in energy consumption is due to the increase in population or due to an increase in demand. Has behavioural change demand reduction as a result of smart metering and increased visibility of costs been accounted for?• Brent Council welcomes the London wide coordination of Decentralised Energy. However will there be funding support for LA in establishing an infrastructure? There needs to be a strong emphasis from the GLA on cross organisation working. Developers need to work with Local Authorities in establishing an infrastructure and should not expect that LA's will work alone.• There are 28 Energy Master planning opportunity areas and somebody will need to ensure adequate funding is available.• The Council would like further information on the early stage investment for decentralised energy in order to reduce risk?• In Denmark it is compulsory for all new builds to link up to a CHP system if one is available in the area. Can the London Plan suggest that this is required in London?• Brent Council welcomes the publication of a Technical Guide for district heating systems. There is significant confusion over decentralised energy. Having a technical guide will also make a stronger case to developers who can be negative towards CHP/CCHP as it is costly. |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent council would welcome a structure of how the Mayor's various 'green' strategies link together. • Brent Council welcomes a 'step pack' to decentralised energy opportunities. The Merton rule was pioneering and brought the need to green and sustainable energy to the political forefront, however there is a need to step back and look at low carbon technologies such as gas fired and in the future biomass CCHP/CHP and Ground Source Heat Pumps (GSHP). Micro renewable technology is not reliable enough. • Brent Council welcomes the dedicated centre of expertise for guidance and support on decentralised energy. • Brent Council would like to see detailed London Map outlining areas where NOx and PM10 levels are still low enough for biomass boilers to be installed. • Greater emphasis on CCHP and CHP rather than only referring to decentralised energy. • BREEAM is not mentioned (however is mentioned in the London Plan) |
| <p>5. London's homes: driving our energy future</p> | <p>Aims that all London homes be retrofitted with energy efficiency measures by 2030 and eradicate fuel poverty by 2030.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homes Energy Efficiency Programme (HEEP) • Mayor's Housing Strategy & | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent welcomes the emphasis on retrofit which is reflected with a new policy in the draft replacement London Plan. Boroughs are expected to identify opportunities to reduce CO2 from existing stock and develop detailed policies on retrofitting. This is supported but needs a realistic assessment and identification of the resources required for such action. In particular, if Local Authorities are to take a stronger role in wide-scale retrofit, |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>beyond Decent Homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Carbon Zones | <p>corresponding resources and skills will need to developed and committed to the strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has too strong an emphasis on housing and does not address flats. ESCO's will need to be established in delivering the Home Energy Efficiency Programme. • Broadly speaking the proposals set out in the consultation documents are welcomed. Having said that we support each of the actions outlined in the documents under policies 6&7, unless these are funded sufficiently there is a danger that expectations are being built up only to be let down. • A general concern is that in a period when we know that public sector funding is going to be cut post the election, all three major parties have announced this to varying degree, the expectations that councils will be able to match fund the measures outlined in the consultation is going to place a real burden upon us, and may not be realistic. • Unless we prioritise this as an area, we are likely to miss out on the funding, case in point is the work we did with Planning/Environment on Low Carbon Zones bid, and I led on the CESP which have both not achieved any additional funding. • Another other concern is the proposal to deliver retrofitting through the Mayor's housing strategy. The final version of the Housing strategy only came out this week, and there has been insufficient time to digest it thoroughly. It is unclear whether there is a proposal to leverage additional funding into the delivery of mitigation proposals. If this is not the case then there will be concerns over the re-direction of the funding from building homes, |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>and this needs to be considered in detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also, how is the provision of energy advice going to be delivered ensuring that plethora of advice already available is not being duplicated or the recipients are the same? Will the Mayor being the strategic co-ordinator? |
| <p>6. Cutting costs and carbon in London's workplaces</p> | <p>Aim to make London's workplaces the most energy efficient in the world</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings Energy Efficiency Programme (public sector buildings) • Better Buildings Partnership • Green500 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to commercial buildings (the largest energy consumer) the suggested actions are primarily on a policy and penalty basis, educating businesses so that they know which measures to put in place. The onus here is on the businesses themselves to pay for capital investment in the technologies. In the current economic climate, resources may be scarce upfront in this way and may reduce the uptake of such investment • Audits of buildings are suggested as support to businesses. Heating and lighting are already known to be the largest contributors to consumption. Suggest that standard guidance of suggested measures may reach wider audience (with the potential savings shown for each) and then it would just need auditors to look at a) feasibility and b) other measures. This would allow businesses to implement for themselves also. • BEEP ESCOs are stated to be involved in installation. Where is the funding responsibility for such installation? • The Council strongly recommends that BEEP funding is applied for to retrofit existing stock. Adequate resources in terms of staff time are required to ensure the programme is delivered. • Energy Efficiency support for SME's in London – Clarity on whether LA's are expected to deliver this? |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly agree with the mechanisms in place to cut carbon in London's work places however as stated in Chapter 3 an accreditation would be useful. |
| 7. Building towards a zero carbon London | <p>Aim that by 2025 all new buildings be built to the highest energy efficiency standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft replacement London Plan • Mayor's Housing Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mayor's policy for new development reflects the Government's statement on the reduction of CO2 emissions from new development. All new residential development is to be zero carbon from 2016 and all new non-domestic development is to be zero carbon from 2019. • The Mayor's energy policies are set out in the draft replacement London Plan which sets targets to minimise carbon dioxide emissions from major developments and all new major residential developments and non-domestic buildings will have to be zero carbon after 2016 and 2019, respectively. The council welcomes a clearer approach to non-residential buildings and energy targets than has been the case hitherto. • The Mayor's change in emphasis from renewables to greater flexibility on tackling climate change is welcomed. At times a tension has formed between meeting the Mayor's energy hierarchy (be lean, be clean, be green) and the 20% onsite renewables requirement. Brent supports an approach which seeks the greatest overall CO2 reduction. • With new development, the opportunity to reduce energy demand should not be under emphasised. The Mayor should seek to drive |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>down carbon emissions through sustainable design and construction and in particular promoting the highest standards of energy efficiency such as the PassivHaus standard. In light of the substantial costs in establishing Decentralised Energy the opportunity to also make CO2 emission reductions through energy efficiency measures should not be overlooked. The council would welcome further guidance from the GLA on maximising energy efficiency in new development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Mayor's proposals to produce 'low carbon cooling guide' is welcomed and demonstrates an integrated approach to the mitigation and adaptations strategies.• BREEAM is not mentioned (however is mentioned in the London Plan)• Funding for commercial projects through LCBP Phase 2 & CSEP is not mentioned in the funding stream.• Improvement to Approved Document L2A (new commercial buildings) L2B (existing commercial building) |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>8. Moving towards zero emission transport in London</p> | <p>By 2025, increase access to low carbon transport options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce need to travel, switch to public transport • Low emission vehicles & use of sustainable biofuels • Cycle Superhighways & 66,000 secure bike parking spaces • 100,000 electric vehicles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mayor’s strategy to promote public transport should include proposals to improve orbital public transport in outer London: in particular to better link town centres orbitally, and should be backed by appropriate funding. • The Mayor should consider further financial incentives to promote the use of public transport. • Council welcomes the £230 million to incentivise electric & hybrid cars. • The first tranche of policies in the Chapter 8 appears well aligned with the draft Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS), which was reported to Brent's Executive Committee in January 2010 in a report that encompassed the (draft) London Plan. • The Council welcomes Policies 10, 11 and 12 which emphasise a broad and overarching aim of minimising CO2 emissions which is anticipated to be delivered via a long-term shift towards the more efficient modes of transport, more efficient operation of transport and through the use of emerging technologies such as low(er) carbon vehicles, by embracing 21st Century technologies and cleaner fuels. • The document states that this will be achieved through existing GLA/TfL programmes, namely ‘<i>Creating a Cycling Revolution</i>’, ‘<i>Making Walking Count</i>’ and ‘<i>Encouraging the uptake of less polluting vehicles</i>’. • Brent Council is in broad agreement with this approach - mindful |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>of the economic downturn and the constraints on funding to launch new programmes and initiatives until economic conditions improve. Brent supports the “Policy to Action” strands which outline how these programmes will be delivered. These correlate and cross-reference well with the material that appears in the (draft) MTS document, reported to the Council’s Executive Committee, 18th January 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent Council suggests it is well placed to respond/facilitate delivery on these initiatives. Although beyond the direct control of the Council, Brent very much welcomes the fact that all new buses introduced to London’s bus fleet will be hybrid vehicles, by 2012. • As stated in the Strategy – the Council recognises that transport accounts for 21% of London’s total CO2 emissions. Of this portion, cars and motorcycles account for just less than half, or around 10% of London’s total CO2 emissions. Brent has a policy whereby it does not actively promote the use of motorcycles (predominantly due to the over representation of people killed and seriously injured on Brent’s roads using a ‘Powered-two-wheeler’). • The Council also manages the delivery of a package of measures aimed at reducing car dependency, such as officers dedicated to working with schools and workplaces across the borough and helping them develop robust and deliverable sustainable travel plans. Brent is a strong advocate of car clubs and car sharing, demonstrating that it is not “anti-car”, but also supporting initiatives that ‘reduce the need to travel’, whilst perhaps mitigating the need for a household to own and use a second, third or even fourth, private vehicle. It is suggested that increased |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>levels of investment and support at a TfL/GLA and Central Government level are sought, for such initiatives, between now and 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Officers note that road freight accounts for a further 21% of the motor-borne proportion of London's CO2 emissions, illustrated in this document. Some parts of Brent do experience higher levels of freight movements/heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) than other parts. Particularly, Harlesden and Wembley, both of which sit upon part of London's 'Strategic Road Network'. The negative impact of freight on the roads is further compounded by the fact that 40% of Europe's largest industrial/business Park – Park Royal – lies within Brent's jurisdiction. The Council is represented and actively involved with the "West London Freight Quality Partnership", and has lobbied/campaigned hard via the GLA/TfL for better public transport in this part of the Borough over the years - with the overarching aim being to facilitate lower private car use and reduce congestion - but with limited success.• This results in HGV's adding to the general congestion within and around the Park Royal region as they attempt to access and leave the area. Morning and evening peak congestion is significant due to the significant level of private-car use associated with the thousands of people who work in this location. Add to that the fact it presents something of a strategic 'rat run' from the North Circular (A406) to Western Avenue (the A40), both TfL managed strategic roads (urban motorways) and it comes as little surprise that the A406 presents huge blight on the borough and leads to failure to meet air quality target as part of the Council's Air Quality |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Management Action Plan, particularly during humid/hot parts of the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finally, in town centre locations, HGVs and smaller ‘white van’ type vehicles can actually compound localised congestion and pollution due to a lack of space for formalised loading/unloading bays or suitable rear servicing provision. This leads to freight vehicles parking outside retail premises in the daytime and congesting the highway. In Brent, this regularly happens in locations such as Harlesden that have a majority of independent retailers, often lacking in logistical planning/guidance from head offices. • Brent Council suggests that the document could afford consideration on the effects of HGV’s loading/unloading, and the effect this can have on traffic flow, congestion and associated localised pollution/CO2 emissions. With this in mind, the Council welcomes the comments regarding the need for a more efficient use of rail or water for freight purposes, as opposed to the highways network. However, it is also noted that “End note XI” states “Eighty-nine per cent of freight is lifted by road <u>and is likely to remain so</u>, due to fragmentation of supply chains, for example ‘just-in-time’, internet shopping and door-to-door delivery”, which does not foster a great deal of confidence in the text which appears earlier in this section. • Brent Council welcomes and supports the principle of Electric Vehicles and the need to expand the supporting infrastructure in anticipation of consumer take-up of these vehicles, which is widely anticipated from 2011 onwards. We do not have any significant concerns or questions relating to the aspirations or principles |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>presented on this matter in the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Council acknowledges that the technology is proven to have a significantly reduced 'Well to Wheel' carbon footprint/CO2 emissions than traditional fuels - such as petrol and diesel - and is the most appropriate of the 'emerging technologies' to embrace and support on a larger scale, both in London and beyond.• The Council is actively involved on the TfL/London Council's "Electric Vehicle Core Delivery Group", which is assisting in the development/delivery of electric vehicle charging infrastructure across London. Indeed, the Council was one of the first to install a 'kerb-side' charging point in the Borough, number of years ago. Looking forward, Brent has identified funding for three new (trial) publically available Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) in the borough, for 2010-2011.• It has been broadly acknowledged by the GLA/TfL that there is lack of public confidence and information about the increasing product range of electric vehicles that are becoming available to the consumer. Issues of particular note are the more technical aspects of these vehicles such as charging abilities and supporting infrastructure, and more pertinently, the range of these vehicles. Such issues are perhaps more easily and successfully overcome through marketing campaigns at a central/London Government level as opposed to a local authority level.• Brent Council also supports the general consensus held by the GLA that there is a need to encourage (Central) Government to take active steps towards ensuring a standard towards electric charging infrastructure, in order to ensure access to, and interoperability |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>between, charging points across the UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reducing the need to travel is quoted in Policy 10 although it is not clear how this will be achieved or even if the strategy would have any influence• Figure 8.2 – suggest that car and motorcycle emissions should be split as car makes up 37% of journey whilst bike only makes up 2%• There is no distinguishment between single and multiple occupancy car use• There is no consideration of aviation• Table 8.1 - No penalties for negative travel choices are defined or incentives for positive ones. The cost of car travel in the capital (excluding congestion charging) is roughly equivalent to public transport. With planned refurbishment, the cost of public transport is likely to rise resulting in a disproportionate financial cost to the environmental one <p>Section 10 – suggest more frequent monitoring may be required. This could serve as a publicity tool to encourage take up of initiatives</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Setting an example through the GLA group | <p>The GLA group will take the lead on reducing CO2 emissions. It will set an example for the rest of London’s public sector, with energy efficient buildings, using low carbon transport options, and stimulating demand for low carbon products and services through its purchasing decisions.</p> | |
|---|--|--|

Appendix 2

The Mayor's draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for London, for public consultation.

Brent Council comments:

General comments

The Council, in general, welcomes the main direction of the strategy and supports, in principle, the roadmap and the actions overall.

All comments

| Section | Summary | Comments |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 1.Executive Summary | - | Action 13 (p.10) is not separated from Action 12. |
| 2.Introduction | Some climate change is now inevitable and there is increasing evidence that it is already happening. With early, sustained and concerted global action to reduce our greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions we can limit the changes both to our climate, and to the natural systems that maintain our climate. Failure to significantly reduce our emissions may fundamentally alter the Earth's climate system and commit future generations to more dangerous changes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Action 7 – consultation with TfL should include use of sustainable building materials to increase levels of permeable ground in addition to gully cleaning and maintenance• In addition to demand balance, leakage from water network should also be considered. Milder winters are discussed but no consideration of the extreme weather that will occur within this climate pattern such as extreme cold. The level of damage to water pipes is greatly increased in such extremes.• Action 21 – Cooling is not a key consideration in the climate change and energy strategy. An increase in focus here would help to tie the two documents together (As with Decentralised Energy). The need for further integration is increased as many of the adaptation measures identified are energy intensive• 'Cool roof technology' should be considered in association with microgeneration i.e, Photovoltaics (PV) |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TfL asset assessment is included but not full consideration of roads and personal transport. The potential impact on agriculture will also further increase the levels of transport to and from the area. • A full risk assessment of buildings or areas would suggest the need for altered building standards (and minimum criteria) depending on the level of risk identified. This could potentially be implemented through the planning system and insurance replacements. |
| 3. London's future climate | Temperatures are projected to rise all over the UK, but most of all in the south and more so in summer than in winter. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colour of baseline in figs 1.7 and 1.8 is not accurate. • Figure 1.8: the colour difference between 2050s and 2080s is too slight. |
| 4. Mapping adaptation – who is responsible for what, and where are the gaps? | There is no steady state of being 'adapted' (because the climate, and hence the risk, will keep changing), therefore adaptation should be seen as a 'journey' rather than a 'destination'. This chapter, using the 'Prevent, Prepare, Respond, Recover' series of actions, 'maps' out who is responsible for enabling adaptation. It also highlights where there are critical gaps and signposts the relevant actions in the strategy. | |
| 5. Flooding | <p>London is prone to flooding from five sources of floodwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • from the sea (tidal flooding) • from the Thames and tributaries to the Thames (fluvial flooding) • from heavy rainfall overcoming the drainage system (surface water flooding) • from the sewers (sewer flooding) • from rising groundwater (groundwater flooding). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewer data from Thames Water is not shared very well - better partnership working between Utilities and LAs would assist. • Action 1 Brent Council welcomes the opportunity to work with the Mayor and the Environment Agency to map and predict flood risk. • Actions 2,3,4 Brent Council will contribute to the Drain London Forum with exchange of information. • Action 7 Brent Council will look to follow best practice with regard to gully and highway drain maintenance. • Background: Brent does not suffer the direct results of tidal flooding. It |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>does have areas and properties which suffer fluvial, surface water and sewer flooding and combinations thereof. Fluvial flooding includes the significant risk of overflow of the River Brent and Wealdstone Brook. Surface water flooding (heavy rainfall overcoming the drainage system) manifests itself from surface water run-off from impervious and saturated ground, and insufficient capacity of the surface water drainage system. Foul sewer surcharge occurs due to ingress of storm water into the foul network, and the ability of foul and surface waters to mix in the older parts of the sewerage network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People: At third paragraph, there appears to be a typo; “figure 3.5” should read “figure 3.1”. • Page 44 It is likely to be the case that Brent’s residents would value a ‘bad weather’ (i.e. heavy rainfall) alert rather than a flood warning. Brent property is unlikely to suffer tidal or fluvial flooding, but residents who have experienced actual or risk of surface water flooding may wish to take protective action. • Page 50, 51: Tributaries to the Thames: Brent welcomes the opportunity to discuss the TCFMP with the Environment Agency, and indeed has appreciated previous meetings with EA officers. The Council is shortly to report on year 2 of NI 189. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SRFA) document was published in December 2007. • Storm Drainage and Surface Water Flooding: It is acknowledged that much maintenance work is required to ensure drains and gullies are free flowing. Brent supports the proposal to consider fluvial and surface water management together, and to maximise on site permeability and/or storage. Recent changes to Brent’s policies will seek to control the hard paving of front gardens, and the provision of car parking spaces. • Page 52: Emergency Planning and Response: Brent’s emergency |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Planning team has taken the lead in working with the Emergency Services and producing the Flood Recovery Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council welcomes the GLA's proposals to improve mapping of flood risk from all sources, this commitment should be matched by the relevant resources to achieve this objective. • Part II, Action 7 – Gully maintenance only is considered for review. No consideration is given to the capacity of the drainage network to cope with the dramatic increases in population and potential increases in rainfall. • Monitoring of insurance claims as a result of natural events may be a valuable indicator of the extent of climate change, and the impact on the economy and infrastructure in the UK. Currently flood risk are cited as included in standard insurance but this standard may change in light of increasing claims resulting in further exclusions and higher vulnerability in addition to those homes without such insurance that have already been identified • Table 3.3 – Suggest that measures should be implemented for emergency services as a priority to allow response to situation • It is not clear if 'maintain the existing defences' for flood will include provisions such as the prevention or limiting of building on flood plains |
| <p>6. Drought</p> | <p>Droughts can be short and sharp, as experienced in the hot summer of 2003, or prolonged, such as the two dry winters experienced in 2004/05 and 2005/06. However, the way water is managed can affect the way a drought impacts upon us and on the environment. If demands for water are high, a lack of water supplies increases the likelihood and frequency of drought management measures, such as water</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground water recharge relies on porous surfaces - how much of London is permeable? • The Mayor's proposed water efficiency standard of 105 l/p/d in all new homes is welcomed; this is in line with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3&4. As the strategy recognises, non-domestic water use accounts for almost one third of water consumption, water efficiency measures in these uses should also be promoted. • The Mayor's draft Water Strategy proposal that all new major development to make use of reclaimed water should recognise the space |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>restrictions. The large population in southeast England, combined with the relatively low level of rainfall means that the amount of water available per person is strikingly low in comparison to many hotter, drier countries.</p> | <p>required to collect and store rainwater. Roof level collection and storage should be promoted where feasible, avoiding the need for additional pumping of reclaimed water supply.</p> |
| <p>7. Overheating</p> | <p>‘Overheating’ is a term used in this strategy to describe when temperatures rise to a point where they affect the health and comfort of Londoners. High temperatures also have an impact on London’s infrastructure, buckling railway lines, melting road surfaces, making travel in the capital uncomfortable and increasing water usage and energy demand for cooling. London’s summers are still mild enough for any significant health impacts due to high temperatures to be linked to uncommon, extremely hot weather events such as heatwaves. Summers are, however, already getting warmer in London. Nights are also getting hotter at a rate above the average rate of warming.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of air pollution? • No mention of Black tarmac use which may contribute to the heat • Trees provide shade but need to be managed and drought tolerant - are these exclusive? • There is a lot of information on the need for air conditioning on buses, trains and the tube, something Brent agrees with across the modes, if public transport is ever going to become as truly appealing/attractive to people as owning a private car is. Newer rolling stock operating on the Chiltern Trains operated route (Sudbury and Harrow Rd - Wembley Stadium - Marylebone, and London Overground Rail routes (e.g. the North Orbital Railway) does have rolling stock with air conditioning operating, which is welcome, and makes a notable difference to the experience of public transport, particularly from during the Summer. • The Mayor’s focus on improving understanding of the risk of overheating and identifying priority areas is welcome. • Opportunities to increase green space coverage are likely to be limited and additional measures useful in reducing the risk of overheating, such as green roofs should be promoted. The target of 100,000m2 of new green roofs by 2012 will aid in this, however, a bolder requirement such as all new public buildings to include green roofs would contribute towards the vision of London as one of the greenest cities in the world. • The addition of a ‘cooling hierarchy’ to draft replacement London Plan is welcomed and provides a practical framework for assessing approaches to reduce overheating in new development. Further design guidance |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>specific to London on reducing overheating will be welcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retrofitting measures to reduce overheating in existing buildings needs to be investigated and promoted. The current strategy provides insufficient detail on what measures should be taken. • Emphasis should be put on protecting existing trees and green spaces to reduce the risk of overheating. |
| 8. Health | <p>The impact of climate change on the health of Londoners is a complex issue, and the benefits for, or threats to health may be direct, or indirect. Managing these impacts is therefore the responsibility of a wide range of agencies, both within the health sector, and beyond. Climate change will affect the quality of life of all Londoners, but there are dramatic inequalities in the health of Londoners and climate change is likely to increase these inequalities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing numbers of pests are likely to put increased pressure on health service |
| 9. Environment | <p>London's green spaces (private gardens, public parks, wild spaces, urban forest, river and transport corridors) perform a range of functions known as 'ecosystem services' that improve the quality of life in London. These ecosystem services are essential to the wellbeing of Londoners and London's resilience to climate change. Improving the quality, quantity, connectivity and diversity of London's green spaces will increase their resilience and therefore increase the capacity of London and London's biodiversity to adapt to a changing climate.</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| 10. Economy | London's position as one of the world's foremost cities exposes it to the impact of climate change beyond its boundaries – both nationally and internationally. | |
| 11. Infrastructure | This chapter looks at the impact of climate change on London's infrastructure – transport, energy and waste. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst Brent lobbies and campaigns for improvements to surface level railways/underground and bus services, the type of vehicles used by the operators are beyond the control of the Council which - unlike County Councils - does not tender contracts or enter into negotiations/agreements on aspects such as types of vehicles/service levels with bus or train operators. • Increases in soil drying as a result of temp increase and rainfall decrease will create potential weakening and damage to infrastructure including roads and buildings. |

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 3

London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee

Consultation on the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy

Item 12
No:

Report by: Jared Boow **Job title:** Environment Policy and Project Manager
Date: 18 March 2010
Contact Officer: Jared Boow
Telephone: 020 7934 9951 **Email:** jared.boow@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report informs Members of the consultation on the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy. The report sets out a proposed response to the Mayor's consultation.

Recommendations: Members are recommended to:

- Note the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy.
- Agree the attached response to the Mayor's consultation, outlined in Appendix 1 of this report.

Background

1. Under the changes introduced by the Greater London Authority Act 2007, the Mayor now has a statutory duty to consider climate change, and is required to produce a statutory climate change mitigation and energy strategy and a climate change adaptation strategy.
2. The Mayor released his draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy 'Delivering London's Energy Future' on 9 February 2010, for consultation with the London Assembly and his functional bodies. The Mayor has also welcomed comments from other organisations as part of this consultation, which closes on 1 April 2010.

Climate change strategy context - UK and London

3. The UK Government Climate Change Act 2008 introduced a carbon dioxide reduction target of 80% by 2050 on 1990 baseline levels. An interim target of 34% by 2020 has been set and Government must also set five yearly carbon budgets and report progress to the independent Climate Change Committee.
4. The previous Mayor of London introduced a target of a 60% reduction in CO₂ by 2025 in his Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) published in February 2007. The current Mayor has subsequently adopted this same target, and begun to implement many of the programmes outlined in the CCAP. This draft climate change mitigation and energy strategy therefore aligns the programmes stemming from the CCAP and the raft of other Mayoral strategies recently reviewed or released for the first time and attempts to provide a coherent strategy for delivering CO₂ reduction targets As well as energy policy for London.

Outline of the draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy

5. The draft Strategy outlines the Mayor's plans regarding how London can achieve a 60% reduction in CO₂ emissions on 1990 levels by 2025 - both through his and his functional bodies' actions and through actions of partners, including central and local government, business and other organizations. Many of the programmes and actions will be already known to Members, such as the 'Homes Energy Efficiency Programme ('HEEP'), the Decentralised Energy Project (DeMAP), and the Mayor's electric vehicle initiatives.
6. The Strategy is structured into ten chapters, outlining the context for targets before chapters on how these targets will be achieved. The targets covers supporting a low carbon economy, changing London's energy infrastructure, improving London's energy efficiency in homes and workplaces, and de-carbonizing London's transport systems.

Summary of London Councils' proposed response

7. The draft Strategy has very few new issues of concern for boroughs other than the overall challenge itself of meeting large carbon reduction targets. Much of this is due to the fact that there is relative cross-party consensus on setting challenging carbon reduction targets which require 'across-the-board' action, but more importantly, that many of the proposals, policies and programmes contained in the draft Strategy are already in train and boroughs are already working in partnership across many of the programmes outlined.
8. A significant omission from the draft strategy is a clear indication of the financial implications of the proposals within the strategy. The strategy needs £60 billion for its delivery. Our response asks the Mayor to set out in a coherent way where he expects this funding to come from not least so that this significant market opportunity can be more easily identified and realised.
9. There is clearly an expectation by the Mayor that London boroughs are critical to the successful implementation of this Strategy and to meeting his proposed CO₂ reduction targets. The boroughs are therefore recognised throughout the strategy as significant partners to work with on a variety of initiatives.
10. There are some specific instances where it would be beneficial to provide more detail on the type of commitment some policies require of the boroughs, but the policies themselves appear

generally acceptable. There are also issues around the way the strategy has been written, how it is structured, and whether certain points should be clarified, modified, be left to other strategies, or removed altogether. Specific points relating to this can be found in the proposed London Councils response in Appendix 1.

Recommendations

11. Members are recommended to:

- Note the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy '*Delivering London's Energy Future*'.
- Agree the attached response to the Mayor's consultation, outlined in Appendix 1 of this report.

Financial Implications

12. There are no significant financial implications for London Councils from this report.

Legal Implications

13. There are no significant legal implications for London Councils from this report.

Equalities Implications

14. There are no significant equalities implications for London Councils from this report.

Appendices

15. **Appendix 1:** Proposed London Councils response to the consultation on the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy Consultation Post Point 19A FREEPOST LON15799 City Hall The Queen's Walk London SE1 2BR | Contact: Direct Line: Fax: Email: | Jared Boow 020 7934 9951 020 7934 9950 jared.boow@londoncouncils.gov.uk |
| | Our Reference: | Response to the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy consultation (Assembly draft). |
| | Your Reference: Date: | 18 March 2010 |

Dear Sir / Madam,

Re London Councils' response to the consultation on the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy.

London Councils represents all 32 London boroughs, the City of London, the Metropolitan Policy Authority and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. We are committed to fighting for fair resources for London and getting the best possible deal for London's 33 councils. We lobby on our members' behalf, develop policy and do all we can to help boroughs improve the services they offer. We also run a range of services ourselves which are designed to make life better for Londoners.

Please find attached London Councils' comments on the consultation for the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy.

Yours faithfully,

Faraz Baber
Programme Director, World City
London Councils

Summary overview

1. London Councils welcomes the Assembly draft of the Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy. Overall, we support the general direction, scope and policies contained within the draft – much of which contains the detail of existing programmes, commitments and actions that boroughs are already working with the Mayor on. Whilst many of the policies are dependent on a wide range of actions from multiple stakeholders, we also recognise that the Mayor's powers and resources are only able to achieve so much. The draft Strategy has recognised this and made clear the Mayor's intentions to lead, lobby and encourage where he is unable to directly make changes through his own powers and responsibilities. The majority of comments below are therefore related to specific minor points, clarifications, and 'structural' issues, rather than significant issues with policy or direction within the Strategy.

A Financial Implications or Market Opportunity Chapter

2. Right from the Executive Summary and through much of the strategy document, the text continually makes reference to the financing of policies and actions included in the strategy. Invariably much of the costs are quoted in £billions. There is reference to a global low carbon market that could be worth in excess of £370 billion per year by 2030; £17 billion worth of investment required by the Mayor to deliver his share of actions towards London's 60% target out of a total investment requirement of £60 billion; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) estimates of \$155 billion worth of investment in alternative energy sectors in 2008 alone amongst others.
3. Whilst all this information is embedded in the document, what is not clearly drawn out is how this represents an unprecedented market opportunity. It is clear that the financing required to deliver this strategy will not come from the public sector. The intrinsic 'payback' over whatever period means this must be an attractive proposition to the markets on a variety of levels. The strategy therefore needs to be more explicit in drawing out upfront, in a chapter on 'the market opportunity' what these opportunities are for the investment community. This chapter should also signpost the market to sections within the strategy where tested investment and delivery models have been referenced inviting investors to consider the implications for scaled up delivery.

Mayor's Foreword

4. The Mayor states that he will "*be pressing the organisations that work most closely with City Hall to commit to tough carbon reduction targets, and have signed City Hall up to cut its own emissions by 10 per cent this year*". Many of the boroughs have signed up to significant emissions reductions through LAAs, but these are across their whole range of activities, rather than just in a headquarters building. Any sign up to such a target would have to be done extremely cautiously, as boroughs will struggle to meet lower targets over the three year LAA period, let alone 10% in a single year, due to their wide roles and activities.

Executive Summary:

5. The statement "*...dominance of the internal combustion engine is over. Think of the vast lake of fuel consumed over the life of a car. Compare that to the pleasure of being able to drive with absolutely no pollution coming out the back of the vehicle – and cheaper running costs as well.*" is both inaccurate and superfluous - the internal combustion engine is still completely dominant

as a model for individual vehicle transport, with electric and alternative fuel vehicles still making up a microscopic percentage of vehicles on the road - now, and even by the Mayor's 60% carbon reduction date of 2025. The reference to 'the pleasure of being able to drive...' etc. added to this make the Strategy suddenly sound like an information brochure selling something, rather than a Mayoral Strategy and does not add anything, particularly as the statement is completely inaccurate (the statement on energy security on page 19 bares this out).

6. The language within the Executive Summary alternates between formal policy language to very casual conversational statements. This is also the case for the rest of the document - the chapters are not consistent in terms of how they are presented, and therefore can often be difficult to follow, giving the impression that chapters were drafted by different authors and not checked for overall consistency. The final draft therefore needs to be more consistent and professional in how it is finally drafted and presented. More specific detail is suggested later where necessary but examples here include:
 - *"We have four times the number of combined heat and power planning applications coming through than we did just a few years ago";*
 - There are several references to 'we' where it is unclear who 'we' represents;
 - Many sentences starting with 'But', that are neither enlightening nor useful for the purposes of the Strategy.
7. There are a few terms used in the Executive Summary that could be properly explained as they presume the reader is familiar with them. Examples include: 'carbon benefits'; 'economic value creation', and 'GVA'.
8. The Mayor makes reference to 'our programmes' such as the 'HEEP' and Decentralised Energy Project, when in fact these are partnership programmes between the Mayor, his agencies, the boroughs, and other partners. There is more detail provided on this fact in subsequent chapters, but we regard it important to emphasise those projects involving significant input from other partners to be clearly recognised as such across the Strategy and in wider communications, not simply as Mayoral programmes.

Chapter 1:

9. Figures 1.2 and 1.3 need to be reproduced as they are currently illegible.

Chapter 3:

10. Page 38: We agree with the statement: *"The low carbon opportunity affects the entire economy, not just the environmental and clean technology sectors. Creating a low carbon economy will require the existing economy to continue to operate and grow whilst reducing the carbon intensity of the activity that drives it"*. However, the draft London Plan does not currently recognise this explicitly, with little reference given to the need to decarbonise all sectors of the economy. The Mayor must ensure all his policies across his strategies are linked together consistently.
11. Page 40: The Mayor states that that London will need to position itself at the forefront in the priority sectors identified by the Government where the UK can take a global lead, i.e. nuclear. What does he envisage London's role should be regarding nuclear power and technology, given that he has not given a clear steer on this previously?

12. Page 41: Under the bullet point Scale – the last line should say ‘...facilities *and* (not or) a decentralised...’ as both are required.
13. Page 43: There is reference to ‘threats’ and ‘barriers’ with a ‘barrier’ being ‘competition from other cities’. Is this really a ‘barrier’ to meeting our carbon reduction obligations? or a ‘threat’ in terms of the amount of economic gain London can make from low carbon transition? It appears to be the latter, so reference to this as a barrier seems incorrect.
14. The layout of policy tables from this chapter (page 45) onwards is slightly confusing and needs to be refined for the public consultation draft. The ‘policy’ is signposted first before the ‘vision’ which seems to be in reverse of what should happen - i.e. you identify the issue, create an objective/vision, and then formulate policy to meet the objective/vision. This is further confused after the policy tables by sections headed ‘overall aim’ - how is this aim different from the ‘vision’ or ‘policy’? The way in which this format is developed and presented across all the chapters therefore need to be better presented and streamlined. The ‘overall aim’ sections appear superfluous and should therefore be removed or combined with the ‘vision’ to create the overall objective for each chapter.
15. Page 46: The Mayor states that he “*will seek designation (for London) as a Low Carbon Economic Area*”. It is not clear what this is and it would therefore be helpful if this was defined in the text.
16. Page 49: reference is made to “*The London Green Fund will operate as a revolving fund...*” could this be explained in more detail, as many of the readers of a strategy such as this will not be ‘finance jargon’ literate and may not understand what a ‘revolving fund’ is.
17. Page 50 (and pages 63 and 73): ‘*The £100 million JESSICA holding fund will be launched this year, made up of £50 million from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and £50 million match funding from the LDA and LWARB.*’ This statement does not sufficiently explain JESSICA and the use of LWARB’s money. It assumes most readers are familiar with the concept and mechanisms as subsequent references in Chapter 4 do not make things any clearer. The strategy should explain exactly how LWARB’s funds are being used and what the benefits of JESSICA are in this context as many uninformed stakeholders would be curious to know.
18. Under Policy 2: “Deploying London’s influence, capacity and resources to drive demand for low carbon growth” the Mayor refers to working “with partners from all sectors to investigate further how London can use joint procurement to stimulate demand for low carbon products and services, including consideration of the GLA group’s own procurement.” The boroughs will need to consider how, through the likes of Capital Ambition’s ‘London Procurement Strategy’, the boroughs can work more closely with the Mayor, TfL and the LDA on procurement in the low carbon sector. We support the idea of working with the Mayor to ensure improvements in procurement not only capture financial savings but also fit with the low carbon economy agenda. This will be important in helping to stimulate demand to assist development of new markets for innovative low carbon technologies.
19. Page 55: reference to working with communities to understand barriers should also include reference to local government being a key partner in this.

Chapter 4:

20. Again the format of this chapter is different from that of the previous chapter. There are no 'issues' and 'barriers' sections. The format of each chapter should remain the same as it makes the Strategy much more coherent as a plan for achieving the 60% target (and from a practical standpoint, more readable).
21. We agree with the policies and proposals to develop decentralised energy networks across London, including lobbying the government for changes to regulation for statutory undertakers and improved incentives for developing heat network infrastructure.
22. A minor point would be change the format of the information boxes to make them discernibly different from the more important policy boxes, as they currently look very similar.
23. Page 65 – '*High efficiency gas, biomass or waste fed combined heat and power systems...*'. Where is the biomass referred to here coming from? References to biomass typically mean waste wood or wood pellets. How does this relate to the Mayor's waste minimisation policies? We note that the implications for air quality are dealt with in Box 4.5
24. Page 68: Under '*Utilising London's zero carbon energy resources*' – we suggest you delete the three words 'such as gasification' as there is no discernible benefit in flagging this specific technology option here.
25. Page 87: The strategy refers to a catalogue of commercially operating advanced waste facilities and a report outlining the opportunities for London being prepared by the Mayor. This was not included in the Mayor's draft municipal waste management strategy consultation. It is important that any such catalogue does not present a list of technologies in isolation of an analysis of what works in London, its financial viability compared with other established options, as well as its viability at the required scale.

Chapter 5:

26. This chapter (and subsequent ones) raises similar issues with regards to the lack of consistency with the layout and format between the chapters.
27. The Home Energy Efficiency Programme (HEEP) needs to be explained more fully so that consultees who have not been part of the development or implementation of the programme can understand what it is. Pages 102 – 106 outline the various aspects of HEEP. However, it will not be clear to lay people that all of these paragraphs essentially set out the components of the scheme. Making the details of the scheme, including its funding, clearer is absolutely essential for the public consultation draft.
28. Page 105: states the Mayor will "*Work with London boroughs to offer reduced parking rates to HEEP assessors and installers or ease parking permit administrative burdens*". London Councils will be keen to support and facilitate this process. However, it is for individual boroughs to determine the most appropriate parking policies for their areas and our support for the delivery of this policy objective will be within that context.
29. Page 106: states "*Twenty nine applications for funding support were received and the standard of the proposals was excellent...*" This sort of conversational phrasing seems out of place and unnecessary.

30. Page 97: 'Boiler Scrappage Scheme' – Just referencing this scheme is the strategy is not sufficient. It is assumed that the Mayor supports this scheme. However, £400 is not enough to replace a G-rated boiler. Is the Mayor proposing to supplement this grant through other schemes to ensure uptake in London? Will the Mayor be lobbying government to increase its offer under this scheme? Given that this scheme is only projected to meet about 4% of the need nationally, how will the Mayor's strategy ensure that London does not lose out? The Mayor's strategy needs to set out how it will take advantage of these national schemes to improve their penetration in London.
31. Page 98 sets out the fact that 'Landlords have little incentive to improve the energy efficiency of their properties...'. It is helpful that the strategy acknowledges the difficulties that landlords face in this area. Landlords put in measures such as central heating to make their properties more attractive to market. Since the overarching aim of policy is to improve the quality of the housing stock, policies that encourage landlords are more productive than coercive policies. Fiscal incentives offered in the past may not have been effective because they did not incentivize the upfront spend required or may have offered very long payback periods. It is however essential that properties in all tenures are brought to high environmental standards if the Mayor's CO₂ reductions targets are to be met. The Mayor's strategy should therefore explore specific measures and incentives aimed at this group. This same issue is reflected on page 118.
32. Page 101: References to *co-funding* of programmes here should be set in the context of the economic opportunity it represents if this has already been emphasised earlier in the strategy as suggested by our response.
33. Page 111: Social tariffs – Whilst we support the call for more work with suppliers to make social tariffs available more widely, the strategy must also realise that there is market competition in this part of the utilities sector. The energy companies run these businesses for profit and social tariffs will not happen just because they are a good thing.

Chapter 6:

34. Page 117: Box 6.1 regarding **National Indicator 185** states that "*local authorities can choose to sign up to this indicator which requires them to calculate and report CO₂ emissions from an analysis of energy and fuel use in their relevant buildings and transport, including where these services have been outsourced*". This is inaccurate. Boroughs do not 'choose to sign up' to national indicators – they must report on all 198 of them. They can sign up to 'stretch targets' for up to 35 of these indicators in the three year 'local area agreement'. Fifteen of the 33 London local authorities have done so. All 33 however must report their performance on this indicator to Government (along with the other 197).
35. Page 121: London Councils supports using innovative financing mechanisms to help reduce carbon across the public estate's building stock, and would support working more closely with the Mayor on retrofitting London's local authority building stock through the Buildings Energy Efficiency Programme ('BEEP') programme.


Chapter 7:

36. We support the proposals in this Chapter.

37. Page 133: typographical error: “*This demonstrates the that developers...*”- remove ‘the’.

Chapter 8:

38. Car clubs – investment in this could actually have a much more significant impact taken in conjunction with hybrid and electric vehicles. As the cost of fossil fuel increases and the cost of conventional motoring becomes more prohibitive, the opportunity to access car share through a car club could become more attractive, particularly to the ‘newly retired’ demographic who have been accustomed to 2-car households. The Mayor should work to promote the membership of car clubs instead of car ownership.
39. “Towards zero emissions transport” – We support the Mayor’s intention to decarbonise transport in London, including the move to Electric Vehicles (EVs). However, in regard to EVs, the concern is that they may replace other more sustainable forms of transport such as walking or cycling, and that the range of incentives currently available (exemption from the congestion charge, for example) may lead to the replacing of trips on public transport with trips by EV, adding to congestion and to pollution (albeit not from the vehicle itself). We also need the strategy to clarify the total carbon costs of electric vehicles in justifying their environmental benefit. EVs may also have a potentially exciting role to play in car club fleets, where usage patterns may be relevant to their recharging timescales and infrastructure needs.
40. With regard to parking concessions, how boroughs treat EVs for the purposes of their residential parking permits is a matter for each borough. However, there is a specific issue in relation to parking charges for members of the pan-London EV membership scheme and discussions are ongoing between TfL and boroughs on provision of universal access to parking bays for EVs owners across London regardless of their borough of origin with boroughs retaining the ability to set their own charges and time restrictions on those parking bays.

| | |
|---|---|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</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>Summary results of the BYP campaign survey 'Break the Stereotype, Fix the Impression'</p> | |

Forward Plan Ref: C&F-09/10-023

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report provides a summary of the results from a survey conducted by Brent Youth Parliament (BYP) between October and November 2009. The aim of the survey was to gather data from all ages about how young people are perceived and to gauge the way society views young people today.
- 1.2 The survey forms part of BYP's ongoing campaign, aimed at challenging the negative stereotypes associated with young people, which was launched at the group's inaugural youth conference at Brent Town Hall on 13 November 2009.
- 1.3 The survey was undertaken using a questionnaire which enabled respondents to give their views on a range of topics as they relate to young people. Questions addressed matters such as discipline and behaviour, respect and support from parents and cultural differences as well as whether young people are aware of their rights and if they take their social responsibilities seriously.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 This summary report was presented to the Brent Children's Partnership, the local Children's Trust, which is a thematic subgroup of the Local Strategic Partnership. The recommendations to Executive have been endorsed by the Children's Partnership.
- 2.2 The Executive is requested to:

- Note and acknowledge the survey findings, using them to influence policy decisions affecting children and young people.
- Approve communication and sharing of the findings with a broader audience in Brent and nationally through the UK Youth Parliament.
- Following the success of a 'media summit' in North Somerset, BYP proposes to work with multi agencies and partners such as the Executive, representatives of BYP, the local media, the community safety board, the police, voluntary groups and officers of the council to tackle the issue raised in the report concerning the negative portrayal of young people in the media.

3.0 Detail

Overview

- 3.1 The BYP questionnaire was available online for the general public to complete on Brent Council's Consultation Tracker (<http://www.brent.gov.uk/consultation>) and also on Brent's Community Network website, BRAIN (<http://brentbrain.org.uk/byp>) between 12 October and 16 November 2009. Paper copies were also distributed by members of BYP at local venues such libraries, tube stations, area consultative forums and schools within Brent. The survey closed on 16 November 2009.
- 3.2 The survey methodology was designed to gauge the perceptions of society towards young people and young people's views about society in line with the Brent Youth Parliament campaign which challenges the negative stereotypes associated with young people. The survey was considered a tool that would assist in establishing a baseline of perceptions surrounding young people in Brent and nationally
- 3.3 In total 2,242 surveys were completed by members of the public, with 62% of respondents stating that they either live, work or study in Brent. The highest number of respondents were young people aged ten to 19 years old, who accounted for over 71% of the respondents.
- 3.4 Due to the profile of respondents completing the survey instrument, which is shown below, the results provide an illustration of how young people perceive themselves rather than how society perceives young people.
- Aged 10 to 19 completed 1,560 of the 2,193 questionnaires (71%)
 - Aged 20 to 40 completed 352 of the 2,193 questionnaires (16%)
 - Aged 41 to 60 plus completed 281 of the 2,193 questionnaires (13%)
- 3.5 The survey results have been disaggregated into respondents who live, work and study in Brent and those who are non Brent. The results have been broken down further to distinguish between adult and young people responses in order to highlight any specific issues arising in these client groups.

Emerging Themes

3.6 The table below provides an overview of the survey findings and compares the findings for those who live, work and study in Brent with those who do not. It should be noted that the majority of respondents (62%) either live, work or study in Brent.

| Question | Total Brent respondents % (1323 respondents) | | | Total No of respondents % (2242 respondents) | | |
|--|---|------------------|------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------|
| | Total respondents who AGREE | Adults who agree | Young People who agree | Total respondents who AGREE | Adults who agree | Young People who agree |
| Most young people today are aware of their rights | 21% | 9% | 12% | 19% | 7% | 12% |
| Most young people take their social responsibilities seriously | 11% | 6% | 5% | 11% | 5% | 6% |
| Should society (in general) intervene in socially disturbing situations occurring in public? | 80% | 33% | 47% | 80% | 25% | 55% |
| Do you feel uncomfortable walking by a group of young people hanging around? | 41% | 13% | 28% | 40% | 10% | 30% |
| Have you been bullied in the last 12 months? | 16% | 4% | 12% | 18% | 3% | 15% |
| Do you believe gang culture is on the increase? | 66% | 25% | 41% | 65% | 18% | 47% |
| The impact of rising unemployment on young people will lead to increased involvement in crime | 72% | 27% | 45% | 74% | 20% | 54% |
| Do you believe that the impact of rising unemployment on young people will lead to increased levels of antisocial behaviour? | 62% | 26% | 36% | 63% | 19% | 44% |
| Do you feel that young people today receive sufficient support from parents/carers? | 46% | 11% | 35% | 51% | 8% | 43% |
| The media doesn't portray young people in a fair light | 50% | 23% | 27% | 54% | 16% | 38% |
| Do you believe that the majority of friendships are cultivated within the same culture? | 59% | 23% | 36% | 61% | 17% | 44% |
| Do you feel that more should be done to bring people from different cultures together? | 83% | 35% | 48% | 81% | 26% | 55% |

Conclusions

- 3.7 The survey is an initial assessment of perceptions but the majority of participants were young people. To fully assess the extent of negative perceptions towards young people by society in general, more adult respondents would need to participate in the survey.
- 3.8 There is very little difference between the views of respondents who live work and study in Brent and those who do not. It is apparent from the findings that young people in Brent feel that the media do not portray young people in a fair light. Youth Parliaments in other parts of the country have recorded the same sort of findings and the example of North Somerset, where the Youth Parliament and the Council held a successful 'media summit' to tackle the issue, gives an indication of ways in which this problem might be addressed.
- 3.9 The outcomes achieved by North Somerset's media summit include;
- Young people questioned why direct quotes and comments from young people were rarely included in stories about young people
 - It highlighted the fact that there are few articles in the press intended for young people, in response to this the editor of the local newspaper offered the youth parliament a regular space for young people to speak on matters of interest
 - Youth parliament members had the opportunity to learn about writing press releases and liaising with the media. The councils marketing and communications team also helped the youth parliament develop a media communications strategy
 - Improved links with young people and the media whereby young people write a regular monthly page for a local newspaper
 - It has also helped raise the profile of young people in the community

The general consensus amongst young people also following a debate in the House of Lords on 10 July 2010 was that the media tend to only print negative articles of young people and not enough positive ones.

- 3.10 Brent is a very diverse borough and we are proud of the mix of people that live here, but over 80% of respondents in Brent feel more should be done to integrate different cultures together, including fostering positive images of young people in the borough.
- 3.11 The low responses attributed to young people understanding their rights and taking their social responsibilities seriously, indicates that we need to work in partnership with schools more to educate young people about these and what they mean in practice.
- 3.12 On a positive note, the low scores attributed to Brent respondents who had been bullied in the past 12 months indicates that effective strategies are being implemented to tackle bullying.

4.0 Financial/ Resource Implications

4.1 There are no financial or resource implications associated with this report to the Executive.

5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 There are no legal implications associated with this report to the Executive.

6.0 Equalities Implications

6.1 The survey was targeted at ages ten and upwards. The purpose of this survey was to gauge the perceptions of young people; therefore no other equality data was captured.

6.2 The initial equality impact assessment screening identified that the project was not relevant to any equality and diversity implications as respondents to the survey were self selecting. The survey does not have a negative impact on the community either as a whole or sections of it as it was aimed to gather views from the general public.

6.3 BYP members conducted some face-to-face surveys at Willesden Library and outside Wembley Park station aiming to target all young people and passers by from all walks of life.

7.0 Background Papers

1. Full survey report (includes survey instrument)
2. Brent specific survey report


Copies can be obtained from the contact officer.

Contact Officers

1. Sarah Mansuralli
Head of Strategy & Commissioning Service
Children and Families Department
Email: sarah.mansuralli@brent.gov.uk
2. Petergaye Palmer
Co-Chair of Brent Youth Parliament
Email: byp@brent.gov.uk

John Christie
Director of Children and Families

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|---|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</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>Re-Development of SEN provision at the Hay Lane and Grove Park School Sites</p> | |

Appendix 3 is not for publication

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 On 26 May 2009 the Executive authorised officers to proceed to the design phase to develop a scheme to rebuild Hay Lane and Grove Park Special Schools as one school and to re-provide the Borough's short break provision on the school site.
- 1.2 This report updates the Executive on the progress made in developing the rebuild scheme and the funding arrangements required to cover the costs. It seeks the necessary authorities to progress the scheme to completion.

2.0 Recommendations

The Executive is requested to:

In relation to Hay Lane and Grove Park School Buildings

- 2.1 Approve the rebuilding of the Hay Lane and Grove Park School buildings as one school incorporating the existing recently completed 16+ Centre on the basis of initial design work already carried out (see paragraphs 3.8 to 3.12 below). This will be subject to the agreement of the Schools Forum on the funding arrangements set out in the report.
- 2.2 Approve the provision of the necessary temporary accommodation during the construction period, within the resources identified and as described in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.15 below.

In relation to Short Break (Respite) Centre

- 2.3 Approve the relocation of the Short Break Centre (currently located at Crawford Avenue and Clement Close) to the site of the rebuilt Hay Lane School.
- 2.4 Declare the Crawford Avenue and Clement Close sites surplus to the requirements of the Council's Children & Families Services once the new building is complete which is estimated to be summer 2013.

In relation to the Resource Strategy:

- 2.5 Approve the resourcing strategy set out in the report. In particular the affordability of the capital funding costs of the scheme as set out in paragraph 8 below.
- 2.6 Submit to the Schools Forum for agreement the proposal that savings arising from the Dedicated Schools Budget be used to meet the annual costs of borrowing. (If agreement cannot be secured, a revised funding package will be developed for re-submission to the Executive Committee.)
- 2.7 Note the overall budget provision for the project at £29,395,000 as identified within paragraph 8 below.

In relation to Procurement: Construction Contract

- 2.8 Approve the pre - tender considerations and the criteria to be used to evaluate tenders as set out in table 4 of paragraph 4 of the report.
- 2.9 Give approval to officers to invite tenders and evaluate them in accordance with the approved evaluation criteria referred to in 2.8 above.

In relation to Supply of temporary classrooms

- 2.10 Approve the pre - tender considerations and the criteria to be used to evaluate tenders as set out in table 4 of paragraph 4 of the report.
- 2.11 Give approval to officers to invite tenders and evaluate them in accordance with the approved evaluation criteria referred to in 2.8 above.

In relation to Procurement: Consultants

Overall Project Manager

- 2.12 Agree the appointment of an Overall Project Manager (PM) through to post contract and pre-construction stage, without following the usual quotation requirements of the Council's Standing Orders, on the basis of the good operational and financial reasons set out in paragraph 5 and Appendix 3 (Not for Publication) of this report.

Lead Design and Design Team

- 2.13 Approve the appointment of Frankham and its design team as a replacement for their previous appointment to continue with the design development work to the end of the defects liability period for the works but with a break clause to allow for termination at the end of RIBA stage E, in line with paragraphs 3.8, 3.9 and 3.12 below.

3.0 Detail

Background

- 3.1 Hay Lane and Grove Park are two all age special schools located on adjacent sites off Stag Lane in Kingsbury. The schools cater for a wide range of special educational needs including profound and multiple learning difficulties, severe learning difficulties, autism with associated learning and behavioural difficulties and physical disabilities. The range and complexity of needs of children attending the two schools are increasing and there is an increasing overlap in the type of needs that the two schools serve.
- 3.2 Following the required statutory consultation process the Executive, at their meeting of 15th March 2010, agreed to proposals to bring the two, hitherto separate, schools together as one school with effect from 1st September 2010. Grove Park School will close with effect from 31 August 2010 and Hay Lane School contemporaneously expanded to 210 to take the current roll of both schools. Hay Lane will expand to take 235 pupils once the new build programme (for which approval to execute is being recommended in this report) is complete.
- 3.3 The increase in places from 210 to 235 is to meet the predicted increase in the number of children requiring this type of special educational provision over the medium term. Increasing capacity will lead to significant savings in out-Borough placement and transport budgets. These savings have been set against the financing cost of the scheme and described more fully in Appendix 2.
- 3.4 The existing school buildings are facing major suitability and condition problems. The educational environment the school buildings provide is becoming ever less suitable as the range and complexity of their children's needs increases. Given the current state of the buildings it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Council to meet its statutory obligations towards these children.
- 3.5 Access to the buildings is limited causing congestion in the school driveways and adjacent roads twice every school day as some 200 pupils are transported to and collected from the sites by a range of vehicles (ramp ambulances, mini buses, cars, taxis, etc.).

- 3.6 This report now addresses the accommodation issues arising from the March 2010 decision, the condition and suitability of the existing buildings as outlined above and the outcome of the feasibility and initial design work authorised by the Executive in May 2009.

School Organisation

- 3.7 The schools are now governed by a single governing body in a federation. This has promoted joint planning and joint working. Collaboration between the two schools is good. The governors have appointed one head teacher and are integrating the staff of the two schools so that there is a common ethos, objectives, standards, and ambition and all the talents of the staff are available to all the children. This is part of the changes aimed at driving up standards. The new building is planned on that basis. From September 2010 there will be a new governing body for the enlarged Hay Lane School.

The School Scheme Design, Construction and Appointment of Architects

- 3.8 Frankham (on the Council's Property Services Framework) won a mini competition to take the scheme through the design phase and provide allied technical services to design and build the new school buildings. Their submission along with those from two other companies, also from the Council's Property Service Framework, were evaluated on the basis of specialist knowledge, architectural imagination, strength of team across the full range of skills required, deliverability, ability to communicate with and relate to stakeholders and competitiveness of their fee proposal. (There were only three potentially suitable companies on the Council's Property Services Framework for this kind of work all of whom entered the competition). Frankham have so far been successful on various aspects of the design development and in particular communicating with users. They have secured high quality special educational needs expertise from educational consultants who have won the confidence of staff and facilitated the reorganisation of the schools. They have successfully engaged stakeholder and have handled discussions with other agencies in the best interests of the scheme. All those achievements have contributed to the development of a good scheme able to be implemented, resources allowing.
- 3.9 Although the RIBA feasibility Stage A/B Report has not yet been signed off and to enable this report to be prepared for Executive, it has been necessary to develop the scheme beyond this initial feasibility stage to identify the project risks and help the Council manage those risks. Much of this relates to the adjacent vacant Roberts Court land (see paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14 below), site access and options for the temporary location of children during the construction phase. The outcome has been to ensure as far as possible that a viable scheme with attendant decant options has been developed prior to seeking the authorities in this report. Relevant surveys and site investigations have been carried out and the results taken into account in the costings for the scheme. This report therefore (among other things) seeks Executive approval for Frankham to be appointed with an estimated total fee value of £2.36M for architectural services and up to a further £442,000 for other technical services

and surveys engaged by Frankham from sub-consultants as set out in Table 5 in paragraph 8. These figures are based on an estimate construction cost of £23.69M including the temporary accommodation. The appointment being made is for design and contract administration services through to the end of the defects liability period, but with a break clause at the end of stage E that will be used if design and build contractor does not take a novation of Frankham's contract at that point. At that point the Council will look to Frankham and the successful D& B contractor to provide Collateral Warranties to protect the Council in relation to design defects.

- 3.10 Frankham carried out a robust and thorough options appraisal during their feasibility study. This shows that a cost effective educationally innovative, transformational and inspirational scheme that meets current DCSF guidance on space, can be contained within the current site and taking account of financial constraints can be achieved. The scheme as currently conceived has been tested by the design champion, who is also on the CABE enablers' panel, and has also been influenced by discussions with officers in the Partnership for Schools (Pfs).
- 3.11 There are significant educational benefits associated with the scheme. Rebuilding the schools will provide additional classroom space and an educational environment better suited to the needs of students with multiple learning difficulties and disabilities. There will be much needed improvement to specialist facilities and outside areas. It will address the current inefficiencies in the use of space and greatly improve access arrangements. It will transform the educational opportunities available to some of the most vulnerable children and young people in Brent and drive up standards.
- 3.12 The scheme as now envisaged takes fully into account the outcomes of consultation with staff pupils, parents and other stakeholders. (See also paragraph 7 below). It is therefore recommended to proceed with the rebuilding of the current sets of school buildings as one school using Frankham's initial design and their further design development work up to RIBA stage E. Further design will then be undertaken by the successful D&B Contractor. Due to an oversight, the initial appointment of Frankham was not approved by the Executive, as is required by Contract Standing Orders for all appointments off Council frameworks that exceed £500,000. The mini-competition that led to this initial appointment was for all the design work through to the end of the defects liability period at the end of the construction. However because there was not full authority to proceed with the scheme from the Executive, a contract was awarded only up to the end of stage D i.e. partial acceptance of the mini-competition bid. This contract up to the end of stage D exceeds £500,000 in value although less than £500,000 has been paid to Frankham. It is now proposed to terminate the earlier appointment and award a replacement contract through to the end of the defects liability period. This contract needs to have a break clause at the end of RIBA stage E, because if the proposed design and build contractor does not take a novation of Frankham to continue to develop the design, then the Council will need to terminate Frankham's appointment.

Temporary Accommodation and Decant of Pupils

- 3.13 The report to the Executive on 26 May 2009 set out how the adjacent vacant parcel of land known as Roberts Court Land might be used to facilitate construction and reduce the number of children taken off site during the construction period. Provision was made in the decisions at that time to acquire the land for a temporary period for that purpose. (See also paragraph 3.19 below). Recent discussions with colleagues in NHS Brent have established that it is the Health Authority's intention in partnership with local GPs to develop the land for that purpose during the 2010/2011 financial year. Consequently this land is no longer available.
- 3.14 The consequences of not being able to use the Roberts Court Land together with the other constraints of the site now makes it necessary to rebuild in one phase rather than two. That requires both the existing Hay Lane and Grove Park buildings to be demolished at the start of the construction works. That in turn requires more temporary accommodation to be used during the construction period (roughly 2 years from April 2011) than hitherto expected. The 16 plus Centre with its specialist provisions will be kept in use. The higher cost of the greater quantity of temporary accommodation is offset by the shorter contract period and the absence of ground works to the Roberts Court land.
- 3.15 It is very unlikely that all the necessary temporary accommodation can be housed on the Hay Lane and Grove Park school sites during the construction period. Consequently officers approached the governors of Kingsbury High, the nearby foundation secondary school to host this decant. They have agreed to collaborate with the Council. Such collaboration is not only much appreciated and helpful in achieving this change, but is expected to yield long term educational benefits and collaborations for the schools to the benefit of all the pupils and staff involved. This may make a saving in the long term to the public purse as Kingsbury may need temporary accommodation whilst one of their blocks (Block C) is refurbished/replaced and longer term when they improve their premises more generally under wave 3 of BSF. Such a saving would accrue if Kingsbury were able to make use of at least some of the modular buildings used for the decant once Hay Lane has finished using them. At the time of drafting this report the details of this arrangement were still under discussion. The supply contract for the modular buildings will also need to be procured through an EU-compliant tender process.
- 3.16 Careful consideration has been given to using the Ark academy buildings temporarily instead of the temporary buildings whilst pupil numbers build at that school. That study shows the buildings to be unsuitable for this purpose for a number of reasons. In particular the only available general teaching spaces would be on the 2nd Floor accessible by single lift whilst the hygiene room would be on the ground floor. There would be insufficient disabled WCs for the likely number of students. The specialist rooms are located on the ground and first floor. Consequently there would be considerable vertical movement of children many of whom have mobility difficulties and or need supervision when moving

about the school. Also a number of specialist facilities would have to be provided such as soft play and sensory areas that are not part of the Academy. There are no laundry facilities for soiled clothes. Hall, sport, dining and staff facilities would be difficult to provide and the pick up and drop off arrangements would be particularly difficult due to the layout of parking and roadways. Given that this is an Academy making alterations to overcome these issues would be problematic. Therefore it is not recommended that the Council pursues this option with Ark Academy Governors.

Short Break Services

- 3.17 The scheme also allows for the Borough's short term break and respite services, currently provided from Clement Close and Crawford Avenue, to be relocated to the school site as a single high quality facility. This makes significant improvement to the quality of these services and produces a capital receipt of £410k and revenue savings on rent of at least £32,000/annum. With one set of new premises replacing two old buildings there are additional revenue savings on premises running costs and staffing. These savings have been set against the financing cost of the scheme.
- 3.18 The scheme for this service as now envisaged also takes fully into account the outcomes of consultation with staff and users of that facility. The Frankham scheme includes this facility being located at Hay Lane.

Land Issues & Town Planning Considerations

- 3.19 In May 2009 the Executive were asked and gave permission for the purchase of the adjacent vacant parcel of land known as Roberts Court. The parcel belongs to a housing association and is designated, via a S106 condition, for health services development. NHS Brent has not so far developed the site in partnership with local GPs. Officers have discussed the current position with NHS Brent colleagues who say they are expecting to develop the site in the near future. (See also paragraph 3.12)
- 3.20 Frankham was instructed accordingly and the school project takes that development into account. Frankham's scheme shows that an innovative building that meets relevant guidance can be achieved within the boundaries of the existing school sites. Once the site is redeveloped emergency vehicular access to the 16+ block will be secure from within the school site. Officers have therefore concluded that it is not necessary to acquire the Roberts Court land as previously envisaged.
- 3.21 The project will seek to maximise the benefit of these adjacent developments to both the school and NHS Brent. Officers are confident that the emergency vehicular access for the recently constructed 16+ Centre via Harrod Court can be secured for as long as is necessary.
- 3.22 The scheme as currently envisaged has been discussed in outline with planning and highways officers. No major issues were identified. Helpful advice was given which is informing the development of the scheme through stages C & D (see also paragraph 7.4 below)

Outline timetable

- 3.23 A detailed programme of work has been developed. The key milestones from the programme are detailed in the tables below:

3.24 Pre-Construction Programme of Work for the Temporary Accommodation.

Table 1

| Milestone | Date |
|---|----------------|
| Approval of Scheme By Executive | April 2010 |
| Approval of use of Dedicated Schools Grant by Schools Forum | April 2010 |
| Expression of Interest and OJEU Published | May 2010 |
| Contractors to respond to expression of interest (37 days) | July 2010 |
| Analyse returns and of expression of interest | July 2010 |
| Recommendations made to the client | July 2010 |
| Preparation and issue of Tender Documents | August 2010 |
| Tender Return & Analysis | September 2010 |
| Tender recommendations to the client | October 2010 |
| Executive Approval Received | November 2010 |
| Alcatel Standstill (10 days) | November 2010 |
| Award contract to provide the Temporary Accommodation | December 2010 |

3.25 Pre-Construction Timetable for a single stage Design & Build single phase contract to rebuild the two schools.

Table 2

| Milestone | Date |
|---|-------------|
| Approval of Scheme By Executive | April 2010 |
| Approval of use of Dedicated Schools Grant by Schools Forum | April 2010 |
| Expression of Interest and OJEU Published | July 2010 |
| Contractors to respond to expression of interest (37 days) | August 2010 |

| Milestone | Date |
|---|-------------------|
| Analyse returns and of expression of interest | September 2010 |
| Recommendations to the Client | October 2010 |
| Prepare and issued Tender Documents | Late October 2010 |
| Tender returns and analysis | Christmas 2010 |
| Tender recommendations to the Client | January 2011 |
| Executive Approval Received | February 2011 |
| Alcatel Standstill (10 working days) | March 2011 |
| Award Design and Build contract to rebuild the two schools as one | March 2011 |

3.26 Construction Phase Programme

Table 3

| Milestone | Date |
|---|--------------|
| Construction starts temporary accommodation | January 2011 |
| Temporary Accommodation ready | March 2011 |
| Construction main project starts | April 2011 |
| Occupation | Spring 2013 |

4.0 Procurement of Contractors

- 4.1 It is recommended that Brent does not restrict itself to contractors with pure SEN school design experience because this would risk few responses. It is suggested that we should seek responses from companies with experience in school design and working in an environment for persons with multiple learning difficulties, in either education or healthcare.
- 4.2 Prior to making the recommendations below the following procurement routes were explored for the main scheme: Traditional Procurement, Design & Build - single and two stage, Partnering, Management Contracting, and Construction Management. Each was scored against agreed criteria. The outcome of this scoring matrix identified that Single Stage Design & Build was most suited to meeting the needs of the project. The report on this procurement process is included in the list of background papers

- 4.3 Batching the scheme with the Crest Academies has also been considered. The discussion concluded that on balance the specialist nature of the project and absence of a link, geographical or otherwise, to those schemes within the locality, would make it difficult to obtain or demonstrate that best value has been achieved.
- 4.4 With the above in mind the detail of the procurement processes for both the works contract and the supply of temporary accommodation are set out in the table below.

Table 4

(a) Shows the works contract

(b) Shows the supply of temporary accommodation project

| Ref. | Requirement | Response |
|-------|--|---|
| (i) | The nature of the contract | <p>a) A single stage design and build (works) contract for the construction of new buildings for Hay Lane and Grove Park Schools using a 2005 JCT design and build form of contract including the 2007 amendments.</p> <p>b) A traditional supply contract for the temporary accommodation from a selected supplier</p> |
| (ii) | The estimated value of Contract. | <p>a) £21m (from line 10 of table 5) This is subject to certain assumptions that are laid out in the Elemental Cost Plan as submitted to the Authority by its technical advisers</p> <p>b) £2.9m for Temporary Accommodation (from line 13 of table 5)</p> |
| (iii) | The contract term. | <p>a) Commencement date of the main scheme: Construction Starts: April 2011 Contract Term: approx 2 years.</p> <p>b) Commencement date of temporary accommodation: Construction Starts: December 2010 including mobilisation period Contract Term: approx 4 months.</p> |
| (iv) | The tender procedure to be adopted including whether any part of the procedure will be conducted by electronic means and whether there will be an e-auction. | <p>(a) and (b) are both required to be tendered in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2006 (the Classic Directive). Formal tendering using the Restrictive Procedure (two-stage) as set out in the Regulations will be adopted.</p> <p>Additionally in order to encourage local providers, this contract will be advertised on the Councils website.</p> <p>Neither contract is appropriate for an e-auction</p> |
| (v) | The procurement timetable. | <p>The indicative procurement timetable is set out below:-</p> <p>(a) Main Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See table 2 paragraph 3.25 above |

| | | <p>(b) Temporary Accommodation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Table 1 paragraph 3.24 above <p>Timetables remain indicative and are subject to individual planning approvals for the main scheme and temporary accommodation.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|-----------|--|--|---|-----|---|-----|-------|-----|--------------------------------|--|---|-----|--|-----|-------|-----|
| (vi) | The evaluation criteria and process. | <p>(a) & (b) shortlists are to be drawn up in accordance with the Council's Contract Procurement and Management Guidelines namely the pre-qualification questionnaire and thereby meeting the Council's financial standing requirements, technical capacity and technical expertise for both the main rebuild contract and for the temporary accommodation. Thereafter once candidates have been selected for tender, full documentation will be sent and thereafter the panel will evaluate the tenders against the following criteria:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Design and Build Works Contract</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design quality & its contribution to raising standards of achievement</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Works & Handover (method statement, programme, manuals, health and safety, stakeholder engagement, programme completion, user training)</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Price</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Temporary Accommodation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design quality & its contribution to raising standards of achievement</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Works & Handover (method statement, health and safety, stakeholder engagement, programme completion)</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Price</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Category | Weighting | Design and Build Works Contract | | Design quality & its contribution to raising standards of achievement | 40% | Works & Handover (method statement, programme, manuals, health and safety, stakeholder engagement, programme completion, user training) | 20% | Price | 40% | Temporary Accommodation | | Design quality & its contribution to raising standards of achievement | 35% | Works & Handover (method statement, health and safety, stakeholder engagement, programme completion) | 15% | Price | 50% |
| Category | Weighting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Design and Build Works Contract | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Design quality & its contribution to raising standards of achievement | 40% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Works & Handover (method statement, programme, manuals, health and safety, stakeholder engagement, programme completion, user training) | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Price | 40% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Temporary Accommodation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Design quality & its contribution to raising standards of achievement | 35% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Works & Handover (method statement, health and safety, stakeholder engagement, programme completion) | 15% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Price | 50% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (vii) | Any business risks associated with entering the contract. | The business risks associated with this project are set out in paragraph 9. This reflects the top risks from the client's point of view. The other most significant risks developed by the Authority and its technical advisors as part of the Feasibility Study are set out in Appendix 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (viii) | The Council's Best Value duties. | The tendering and award of the contract based on the criteria set out above will enable the Council to meet its Best Value objectives. Further information on the Council's Best Value is set out in the Council's Contract Procurement and Management Guidelines available on the Council's website. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (ix) | Any staffing implications, including TUPE | There are no staffing implications arising from the construction contract. There are staffing implications in merging the two schools but that decision is not part of this | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | and pensions. | consideration and are matters for the school governors. There are no TUPE implications. |
| (x) | The relevant financial, legal and other considerations. | See paragraphs 8 & 10 respectively. No decision has yet been taken about whether to require the design and build contractor to take a novation of the Council's designer Frankham, or whether to give the contractor the option of having Frankham novated to it. However in order to allow for flexibility, it is proposed that the new contract awarded to Frankham will have a break clause at the end of stage E which will be when the design and build contractor is appointed. At that point the Council will probably need to appoint an ongoing technical adviser to scrutinise the design work of the contractor. |

5.0 Appointment of Consultants: Overall Project Manager

- 5.1 The Council currently has in place an Overall Project Manager who was first involved in this project in May 2008. He was engaged through to completion with an expected commitment of, on average, 5 days per month until September 2012. That arrangement has been reviewed in the context of the Council's review of property services. Consultation has taken place with the current Overall Project Manager. It is now proposed to terminate that appointment and appoint the current Overall Project Manager for the duration of the development phase of the project up to post-contract stage i.e. for a further 3 years. It is envisaged that his knowledge and expertise will remain available to the Council and its delivery team, for the construction phase, at which point appropriate arrangements will be put in place and reported in advance to Executive as appropriate. He has developed substantial knowledge and background around the project, has established effective relationships with various Council Departments, partner agencies including central government departments and will therefore be able to give continuity to the remainder of this project seamlessly and without the need to revisit ground already covered. In addition, the (per diem) fee level negotiated with the proposed project manager is below the daily average rate for this type of work. It is estimated that the total annual cost will not exceed £46,800 and with an estimated total contract value of approximately £150k. The detail is set out in Appendix 3 Not for Publication.
- 5.2 In the event that the LA seeks to invite competitive bids, it is likely that delays will be introduced into the timeline and the currently negotiated fee rates (deemed to be favourable to the Council) from the proposed project manager will no longer apply. In the unlikely event that someone else is able to submit a lower fee rate and are able to show the credentials comparable to the current project manager now being proposed for appointment for the duration of this project, it is likely that they will still need time to gather sufficient knowledge about this scheme and establish communication links for the better performance of the project.

5.3 There are therefore good financial, operational and efficiency grounds for appointing the project manager currently managing the feasibility and development phase of this project for its duration in line with Appendix 3 (Not for Publication).

6.0 Feasibility Study: Support for the New Build

6.1 Much of the background for the case to rebuild the current pair of schools on their existing site was set out in the report to Executive on 26 May 2009. Some of the key points are summarised in paragraphs 3.4, 3.5 and 3.11.

6.2 A feasibility study was carried out. The key conclusions of that study are:

6.2.1 The size of the proposed schools can be accommodated on the existing site without the Robert's Court Land whilst meeting relevant design guidance from the DCSF and elsewhere;

6.2.2 An effective solution to the design brief, which is innovative and likely to drive up standards, can be achieved

6.2.3 The project will require temporary accommodation to be provided for about three quarters of the pupils. It is likely that the much of this will be on the Kingsbury High site during the construction phase

6.2.4 The procurement of the new school will deliver best value for money and comply with relevant national and EU regulations and requirements.

7.0 Consultation

7.1 Stakeholder engagement is a key driver in developing a high quality educational environment as well as a resource for other people and local schools.

7.2 There has been extensive consultation with staff and other stakeholders in developing the project. In particular in September Anne Hayward Associates, engaged for this purpose by Frankham spent 3 days in the schools consulting with staff, parents and pupils and carried out a parallel consultation with staff at the short break centres. This resulted in a major report (included in the list of background papers) and DVD recordings of the pupil voice at the school and in the youth parliament.

7.3 That major consultation has been followed up as the scheme has been developed with monthly design meetings between the architect and school and short break centre staff to establish the schedule of accommodation and relationships among the spaces. That process is ongoing. Anne Hayward Associates conducted a second round of consultation on 1 March 2010 and follow-up sessions on specific topics are planned. EC Harris, engaged by Frankham to provide project management and other services is in the process of developing a programme and methodology for engaging stakeholders and is

in contact with the Council's communications team on how best to communicate with the wider community.

- 7.4 A Corporate Board including officers from Children and Families, the project manager, and officers from planning, finance and corporate property has been meeting roughly monthly throughout the development of this scheme. In addition Frankham's planning consultant and other relevant technical staff have met with planning and highways officers to discuss both the main scheme and the sighting of the temporary accommodation. No major issues were identified. Further meetings are planned. (See also paragraph 3.22 above)

8.0 Financial Implications

Financial Appraisal

- 8.1 Following the decision by Executive in May 2009, a financial package has been compiled with the objective of enabling the scheme to proceed to post tender and pre-contract stages subject to agreement by the Schools Forum for use of the Dedicated Schools Grant and subsequently the tender returns.

Affordability

- 8.2 The current projected costs for the scheme are laid out in Table 5 below. This makes comparison to the costs originally reported to the Executive in May 2009 in order that members can assess the progress made to date in addressing the affordability issues. In total cost savings of £2.782m have been achieved over the previous forecast. Lines 8 & 18 demonstrate that an appropriate provision for unknowns (contingencies) has been included.

Table 5 – Scheme Cost

| | | May 2009 report to Exec £(000) | Current project £(000) |
|-----------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | Description | £(000) | £(000) |
| 1 | New build including demolition | 28,677 | 12,946 |
| 2 | Refurbishment allowance | | 165 |
| 3 | Hydrotherapy/warm Pool | | 439 |
| 4 | Short Break centre | | 1,442 |
| 5 | Externals | | 1,746 |
| 6 | Services | | 150 |
| 7 | Preliminaries/profit | | 2,412 |
| 8 | Contingencies | | 2,449 |
| 9 | Contract deflation factor | | -702 |
| 10 | Sub Total for Main Contract | 28.677 | 21,047 |
| | | | |
| 11 | Fees | Included above | 2,357 |
| 13 | Temporary accommodation | 2,000 | 2,879 |
| 13 | Surveys and investigations | | 442 |
| 14 | FFE | | 80 |
| 15 | Catering | | 75 |
| 16 | Loose F&E including fees | | 1,075 |

| | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 17 | ICT | | 409 |
| 18 | Client contingency/ other fees | | 1,031 |
| 19 | Acquisition of Roberts Court | 1,500 | 0 |
| 20 | Total Scheme Cost | 32,177 | 29,395 |

8.3 The currently forecast funding resources for the scheme are laid out in Table 6 below, identifying a net capital requirement for the scheme of £19,739k. This table also provides Members with details of the forecasts submitted to the May 2009 meeting for purposes of comparison.

Table 6 – Available Funding

| | Scheme | May 2009 report to Exec £(000) | Current project £(000) |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Available funding | | |
| 1 | Targeted Capital Fund (TCF) | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| 2 | Devolved Capital | 286 | 286 |
| 3 | Maintenance Capital | 500 | 500 |
| 4 | Aiming High Grant | 460 | 460 |
| 5 | Clement Close | 410 | 410 |
| 6 | Release of Roberts Court or equivalent | 1,561 | 0 |
| 7 | Total Capital available (sum 5 to 10) | 11,217 | 9,656 |
| 8 | Total Scheme Cost (Table 5, line 20) | 32,177 | 29,395 |
| | Net Capital Required (line 8 minus 7) | 20,960 | 19,739 |

8.4 Members should note that there is a risk that the DCSF may not agree to the use of the Aiming High Grant (£460k, at line 4 of the table above) to pay contractor fees in 2010/11. The Grant conditions require the grant to be spent by March 2011 and a physical asset should be in place by that time. Officers in Children & Families are pursuing this matter with DCSF. If DCSF agreement is not secured an amended proposal to meet this element of the funding package will have to be developed before the scheme can continue. Any additional revenue costs arising will fall upon the Dedicated Schools Budget and be subject to the agreement of the Schools Forum.

8.5 The funding gap of £19,739k, as detailed above, will be addressed through the provision of additional unsupported borrowing. It is proposed that the debt costs associated with this unsupported borrowing will be met from savings in both the General Fund and Dedicated Schools Budget revenue provisions. Table 7 below summarises the capital financing costs arising and the forecast savings that will fund these costs on the basis that borrowing will be repaid over a 60 year period. The result of this forecast is a surplus of savings of £3,724k over the period and the Table also provides the Net Present Value of this surplus of £35k in order that Members consideration can take into account the time value of money over the 60 year period, using the Treasury's recommended rate of discount of 3.5%.

Table 7 – Financing of Capital Borrowing Costs

| Description | £'000 |
|--|--------------|
| Total Debt Charges Arising | 67,085 |
| <u>General Fund Savings Arising:</u> | |
| Crawford Avenue Rent | (1,824) |
| Crawford Avenue/Clements Close Managers Post | (2,850) |
| Transport | (25,850) |
| | |
| <u>Dedicated Schools Budget Savings:</u> | |
| Day Placements | (13,750) |
| Residential Placements | (12,375) |
| Reduction of School Lump Sum | (9,735) |
| Maintenance | (4,425) |
| | |
| Total Savings | (70,809) |
| | |
| Surplus on Savings over 60 year period | (3,724) |
| | |
| Net Present Value of Surplus on Savings | (35) |

Appendix 1 to the report sets out a detailed cash flow analysis for the financing of the borrowing costs summarised in Table 7.

- 8.6 Members should note that the use of savings to fund the costs of unsupported borrowing will have to be agreed by the Schools Forum subsequent to the Executive approving this proposal. If Schools Forum agreement is not secured this route of funding will not be available to the scheme and an amended proposal will have to be developed before the scheme can continue.
- 8.7 Appendix 2 to the report provides detail to the forecast savings outlined in Table 7 that will be accruing with regard to Outborough Placements.
- 8.8 The remaining revenue savings attributed to the Dedicated Schools Budget in Table 7 above are generated from the rebuild scheme resulting from reduced revenue costs such as staffing and building costs from establishing a single school rather than currently having two separate schools.
- 8.9 The detailed cash flow analysis of financing borrowing costs at Appendix 1 to the report demonstrates that in the early years of the debt repayment model there is a deficit of savings available to meet costs. Table 8 below summarises this position to the point of break even.

| Year | Financing Costs | General Fund Savings | Dedicated Schools Budget Savings | Net Costs/Savings |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|

| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2010/11 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| 2011/12 | 592 | 0 | (240) | 352 |
| 2012/13 | 987 | 0 | (240) | 747 |
| 2013/14 | 987 | (176) | (335) | 476 |
| 2014/15 | 1,150 | (270) | (430) | 450 |
| 2015/16 | 1,150 | (364) | (525) | 261 |
| 2016/17 | 1,150 | (458) | (620) | 72 |
| 2017/18 | 1,150 | (552) | (715) | (117) |

- 8.10 In order for the scheme to progress this cashflow issue will have to be resolved. It is currently proposed that this matter will be discussed with the Schools Forum in order to ascertain whether the gap in early years could be supported by the Dedicated Schools Budget with repayment in the latter years when the model moves into surplus. If Schools Forum agreement is not secured an amended proposal will have to be developed before the scheme can continue.
- 8.11 The current school capital programme in future years is fully allocated to other primary and secondary projects and consequently is not available as an alternative source of financing for this project. There will not be any additional allocations made from the Council's Capital Programme and any gaps arising in the funding package will have to be addressed from existing Children and Families budgets or via the Dedicated Schools Budget subject to agreement of the Schools Forum.

9.0 Risk and Risk Management

- 9.1 The Executive will note that the programme is tight and the risk of slippage against timelines is high with attendant additional site costs; the risks will be monitored closely so that they are effectively managed and key decisions made on time. The project management structure and reporting and monitoring mechanisms put in place for the Ark Academy and Crest Academies were successful to date and it is proposed to put in place a similar arrangement for this project. The Council will set up a cross departmental Project Board which will receive regular reports from the Overall Project Manager.
- 9.2 The architects and QS have assessed risks associated with the project and provided appropriate contingencies within the capital provision. At this stage of the project those sums are likely to be needed.
- 9.3 The top 10 risks from the design and supply point of view are set out in Appendix 4 and will be kept under review
- 9.4 From the client's point of view the main risks and the strategy for their management are summarised below: They too will be kept under review

9.5 **Risk 1:** To be able to deliver this project in the timescale provided in tables 1, 2 & 3 of paragraphs 3.23 to 3.25 above, it is important for key decision makers to make decisions on time.

9.5.1 Strategy: Robust project documentation will be provided in time for key decisions to relevant stakeholders.

9.6 **Risk 2:** Potential delays in procurement.

9.6.1 Strategy: Project board to include legal and procurement officers will review key documentation; established procedures and guidance will be followed.

9.7 **Risk 3:** Complexities with the town planning process could slow down this project and/or affect its delivery.

9.7.1 Strategy: Planning conditions will be identified as early as possible in the project; the local authority will liaise closely with the Planning Authority prior to the submission of the planning application. (Meeting held 8 March).

9.8 **Risk 4:** Access to, location and the quantity of temporary accommodation on the Kingsbury School site. There is ongoing discussion with colleagues in Parks, Transport and Planning about the access route to the site that will cause least disruption to neighbours, Kingsbury High and its pupils, and yet enable the vehicles to stand off the highway during pick up and set down of pupils. As the temporary accommodation is proposed to be located on part of Kingsbury High's playing field, albeit an unused part, plans must be submitted to Sport England and the Mayor's office, either or both of which could cause delay and possibly place restrictions on what can be located on this site.

9.8.1 Strategy: Consequently alternative locations for at least some of the temporary accommodation are being considered.

10.0 Legal implications

10.1 The Executive is being asked to approve the rebuilding of the two sets of buildings at Grove Park and Hay Lane schools, as well as the funding and procurement issues.

10.2 Because Kingsbury High is a foundation school there will need to be a legal agreement between the Council and the Governors of Kingsbury High School covering the Council's access to and use of the temporary accommodation erected on their site for the purpose of decanting the Hay Lane/Grove Park school for the duration of the construction phase.

10.3 Both the works contract and the supply contract are covered by the European public procurement rules and will need to be tendered in accordance with those

rules. Both contracts are also High Value contracts under the Council's Standing Orders and will need to be awarded by the Executive.

- 10.4 In relation to the recommendation at paragraph 2.12, Standing Order 84 allows the Executive to grant an exemption from a requirement of Standing Orders where there are good operational and / or financial reasons for doing so. The Executive needs to be satisfied that the reasons set out in section 5 are sufficient to justify a departure from the usual requirements to obtain three quotations before appointing a project manager.
- 10.5 In relation to the recommendation at paragraph 2.13, the proposal is to terminate the existing contract awarded to Frankham and replace it with a larger one that covers the design work until the end of the defects liability period. It is understood that Frankham's bid in last year's mini-competition process for the full scope of design work still remains open for acceptance.

11.0 Diversity Implications

- 11.1 An equality impact assessment has been completed. The scheme will further improve the educational and teaching facilities for children with special needs, their families and carers.

12.0 Staffing Issues

- 12.1 The Council has made clear that given that the number of pupils is likely to rise, the merger of the two schools is expected to have a similar number of posts as in the existing two schools. However it is likely that a number of people's jobs will change and a fair selection processes will need to be adopted to give effect to such changes where necessary.
- 12.2 Staffing matters in schools are the responsibility of the governors. Staff are represented on the federated governing body and will be represented on the new governing body once the schools formally merge on 1 September 2010. The Advisory Consultative Group has been set up with trade union representatives as required by Brent's agreement with school staff when organisational change is planned. Following consultation with that group it has been possible to recommend policy documents to the governors for them to adopt for teachers and support staff to manage this change. The Governors have adopted the policies as recommended. Support staff in schools are covered by the corporate agreement of January 2008, and that is the policy document recommended and adoption. The agreements between the teaching staff trade unions and the Council are some 10 years old. Officers and the trade union representatives have worked collaboratively on these documents and agreed the necessary minor changes appropriate for this particular reorganisation without prejudice to its wider application among all schools.
- 12.3 The head teacher of the expanded Hay Lane School and governors are in the process of consulting with staff about appropriate staffing structures to meet the school's needs during the following three periods:

- 12.3.1 From September 2010 until the pupils move into their temporary accommodation for the construction period;
- 12.3.2 For the duration of the construction period whilst the school operates on two sites; and
- 12.3.3 From about September 2013 when the school will move into its new buildings.
- 12.4 The governors have appointed one of the two existing head teachers to lead the reorganised school. There will be one less head teacher post in the new staffing complement compared with the existing. A small number of other posts some among the leadership team may also be at risk. Discussions between the school management and trade unions over the shadow structure are ongoing.
- 12.5 A similar situation applies to the short break service. Here the Integrated Services Manager is in discussions with her staff on the possible arrangements with one set of premises rather than the current two. In this case however the current centres will continue to operate until 2013.
- 12.6 Discussions are also being held with colleagues in NHS Brent as some of their employees work at the schools and they will need to be satisfied that their staff will be able to continue to deliver the appropriate levels of service both during the period of construction and in the new buildings.

Background Papers (essential)

- Business Case Summary dated 9.4.09
- Asset Management Information.
- Feasibility Study by Hunters - Dec 2008 (Final version).
- Stage A/B feasibility report from Frankham together with financial analysis
- File notes of Corporate Officers' Working Group
- Background & Assumptions – Project files, TCF Project Steering Group Notes.
- File notes of discussions with Hay Lane & Grove Park special schools.
- Minutes of the federated governing body and of its Change Committee
- Report to Executive Committee of 15 March on resolution of school merger
- Equalities Impact Assessment December 2009
- Hay lane/Grove Park Consultation Report June-September 2009 Anne Hayward Associates
- EC Harris Procurement Strategy Report March 2010

Contact Officers

Nitin Parshotam, Head of Asset Management Service (Children and Families),
Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley Middlesex HA9 7RW
Tel: 020 8 937 3080. Fax: 020 8 937 3023. E-mail: nitin.parshotam@brent.gov.uk

John Christie
Director of Children and Families

Meeting
Date

Version no.
Date

Appendix 1

HAY LANE & GROVE PARK SCHOOLS: CASH FLOW

This appendix is in the form of a spreadsheet and is attached

HAY LANE & GROVE PARK SCHOOLS: SAVINGS ON OUTBOROUGH PLACEMENTS

Grove Park/Hay Lane – savings on out-Borough placements

The capacity of the 2 schools is currently 210 students. After re-build, there will be capacity for 235 students; 185 in the main school and 50 in the post 16 block. There will therefore be 25 additional places.

In addition, new mainstream provision will be established from 2013 for students with complex physical/medical needs who do not have severe or profound learning difficulties. This will be a 10 place additionally resourced provision at Queens Park Community School funded through the Building Schools for the Future Programme. The needs of pupils with severe physical and or medical difficulties are currently often met at Grove Park School but this will not be the case in the future. In effect, the capacity of the expanded Hay Lane School to take students with ASD and severe profound learning difficulties (who would otherwise be placed out of the Borough) will increase. A modest assumption is that the development of the mainstream physical/medical needs provision will increase place availability of Hay Lane by a further 5 places, so in total 30 additional places will be available.

There will be improved facilities, a short break centre on site supported by health provision. This will increase the attractiveness of Hay Lane to parents. The school will also be better placed to meet the needs of students with specialist and complex needs (including ASD/Challenging behaviour and multi sensory impairment) as a result of improved facilities.

Currently, both schools are virtually full to capacity and Brent has to place some children out-Borough because local provision is full. It is projected that demand for places will continue to grow, particularly for students with severe learning difficulties and or autism and profound and multiple learning difficulties.

Once the additional places are available, there will be savings on placement costs (within the Dedicated Schools Budget) and transport costs (within the local authority budget). Initial investment is required in order for savings to be generated from 2013/14 onwards.

For every out-Borough day placement avoided, the projected savings are as follows,

Savings to placement budget = £10k/year.

Savings to transport budget = £18.4k/year (20% NKA savings applied to £23k per pupil)

For every residential placement avoided, the projected savings are as follows,

Savings to placement budget = £45k/year.

Savings to transport budget = £2k/year.

Table 8 and 9 are based on the following assumption

1. The average length of an out-Borough placement is 5 years (this is a modest assumption as most students placed out-Borough do not return to the Borough).
2. Each year after rebuild, 5 out-Borough day placements and 2 residential placements will be avoided.

| Projected savings on day placements | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| Table 8 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 and continuing |
| Number of students attending HL/GP who would otherwise be placed in day out-Borough schools. | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| Savings on transport budget £k | 92 | 184 | 276 | 368 | 460 |
| Savings of placement budget £k | 50 | 100 | 150 | 200 | 250 |

| Projected savings on residential placement. | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| Table 9 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 and continuing |
| Number of students attending HL/GP who would otherwise be placed in residential out-Borough schools. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Savings on transport budget £k | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| Savings of placement budget £k | 45 | 90 | 135 | 180 | 225 |

Total projected savings from Year 5 onwards.

Transport = £470,000

Placements = £475,000

Total = £945,000


Appendix 4

HAY LANE GROVE PARK – EXTRACT FROM RISK REGISTER (Top 10)

| No. | Raised By | Category | Risk Description (Cause & Effect) | Mitigation Action | Owner |
|-----|---------------|--------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| 19 | Structural | Statutory | Use of existing site entrance is not approved by the highways agency. Possible highways works necessary if using alternative access and egress will have a cost attached. | Early consultation with highways agency to mitigate any additional works, or programme implications associated with them, is essential | FRANKHAM Environmental Consultant |
| 22 | CDM-C | Construction | Construction site causes unnecessary risk to the live school site. Sloping level of the site may make the site impractical or unusable for use as an SEN school. Costly levelling works would have to be undertaken in order to make the site suitable. | Segregation of entrance and exit of construction site and school. School to be orientated so that the access and egress routes are over the minimum gradient. Platform lifts to be avoided as they are slow and may cause fire escape obstructions. | Contractor |
| 23 | Architectural | Design | Timescales are insufficient for an effective decant | Robust programme to be worked up in conjunction with the temporary accommodation contractor. | FRANKHAM Architect |
| 34 | PM | Decant | Uncertainty in the market re tender costs and inflation as a result of the 2012 Olympics and 'credit-crunch' making it difficult to assess tender costs. | Cost plan to take into account predicted inflation as accurately as possible and provide range of possible inflation | ECH PM |
| 37 | QS | Procurement | Planning Process is drawn out by statutory consultees. | Engage with planning consultant and local authority. Frankham to appoint planning consultant ASAP. | ECH QS Planning Consultant |
| 39 | PM | Statutory | The Planning application requires complex submission which impacts on programme | Early consultations with the planners will identify the extent of the deliverables required in the application and therefore the risks involved | Planning Consultant |
| 40 | PM | Statutory | Funding Availability. | BRENT to confirm funding is in place. QS to actively manage cost and regularly report as design develops. | ECH QS |
| 44 | PM | Client | Phasing issues lead to excessive additional temporary works in terms of segregation of services and temporary accommodation | Survey and development of design to minimise Approval required from Brent and the key stakeholders on the preferred route for the temporary accommodation and decant. | FRANKHAM |
| 46 | PM | Decant | Design programme outlined for the temporary accommodation is not achieved. | | BRENT |

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|---|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Director of Communications and Diversity</p> |
| <p>For Action Wards Affected: ALL</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Brent Annual Equalities Report 2009</p> | |

1.0 Summary

1.1 The Annual Equalities report provides a profile of the council's workforce by the six diversity strands, as well as information about the council's employment practices and achievements in the area of diversity, equality and community cohesion. The report which is a statutory duty is used in a variety of ways by the council and its stakeholders such as using it for comparison purposes on equality matters by service areas. This report is Brent Council's eighth Annual Equalities report and covers the period from April 2008 to March 2009 and will be a key document used during the assessment for the Equality Framework for Local Government (EFLG).

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 That members of the Executive endorse the report.

3.0 Detail

3.1 Brent Annual Equalities report is a statutory document which is a requirement of a number of pieces of Equality legislation. It is a way of engaging the workforce and is a useful report, which highlights trends around staff by the six diversity strands within a service area and the council as a whole.

3.2 The report is divided into sections:

- Section one covers council-based employees, councillors, contractors and agency staff.
- Section two looks at the workforce profile in schools.

- Section three looks at our human resource information and the results of the staff survey.
- Section four covers our achievements in equality diversity and community cohesion.
- Section five sets out the diversity improvements planned for 2009/2010.

3.3 In addition to the usual staff diversity data, this years report contains details of achievements in the area of equality, diversity and community cohesion which will be used to inform our submissions for the EFLG

4.0 **Headline Results**

4.1 On 31 March 2009 women made up 64.53 per cent of the workforce, which is an increase of 1.03 per cent on the previous year. Of the senior management posts PO8 and above 46.92 per cent are held by women which is an increase on the 2008 figure of 46.22 per cent.

4.2 In March 2009 Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) employees made up 59.87 per cent of the workforce, compared to 58.87 per cent the previous year, but held 45 per cent of all management posts, which is an increase of one per cent on the previous year.

4.2 Disabled employees made up 3.78 per cent of the workforce, compared to 3.62 per cent the previous year, and held four per cent of all management posts, which is a one per cent increase on the previous year.

4.4 In January 2009 31.6 per cent of teaching staff in Brent schools came from BME groups which is an increase on the figure for 2008 ensuring that the BME representation of staff in Brent remain is one of the highest in the country

5.0 **Financial Implications**

None

6.0 **Legal Implications**

6.1 The following pieces of legislation set out the legal duties of Brent Council with regard to equality and diversity: Disability Discrimination Act 2005, the Race Relations Act 2000, the Sex Discrimination Act as amended by the Equality Act 2006, Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003, the Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations 2003, the Equality Act, the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006 Part 2 of the Equality Act re goods, facilities and services and the Human Rights Act 1998.

7.0 **Diversity Implications**

7.1 Statutory Equality Duties require public authorities to produce Equality Scheme and Annual Equalities Monitoring Report covering race, gender and

disability either individually or under the umbrella of a Single Equality Scheme. Brent council has addressed this duty and beyond.

8.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

None

Background Papers

Brent Annual Equalities Report

Contact Officers


Jennifer Crook - Head of Diversity, Communications and Diversity

Jennifer.crook@brent.gov.uk

Jennifer Laurent-Smart – Senior Corporate Diversity Manager, Communications and Diversity

Jennifer.laurent-smart@brent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|--|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Policy and Regeneration</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Wards Affected: ALL</p> | |
| <p>Childhood Immunisation Task Group – Final Report</p> | |

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The Childhood Immunisation Task Group report has been considered and agreed by the Health Select Committee. This report presents the task group's work to the Executive for approval.
- 1.2 When the task group started its work it quickly became clear to members that immunisation rates in Brent were poor and that there needed to be a significant change in approach to improve immunisation levels in the borough. This was acknowledged in the first version of NHS Brent's Commissioning Strategy Plan 2008-13, which contained specific targets relating to childhood immunisations, such as achieving 95% coverage of the MMR vaccine by April 2011. Although the target isn't included in the latest version of the commissioning strategy plan, it is still NHS Brent's intention to achieve these immunisation rates.
- 1.3 In order to do this, there needs to be a significant step change in the way that immunisations are provided and the data recorded and reported in Brent. The task group has found that there is a great deal of willingness from within the PCT and the local authority to work together to improve immunisation levels, but the systems and process are not yet in place to make this happen consistently across the borough.
- 1.4 The task group has made a number of recommendations, which can be grouped into four broad themes:
- Immunisation data management
 - Accountability for the delivery of vaccinations
 - Educating NHS and local authority staff on the benefits of vaccination

- Working in partnership with the council to improve immunisation rates

1.5 The majority of the recommendations are addressed to NHS Brent, but a number of them relate to the use of schools and children's centres to promote and enhance vaccine services. The Health Select Committee hopes that the Executive is able to endorse and agree these recommendations.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 To agree the recommendations set out in the report.

2.2 To thank the members of the task group for their work.

3.0 Details

3.1 Childhood immunisation against illnesses such as measles, mumps, polio and diphtheria are crucial to protect the long term health of young people in our borough. Immunisation has the most robust evidence in terms of safety, efficacy and cost effectiveness of all healthcare activities, but there have been long standing problems in achieving good levels of coverage in London. Brent has been no exception to the London-wide trend of low immunisation rates.

3.2 Brent Council's Health Select Committee established the Childhood Immunisation Task Group because councillors were concerned about the low immunisation rates in the borough. Childhood immunisation rates in Brent for 2008/09 were reported to be below target for all of the immunisations in the national immunisation programme except human papilloma virus vaccine and tetanus, diphtheria and polio booster.

3.3 The task group was keen to investigate how NHS Brent and partners, including the council, were addressing immunisation performance to ensure young people received the correct vaccinations to prevent the unnecessary spread of disease. It should be added that as well as looking at childhood immunisation, the task group felt it could not ignore the swine flu vaccination programme even though this would be aimed at a much wider population group than children. Swine flu was a significant issue at the time that the task group was agreeing terms of reference and so it was included in the remit of the work.

3.4 The task group has made the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1 - The task group recommends that NHS Brent ensures resources are available so that an accurate CIS database can be maintained beyond the life of the current data clean-up project.

Recommendation 2 – The task group recommends that NHS Brent reports back to the Health Select Committee in December 2010 on the information held on the CIS database and the Exeter database to ensure that there is at least a 95% match between the two.

Recommendation 3 - The task group recommends that immunisation results for each GP practice in Brent are published quarterly on the NHS Brent website to help improve accountability.

Recommendation 4 – The task group recommends that NHS Brent starts to use the accurate CIS database to consider where there is underperformance in the immunisation service. For example, are there geographical or ethnicity trends that can be used as the basis for an effective immunisation promotional campaign.

Recommendation 5 – The task group recommends that all staff employed by NHS Brent are given an overview of the benefits of vaccination as part of their induction programme. This should include information on childhood vaccinations and the flu vaccination for both vulnerable adults and children. Training should be given to medical and non-medical staff working in frontline positions, and should be extended to GP receptionists.

Recommendation 6 – The task group recommends that as part of the induction training on immunisations, it is made clear to NHS Brent staff and employees at GP surgeries that there is no link between the MMR vaccine and autism so that they are able to communicate this message to members of the public, should they be asked about this subject.

Recommendation 7 – The task group recommends that NHS Brent carries out a childhood immunisation promotion campaign once an analysis of the CIS database has been completed and more is known about the children who have not had the vaccines they need. A campaign could be tied into vaccination clinics at children's centres (see recommendation 8 below).

Recommendation 8 – The task group recommends that vaccination clinics are trialled at five children's centres in Brent (one in each locality) to assess demand and popularity. One of the trials should be carried out at the weekend to see if there is demand for services outside core hours. As well as providing immunisations, health visitors should be available at the clinics to speak to parents about vaccinations and answer any questions that they have. The clinics could be timed to take place during a vaccination campaign (see recommendation 7 above).

Recommendation 9 – The task group recommends that children's centres collect information on the immunisation status of each child that it registers. This information should be passed to a health visitor for follow up with the parents if the child has not received the vaccinations in the childhood immunisation programme.

Recommendation 10 – The task group recommends that each school in Brent has a member of staff (such as a school nurse) who is able to advise parents and teachers on the benefits of immunisation. This member of staff should be invited to attend NHS Brent immunisation training to ensure their knowledge is kept up to date.

Recommendation 11 – The task group recommends that teachers in Brent are given an opportunity to attend immunisation training by NHS Brent so that they are better placed to advise parents on immunisation and the diseases that vaccines work to prevent.

Recommendation 12 – The task group recommends that parents are asked to provide information on their children’s immunisation status when they fill out their school admission form. This information would be disclosed on a voluntary basis and passed to the school nurse for follow up with the parent if necessary.

Recommendation 13 – The task group recommends that NHS Brent and the council’s Children and Families Department work with secondary schools in Brent to promote the benefits of the HPV vaccine to pupils and their parents in order to increase the vaccination rate. Work needs to include information on the vaccines safety, accessing the vaccine and organising the way the vaccine is delivered so that opportunities to complete the course of vaccine aren’t missed. Young people have an important role in this and groups such as the Youth Parliament should be approached to engage young people directly on this issue.

3.5 Although the task group has made a number of recommendations that it thinks can help to improve immunisation services in Brent, members were encouraged by the efforts that NHS Brent have made to improve the immunisation service during the course of the review. There is a genuine commitment from the organisation to improve immunisation rates in the borough and stop the spread of diseases that are clearly preventable. A significant data clean-up project has been taking place which is crucial if Brent is to increase immunisation rates. Maintaining accurate data now becomes of paramount importance so that progress can be maintained.

3.6 NHS Brent is responsible for delivering the childhood immunisation programme in Brent, but the task group believes that a partnership approach with children’s centres and schools will be beneficial and ensure greater coverage. For this reason the task group has made a number of recommendations relating to children’s centres and schools to help facilitate the immunisation programme.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 NHS Brent has provided a response to the task group’s recommendations, which is included as an appendix to this report.

5.0 Legal Implications

5.1 There are no legal implications for the council arising from the report.

6.0 Diversity Implications

6.1 None

7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

7.1 None


Background Papers

Contact Officers

Andrew Davies, Policy and Performance Officer, Tel – 020 8937 1609
Email – andrew.davies@brent.gov.uk

PHIL NEWBY
Director of Policy and Regeneration

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|--|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Policy and Regeneration</p> |
| <p>For Action Wards Affected: ALL</p> | |
| <p>Services for women in and exiting prostitution Task Group report</p> | |

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 This report brings to the Executive the work, findings and recommendations of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's task group investigation into *Services for Women in and exiting prostitution*.
- 1.2 This task group was set up following the publication of Eaves POPPY Project's report *Big Brothel – A survey of the off-street sex industry in London (August 2008)*. Their research identified Brent has having the second highest number of adverts for brothels in local news papers in London. As these finding were potentially significant for Brent the task group focussed on the scale and nature of prostitution in Brent, the impact of a major sporting arena, tackling sex industry adverts in Brent and working in partnership to provide services for women in and exiting prostitution.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive endorse the task group's recommendations
- 2.2 That members of the task group be thanked for their work

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 Eaves POPPY Project's report *Big Brothel - A survey of the off – street sex industry in London* highlighted Brent as having the second highest number of adverts for brothels in local news papers in London. While this does not necessarily mean that Brent has the second highest number of brothels the findings were potentially significant.

- 3.2 The issues highlighted in Eaves POPPY Project's report were raised at the Crime Prevention Strategy Group by the lead member for Crime Prevention and Public Safety. Partners involved in the group agreed to support the task group's work. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee agreed a partnership approach was essential and the police and NHS Brent were invited to participate in the task group's work.
- 3.3 In order to complete the work identified in the scope and produce locally implementable recommendations that will help this vulnerable group of people, the task group undertook the following research:
- Helen Atkins – Eaves R&D POPPY Project on prostitution and trafficking with a focus on the London Borough of Brent
 - David Thrale – Director of Environmental Health on the licensing of massage parlours
 - Andy Brown – Head of Substance Misuse, NHS Brent about local themes and perspectives on substance misuse and the sex industry
 - Christine Topping – Violence Against the Person Focus Desk Manager, Brent Police, provided an snapshot of police intelligence relating to prostitution in Brent
 - Helen Hepburn Development Manager, Make a Change Ipswich, and DCI Tim Beach, Suffolk Constabulary explained how the Make a Change projects had started following the murders of women involved in prostitution in Ipswich, the barriers they faced and their current work in developing an off street prostitution strategy.
 - DCI Kevin Hyland CO14, Clubs and Vice, Metropolitan police
 - David Blake, Publishing Director, Archant London
 - Alice Peycke, Partnership Co-ordinator, Safe Exit, Toynbee Hall, Tower Hamlets told us about a court diversion initiative which aims to provide better services for women involved in prostitution
 - The Chair of the task group attended the *Solace Human Trafficking Conference* which launched their report into the role of local authorities in addressing human trafficking.
 - The Chair of the task group attended the Developments in Prostitution Policy conference organised by the Eaves the parent organisation for

the Poppy Project. Information brought back to the task group included:

- Taking a human rights based approach to prostitution – Cate Briddick, Rights for Women
- Parliamentary developments on legislation against demand for prostitution – Fiona Mactaggart MP
- GAPS Newcastle, sexual exploitation and sex work in Tyne & Wear – Laura Seebohm & Kelle Holliday
- Successful demand prevention in Nordic Countries – Gunilla Ekberg CATW international

3.4 The task group's work focussed on the following areas:

- The scale and nature of prostitution in Brent
- The Impact of a major sporting arena
- Tackling sex industry adverts in Brent
- Working in partnership to provide services for women in and exiting prostitution

4.0 Recommendations from the Task Group

1. That the Brent police make the tackling of prostitution in Brent a higher and more co-ordinated priority.
2. That Brent Police:
 - Enhance the awareness of Brent police officers and staff about the issues faced by women involved in prostitution and those who have been potentially trafficked.
 - Provide appropriate training to selected police staff around how to support and deal with women affected by these issues. (This is to include for example advice about tactical options in relation to dealing with a report of a local brothel).
 - Provide clear guidance as to partner staff and the public about how to report a crime against a woman affected by these issues and/or other concerns.
3. That Brent Council and partners, via the Crime Prevention Strategy Group, continue the work the task group has started in relation to the Olympics with the CO14, Safe Exit and other Olympic boroughs to reduce the

- opportunities for organised crime, trafficking and prostitution associated with major sporting events.
4. That the council and partners lobby the Mayor of London to ensure a pan London strategy / approach is developed prior to the Olympics.
 5. That the council and partners continue the task group's work and keep lines of communication open with the press to influence them to keep to their own guidelines and ensure that adverts relating to the sex industry do not include, for example:
 - Photographs
 - Information on ethnicity
 - Information on age
 6. That local newspaper groups operating in Brent agree to carry a prevention and deterrent advert next to sex industry related adverts, the contents of which will be agreed by partners but will include useful contact numbers.
 - 7 That the task group's report and the issues it raises are included in an article in Brent Magazine.
 8. That it is a priority for all front line local authority and partner staff to remove cards advertising sex services from public areas.
 9. That a Partnership Strategy on prostitution is produced which includes the development of services to help women exit.
 10. That a Stakeholder Event is held to bring together all relevant agencies in the borough to help develop the Partnership Strategy.
 11. That a Partnership Group be set up to take this work forward. This should be the responsibility of the Crime Prevention Strategy Group and include some of the task group membership to ensure continuity of developing expertise. The work of the group should include:
 - Identifying resources available to provide services and assistance for women exiting prostitution
 - Ensuring all relevant agencies know how to identify and respond to women in need of assistance.
 - Continue to gather and examine evidence about the scale and nature of prostitution in Brent
 - Develop and update a list of policy and tactical leads from partner organisations, and a map of services and pathways available to women within Brent and nationally
 12. That NHS Brent develops a treatment and care pathway for those women who are involved in or want to exit prostitution.

13. That action against landlords is taken when a brothel is identified - eg letter to tell them they are breaking the law, and checks against council tax.

5.0 Response to the task group's recommendations

5.1 The chair of the task group presented the draft task group report to the Crime Prevention Strategy Group on 19th January 2010 to consult partners about the key findings and recommendations. Members of the Crime Prevention Strategy Group welcomed the report and endorsed the recommendations.

| Recommendation | Response | Officer Responsible |
|---|---|---|
| <p>That the Brent police make the tackling of prostitution in Brent a higher and more co-ordinated priority.</p> | <p>Brent Police undertake to support this recommendation</p> | <p>Brent Public Protection DCI currently Kevin Concannon / will be DCI Matt Bonner</p> |
| <p>That Brent Police:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the awareness of Brent police officers and staff about the issues faced by women involved in prostitution and those who have been potentially trafficked. • Provide appropriate training to selected police staff around how to support and deal with women affected by these issues. (This is to include for example advice about tactical options in relation to dealing with a report of a local brothel). <p>Provide clear guidance as to partner staff and the public about how to report a crime against a woman affected by these issues and/or other concerns.</p> | <p>Brent Police now have a Borough Champion in relation to Prostitution and Vice issues.</p> <p>Training package to be developed and delivered to all SNT and other selected staff. As part of the training package officers will be provided with a set of questions which will aid risk assessment and identification of potentially trafficked victims.</p> <p>Additional training to be considered for front line partner staff ie: Libraries, One stop shops</p> | <p>Christine Topping, Brent Police</p> <p>Christine Topping, Brent Police</p> <p>Christine Topping, Brent Police</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | This area of work is to be included in the service plan for the Brent Community Safety Partnership unit | Genny Renard, Head of Brent Community Safety Partnership |
| That Brent Council and partners, via the Crime Prevention Strategy Group, continue the work the task group has started in relation to the Olympics with the CO14, Safe Exit and other Olympic boroughs to reduce the opportunities for organised crime, trafficking and prostitution associated with major sporting events. | <p>Work has commenced to find the appropriate sub-group to take this work forward.</p> <p>It will remain a standing item on CPSG partnership update to ensure that it remains within the high priority group.</p> <p>Brent police will contact CO14 Vice Team and establish a single point of contact so that intelligence / information can be exchanged quickly</p> | <p>Genny Renard</p> <p>Christine Topping Brent Police</p> |
| That the council and partners lobby the Mayor of London to ensure a pan London strategy / approach is developed prior to the Olympics. | This work will be taken up by the sub group and CPSG | Genny Renard |
| <p>That the council and partners continue the task group's work and keep lines of communication open with the press to influence them to keep to their own guidelines and ensure that adverts relating to the sex industry do not include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photographs • Information on ethnicity • Information on age | <p>Working with the Police and Communications Team the CPSG will continue to press for these guidelines to adopted and adhered to.</p> <p>Work with other boroughs is being explored and in addition the Lead Member for keen to continue to lobby central Government for legislative changes.</p> | Genny Renard |
| That local newspaper groups | This will be included in | Genny Renard |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>operating in Brent agree to carry a prevention and deterrent advert next to sex industry related adverts, the contents of which will be agreed by partners but will include useful contact numbers.</p> | <p>the work outlined above</p> | |
| <p>That the task group's report and the issues it raises are included in an article in Brent Magazine.</p> | <p>The report will be publicised through the various channels open to the council in local, national and specialist media and through social media to enhance the council's reputation as a forward-thinking community partner.</p> <p>The CPSG has from time to time funding from the Home Office or Metropolitan Police Association to place adverts, items in the Brent Magazine and other publications. Wherever feasible given the guidelines attached to the funding this issue will be raised.</p> | <p>Cheryl Curling, Communications Manager</p> <p>Genny Renard</p> |
| <p>That it is a priority for all front line local authority and partner staff to remove cards advertising sex services from public areas.</p> | <p>Safer Neighbourhood Teams have been asked to remove cards and stickers and forward them to the Violence Against the Person Focus Desk Manager at Brent Police for intelligence checks</p> | <p>Christine Topping, Brent Police</p> |
| <p>That a Partnership Strategy on prostitution is produced which includes the development of services to help women exit.</p> | <p>This is to be included in the two year work plan being developed for Brent Community Safety Partnership Unit</p> | <p>Genny Renard</p> |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>That a Stakeholder Event is held to bring together all relevant agencies in the borough to help develop the Partnership Strategy.</p> | <p>This will form part of the work involved in developing the strategy</p> | <p>Genny Renard</p> |
| <p>That a Partnership Group be set up to take this work forward. This should be the responsibility of the Crime Prevention Strategy Group and include some of the task group membership to ensure continuity of developing expertise. The work of the group should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying resources available to provide services and assistance for women exiting prostitution • Ensuring all relevant agencies know how to identify and respond to women in need of assistance. • Continue to gather and examine evidence about the scale and nature of prostitution in Brent • Develop and update a list of policy and tactical leads from partner organisations, and a map of services and pathways available to women within Brent and nationally | <p>As outlined currently the CPSG are exploring if this important raft of work should sit within an established group or stand alone.</p> <p>The research focuses on making best use of resources and having the maximum impact.</p> <p>Various funding avenues are actively being explored with a view to garnering additional resources hopefully on a one to three year basis or possibly initially seeking resources to help with the inevitable impact Olympics.</p> <p>Brent Police have raised the level of intelligence gathering activity. SNT training should improve the police's ability to gather and act on intelligence.</p> <p>The development of a strategy will include the mapping of services and agencies available.</p> <p>It will also be based on updated evidence.</p> | <p>Genny Renard</p> <p>Chrisitne Topping, Brent Police</p> <p>Genny Renard</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>That NHS Brent develops a treatment and care pathway for those women who are involved in or want to exit prostitution.</p> | <p>NHS Brent will continue to commission services through Brent CRI Brent Outreach Engagement Treatment Service (BOETS) to work with those women who are involved in the sex industry/prostitution in both on street and off street settings.</p> <p>A clear line of activity to be included in the Adult Treatment Plan 2010/11 to ensure rapid access to prescribing services and Blood Born Virus interventions (where opiates are involved), clinical healthcare assessment and rapid access to GUM clinics.</p> <p>The target for clinical interventions for substance misuse is a 72 hours to enable a rapid access to services and assist in the exit strategy</p> | <p>Andy Brown, Head of Substance Misuse, Brent PCT</p> |
| <p>That action against landlords is taken when a brothel is identified - eg letter to tell them they are breaking the law, and checks against council tax</p> | <p>Brent Police have drafted letters to serve on Landlords of premises being used as brothels.</p> <p>If the property is listed incorrectly, the council could take action. However, if the premise is being used as a business, we would need to refer it to the Valuation Office to get it included on the business list, and then charge NNDR.</p> | <p>Christine Topping, Brent Police</p> <p>Paula Buckley Head of Revenues</p> |

6.0 Financial Implications

- 6.1 The Community Safety Partnership team are exploring sources of funding, in particular they are developing a bid for the Daphne European fund. This bid is for £3 million over five years and is an interacting programme around women, children and violence Daphne111. A further European Bid relating to drugs has also been submitted and this will also cover women in the sex industry -

As is common in Local Government, services will be prioritised and tailored to fit the funding profile of any successful bid. A key element of any externally funded project will be the sustainability of the service offered at the end of the funded period. Extensive work is being done to make sure that interventions create identifiable savings and/or are undertaken with voluntary sector groups who can apply for charitable or trust funding to make sure that following a robust evaluation any key services additional services can be maintained.

7.0 Legal Implications

- 7.1 The Authority has the ability to work with their partners as identified in the recommendations. Under S 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 which provides that every Local Authority has the power to do anything which they consider is likely to achieve one or more of the following objectives;

- The promotion of improvement of the social well-being of their area
- The promotion of the economic wellbeing of their area
- The promotion or the improvement of the environmental well being of their area.

In the circumstances of the proposals the promotion of the work identified by the recommendations falls within the well-being power provided by S2.

8.0 Diversity Implications

- 8.1 Recommendations from task groups are incorporated within service department's delivery or development plans and as such will be subject to the equalities impact assessments carried out by services as part of their work programme.

9.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

- 9.1 None

Background Papers


Services for women in and exiting prostitution task group

Contact Officers

Jacqueline Casson
Senior Policy Officer
Jacqueline.Casson@brent.gov.uk

Phil Newby
Director of Policy and Regeneration

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|---|
|  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 style="text-align: center;">Executive 12 April 2010</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Report from the Director of Communication and Diversity</p> |
| | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Community Consultation, Engagement and Empowerment Strategy 2010 - 2014</p> | |

1. Summary

- 1.1. This report presents Executive members with a draft of the new Community Consultation, Engagement and Empowerment Strategy 2010/14. This strategy replaces the Community Consultation and Engagement Strategy 2006/09.
- 1.2. The new strategy is a framework partnership document, developed in the first instance between the Council and NHS Brent and overseen by the consultation board. The strategy is open to adoption by all member agencies of the local strategic partnership, 'Partners for Brent'.
- 1.3. The development of a new strategy was initially identified as a task in the corporate area assessment consultation, engagement and empowerment action plan, agreed by corporate management team in May 2009.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. Members are recommended to adopt this 'in principle' document as the Community Consultation, Engagement and Empowerment strategy 2010/14. The strategy will be published formally in May 2010.

3. Detail

- 3.1. **Background** - Developing a partnership approach to consultation and engagement was one of the improvement activities agreed by corporate management team in May 2009. The principal drivers for this initiative were new national requirements the council is required to meet under the comprehensive area assessment, (CAA) regime and new legislative arrangements, i.e. Part 7, section 138 Local Govt Public Involvement in Health

Act 2007, which brings into force the 'duty to inform, consult and involve'. In addition Brent's previous consultation and engagement strategy was due to expire at the end of 2009.

- 3.2. Under the CAA regime the Council and its partners are required to demonstrate an understanding of the experiences and needs of residents as well as showing that this information is being used to shape service delivery. Specific partnership actions regarding this agenda include:
 - Producing an annual partnership plan;
 - Working with partners to ensure partner responsibilities for undertaking consultation and engagement are carried out;
 - Coordination of the communication of consultation and engagement activity and results across the partnership.
- 3.3. The two principal partners in the development of the strategy so far are Brent Council and NHS Brent. Strategy development has been overseen by the CAA consultation, engagement and empowerment working group and latterly by the consultation board.
- 3.4. **The Strategy** – the strategy is a partnership framework document. The principal partners, the council and NHS Brent are already fully signed up to this approach, but the strategy document is open for adoption by other partners in Brent.
- 3.5. A joint action plan is attached to the strategy. This document will form the core of the annual partnership plan.
- 3.6. The key themes in the new strategy are shared strategic objectives and common quality standards for undertaking consultation activity. Shared strategic objectives include:
 - Making engagement more effective;
 - Information sharing and a shared evidence base;
 - Improving stakeholder empowerment to create real influence;
 - Linking engagement to improved service satisfaction;
 - Tackling exclusion by improving the inclusivity of consultation and engagement;
 - Promoting best practice and innovation in consultation and engagement activity;
 - Developing a consistent approach;
 - Improving partnership working;
 - Greater involvement of elected members.
- 3.7. Quality standards for consultation have been rewritten around key themes of:
 - **Clarity** – explaining why we are consulting and how we will take people's views into account;

- **Inclusiveness** – ensuring the under-represented groups in the community are routinely included in consultation and engagement activity;
- **Valuing people** – organising consultation that values people;
- **Follow up** – reporting back and acting on the findings of consultation.

3.8. **Progress to date** – the draft strategy has been consulted on the following occasions:

- Presentation to Brent’s corporate management team on 18 February 2010.
- Presentation the Local Strategic Partnership Board at its meeting 1 March 2010.
- A joint council/NHS Brent community consultation day for partners and the public was held on 10 March 2010.

3.9. An agreed final version of the strategy will be published in May 2010.

4. Financial Implications

4.1. None

5. Legal Implications

5.1. There are no legal implications beyond those set out in the body of the report, (see section 3.1).

6. Diversity Implications

6.1. None

7. Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

7.1. None

Background Papers

Community Consultation, Engagement and Empowerment Strategy 2010/14

Contact Officers: Owen Thomson – Head of Consultation

Toni McConville
Director Communication and Diversity

This page is intentionally left blank

Partners for Brent

Community Consultation, Engagement
& Empowerment

STRATEGY

2010-2014



Community Engagement and Empowerment A Partnership Strategy for Brent

Foreword from Partners from Brent

Forward from Partners for Brent

Welcome to Partners for Brent's Community Consultation, Engagement and Empowerment strategy 2010 – 2014. This is a partnership framework document which sets out our priorities and ambitions for how we will consult with, engage and involve our respective stakeholders in all aspects of the services we provide, from design through to delivery. The strategy also sets out our minimum quality standards for consultation and engagement activity and outlines our commitment to making consultation and engagement a partnership endeavour for Brent.

Chair of the Brent Local Strategic Partnership

What is the Local Strategic Partnership?

The Brent local strategic partnership, (Partners for Brent) is a partnership that brings together a range of organisations within the public, private, community and voluntary sectors responsible for delivering services at a local level.

The key values of Partners for Brent are:

- To deliver efficient, accessible and sustainable services to excellent standards;
- To develop tailored solutions to meet the needs of individuals, families and communities;
- To celebrate the Borough's diversity and build upon our national reputation for nurturing successful community cohesion.

Effective engagement and the involvement of all our stakeholders is a key factor in ensuring that Partners for Brent is able to meet the needs and aspirations of Brent's residents.

The partnership consists of:

- Brent Council
- NHS Brent
- Metropolitan Police
- London Fire Brigade
- Central and North West London Mental Health NHS Trust
- North West London Hospitals NHS Trust
- BrAVA
- College of North West London
- The Employer Partnership
- Brent HAG
- Learning and Skills Council
- Brent schools
- Job Centre Plus
- London Development Agency
- Brent Community/Lay members

Vision/Mission - Statement of Common Purpose

Statement that outlines an agreed common purpose and values for a partnership approach to consultation and engagement.

We share a common public; community empowerment, citizen satisfaction and service accountability are shared themes across all public services. Citizens and communities have knowledge about the wider concerns of an area, the different causes of and solutions to local problems and ideas about what would be a better use of available resources. With this in mind, we will put our community and stakeholder priorities at the centre of service planning and provision.

We will do this in a coordinated way, adhering to shared principles and standards and in such a way as to avoid duplication and enhance the citizen experience with local public services.

Policy context

Community engagement has become increasingly important for local authorities and our partner organisations. It is at the heart of central government policy to improve and modernise local services. Some of the government's key policy initiatives include:

- *The new performance framework including the National Indicator set and the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA);*
- *New legal duties for council's and other public organisations – the duty to inform, consult and involve, the duty to respond to petitions, and obligations under the Sustainable Communities Act;*
- *New empowerment tools – including participatory budgeting, the councillor call for action and community ownership;*
- *Sections 242/244 NHS Act 2006;*
- *World Class Commissioning;*
- *NHS Constitution;*
- *Race Relations Amendment Act 2000;*
- *Disability Discrimination Act.*

The rise of community engagement and empowerment is also driven by the potential opportunities that that agenda offers to local public services in terms of increased well being and place shaping. Community engagement and empowerment provides opportunities for the involvement of local people in the services they use and has practical benefits for public services:

- *Research shows that effective communications is a key driver of resident satisfaction;*

- *Brent in common with other public service organisations increasingly adopts an 'evidence based' approach to its service planning;*
- *We know that members of the public are increasingly interested in being more involved in the decisions made at local level (Brent Council's 2009 Residents' Attitude 39% of people agree).*

What is community engagement?

Community engagement is a term covering a spectrum of activity carried out with people who make up our communities. It's about making sure that people can participate and engage in lots of different ways to make Brent a better place.

In recent years various engagement models have been developed and refined which attempt to describe a range of opportunities for stakeholders, from passive recipient of information to active participant in the delivery of public services. Conventionally these can be summed up as informing, consulting and involving.

1. **Informing** - Information is the basic element of customer focus and community engagement. Information is needed to access services but also to enable people to understand the nature and quality of services. Information is the day business of public authorities and good public service organisations will strive to communicate effectively and continuously with their stakeholders.
2. **Consulting** - the process by which public services seek advice, information and opinions about strategies, policies and services, to inform decision making and design good services which reflect the aspirations of stakeholders. The usual forms for gathering this type of consultation information are surveys, focus groups and public meetings.

3. **Engaging** – over and above being informed and/or consulted and providing real opportunities for stakeholders to get involved in the design, shape and delivery of services.

AIM

We aim to improve the lives of local people through effective engagement and communication with our stakeholders including the public, service users, patients, staff, other partners, providers, voluntary and community groups, opinion formers and seldom heard and under-represented groups to better understand each other's needs and priorities.

The new partnership Consultation and Engagement Toolkit, (replacing the Brent Council Consultation Toolkit), is a shared resource which provides comprehensive advice and guidance on a wide range of communication, consultation and engagement techniques. The toolkit is principal resource for planning consultation and engagement projects.

Strategic Objectives

1. We will share results

Results from consultation and engagement will be shared across the partnership to increase involvement, avoid duplication and consultation fatigue amongst residents and to make best use of available resources. Results of consultation undertaken within the partnership will be fed into our evidence bases to enrich the information available for service planning and strategy development. Consultation and engagement activity will be publicised in the local media to increase good news coverage of engagement activities across the partnership.

2. We will empower local people

Partners for Brent will develop and put in place regular and effective processes which enable all Brent residents to influence and control the services and quality of life in the area in which they live and work and to ensure the needs of local people are met.

3. We will improve satisfaction with our services

Resident satisfaction with public services is a key indicator of our performance and how we are perceived by local people. In Brent we will strive to show continuous improvement during the life of the consultation, engagement and empowerment strategy.

4. We will include under-represented groups

Brent is a multi-cultural, young and vibrant community. More than 55% of our residents are from Black Asian Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups and the borough has the highest proportion of people born outside the EU. The views and concerns of 'under-represented' or 'seldom heard' groups are known and routinely used to inform service planning and delivery. No community or group will be disadvantaged by the way that Partners for Brent engages with residents.

5. We will use the best tools and techniques

We will develop regular, effective and seamless community engagement mechanisms across the partnership. We will encourage the use of different tools and techniques when planning consultation to ensure consultations undertaken are effective, engaging, and make the most of new resources and technology. Advice and guidance on how to use a wide full range of consultation tools are set out in the partnership Consultation and Engagement Toolkit.

6. We will communicate clearly and simply

We will ensure that communication and information materials are written clearly and simply and can be accessed at home, at work, at school and on the move.

7. We will work in partnership

We will work together to make best use of consultation, engagement and empowerment opportunities. We will ensure that consultation and engagement protocols, procedures and quality standards are routinely applied across the partnership ensuring efficiency, value for money and consistency of approach.

8. We will engage elected members

Elected members, (local councillors and members of parliament), will use their role as community leaders to engage local people, using established consultation and engagement methods such as the area forums and neighbourhood working. A constructive relationship between elected members' and their constituents provides useful information for the partners and helps enhance democratic engagement and participation in the borough.

Measures of success / evaluation

The effectiveness of our communication and engagement strategy will be monitored and our principal measures of success will be:

- *The Place Survey – specifically the measurement of National Indicator (NI) 4 – opportunities to influence local decision making;*
- *Brent Residents' Attitude Survey – a face to face survey measuring, liveability, service satisfaction, health, policing, community safety on service satisfaction;*
- *Patient survey (NHS Brent);*
- *Patient perception survey (NHS Brent);*

- *Staff surveys;*
- *Qualitative feedback annual report (NHS Brent);*
- *Ad-hoc research using the Brent Citizens' Panel;*
- *Media monitoring.*

Governance and partnership working

Communication and engagement is governed by Brent council's Consultation Board and in NHS Brent by the PPE Steering Group. Both the Consultation Board and the PPE steering group report directly to their respective executive management teams, for the council this is the Corporate Management Team and for NHS Brent, their Executive Management Team. Brent Council and NHS Brent are represented in the membership of each of these groups. We will establish a practitioner level consultation and engagement officer group open to all partners which will sit below this group.

DRAFT

Appendix 1

Consultation standards

Principles and quality standards will bring about improved coordination and consistency between consultation and engagement activity undertaken in Brent. Revised standards, (below) are the minimum quality standards with which all consultation and engagement activity should comply. The revised standards have been arranged around the key headings of:

- **Clarity**
- **Inclusiveness**
- **Valuing people**
- **Follow up**

The standards are

1. Clarity

We will explain why we're consulting and how we're going to take people's views into account.

- *Have a plan and communicate this – be clear about your purpose, what change is possible and where people can make a difference;*
- *Don't promise what you can't deliver; explain where decisions have already been made and what the parameters are;*
- *Be clear about what you are asking people; who will be affected by proposals and timescales involved;*
- *Information must be clear and concise – use plain language and no jargon;*
- *Check what else is happening in the borough / organisation and seek to coordinate activities.*

2. Inclusiveness

We will involve the widest spectrum of the community in our consultations, including under-represented, marginalised and 'seldom heard' groups.

- *Go where people are – don't expect them to come to you. Consider approaching existing groups and networks;*
- *Don't just speak to people who currently use services – past and future users have valuable input too;*
- *Identify potential barriers for people to get involved and remove them wherever possible;*
- *Be responsive to people's needs - consider providing expenses and be flexible in your approach;*
- *Offer a variety of appropriate methods for the people you want to involve and what you want to find out;*
- *Make sure you give enough time for people to respond.*

3. Valuing people

We will organise consultation in ways which are convenient and accessible to the people whose views we are seeking.

- *Involve people from the outset and throughout the whole process;*
- *Value people's skills and knowledge – listen to what is said;*
- *Value and reward people's time and input;*
- *Make people feel comfortable about asking questions – they are not necessarily experts;*
- *Allow people to speak freely – respect their confidentiality and privacy;*
- *Make it enjoyable!*

4. Follow up

We will act on the findings to improve services, programmes and quality of life for local residents. We will report back to the public what they've told us during the consultation and what we've done as a result of it.

- *Give quick, responsive feedback on what people have said;*
- *Consider what people have said and decide what action to take;*
- *Let people know what you are going to do and when;*
- *If you can't do something let people know and explain why;*
- *Involve people in bringing in the changes;*
- *Evaluate how effective your consultation / engagement was;*

- *And remember to report all activity through appropriate channels and to share results with partners and other key stakeholders.*

DRAFT

Appendix 2

Consultation Framework – listed below are some of Brent’s standing fora/user groups that partnership members might want to engage in the process of community consultation.

| Consultation Opportunity | Frequency | How to access |
|--|--------------------|--|
| Five area consultative forums | Quarterly meetings | Brent Council |
| Service user consultative forums covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pensioners ○ Disabled users ○ Voluntary sector ○ Private sector housing ○ Black & minority ethnic | Quarterly meetings | Brent Council |
| Multi faith forum | Ad-hoc | Brent Council |
| Brent Citizens’ Panel | Ad-hoc | Brent Council |
| Brent LINK | Ad-hoc | Hestia |
| Safer Neighbourhoods’ Panels | Ad-hoc | Police SN Teams |
| Neighbourhood working | Ad-hoc | Brent Council |
| Brent Youth Parliament | Ad-hoc | Brent Council Children & Families |
| 4 Area Housing Boards | Quarterly meetings | Brent Housing Partnership |
| Open Forum | Quarterly meetings | BrAVA |
| Community Safety Board | Ad-hoc | Brent Council Community Safety Team |
| Brent Health and Social Care Forum | Bi-monthly | NHS Brent |

This page is intentionally left blank