

Bridge Park Heads of Terms 2

Department

Regeneration and Growth

Person Responsible

Jill Rennie

Created

14th May, 2015

Last Review

14th May, 2015

Status

Complete

Next Review

31st August, 2015

Screening Data

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

Brings Forward New Housing - To bring forward the development of circa. 500 new homes. This was to include new tenures such as private rented housing

Quality & architecture & design - To deliver exemplar quality architecture and urban design and landscape design to transform the Bridge Park neighbourhood to improve resident's life chances and maximise value to the benefit of the regeneration programme.

Brings forward significant improvement to the joint sites - Brings forward significant improvement across the Council, Car Breakers and Unisys sites, through creating a new Leisure Centre and bringing back into use the Unisys site

State of the art sports facilities to the local community - To relocate the existing Sports Centre to a modern fit for purpose facility supporting the Council regeneration agenda.

Future of Bridge Park - To make a clear decision about the future use of the Councils Bridge Park site

Deliver a Sports Centre at no cost to the Council - Paid for out of CIL and land value

Delivers continuous sport provision - Delivers a centre at the beginning of the development programme before the existing centre closes

This equality analysis is attached to the June 2015 Cabinet report which is a follow on to two previous Cabinet reports. The June 2015 Cabinet report relates mainly to entering into the Heads of Terms.

Heads of Terms

Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre and Technology House (a separate office block on the site) have a backlog of repairs and both need future investment to bring them up to modern standards. The ex-Unisys site (owned by Harborough Invest Inc (Harborough) to whom General Mediterranean Holdings SA (GMH) are a parent company) has stood vacant for over a decade. A development between GMH and the council would secure a significant land value with a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to afford a replacement leisure centre. The current leisure centre would not close until the new leisure centre is built. The development would result in the Council selling part of its site to Harborough/GMH - see attached Cabinet report.

The Executive agreed in June 2013 that the council pursue the option of GMH and its subsidiary company (Tucan a special purpose vehicle proposed for the purposes of this development) developing the Unisys and Bridge Park sites for residential and commercial development to fund a new Bridge Park sports centre. The principle where GMH sit behind the transaction has not changed. The Council is seeking agreement to enter revised Heads of Terms with GMH & Harborough, which results in a greater land receipt to the Council. GMH have indicated that their subsidiary will be Harborough and no longer Tucan Investments Plc. GMH have explained that it would be sensible for the landowner to be party to the agreement rather than a new development vehicle.

The Executive in February 2014 agreed to the preferred Leisure Centre option, this was option 3 which included a swimming pool which the current centre does not have. This Cabinet paper does not seek any changes in regards to the Leisure Centre option at this time, as such the equality analysis on the Leisure Centre option has not be revisited and should be read in conjunction with this analysis.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

Residents: There will be a new state of the art Leisure Centre for local residents, with the current provision not closing until the new one is built. Property which has stood vacant for over a decade will be redeveloped. A New housing provision will provide opportunities for the local community and the development of the site and the hotel development could provide local employment opportunities. A There will be no re-provision of the function hall/large meeting rooms, as such those who utilise this will be affected.

Staff: Bridge Park Community A Leisure Centre is now showing its age and is difficult to manage because it is a converted bus garage. Because entry is difficult to control, security staff have to be employed. Any new centre would have new and up-to-date facilities and proper controlled access would increase security. If the existing centre is kept open until the new one opens then there would be no implications to staff if current arrangements are maintained. If it were chosen to outsource any new centre then TUPE arrangements would apply.

Tenants within the Bridge Park site: There are approximately 20 separate individuals/organisations utilising the business space at Bridge Park, (four of which are Council departments), and includes two church groups, an upholsterer, a nursery, charities and storage purposes. A As this accommodation will not be re-provided there will be an impact on these individuals/organisations.

Car breakers yard site: The car breakers yard site is to be acquired as part of the development. A The quality of the existing car breaker's site contributes to the poor physical environment that currently exists in the wider Bridge Park site. The acquisition either through negotiation or CPO would extinguish the existing car breakers business operating from the site at the rear of Bridge Park. A There would be a financial payment for any acquisition of the site.

External Stakeholders: By pursuing a deal with GMH the Council is not releasing the option of disposing of the Council land to the market. A This could result in the Council not getting best value for money as the market has not been tested through an open marketing campaign (though it should be noted that Deloitte have stated that the GMH offer for the Land at Bridge Park was above that of Deloitte LLP revised opinion of value). A The Council is also not giving other organisations the chance to bid for the opportunity if this had been available on the open market. A External Stakeholders will have the opportunity to bid for work on the development of the Leisure Centre. The Council did consider if a development could be taken forward on the Council land solely, but decided to progress with a holistic development.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

- Yes

If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

- Age
- Disability
- Gender identity and expression
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Other (please specify)

The equalities analysis completed for the 2014 February Cabinet paper was concerned with the new Leisure Centre option. The equality analysis did identify that a new Leisure Centre (option 3) would have a positive impact on age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, sex and sexual orientation, with an adverse impact on religion and belief.

The previous equality analysis outlined the options and reasoning for option 3 and the impacts.

As part of the redevelopment the business units will not be reprovided, this was discussed in the previous equality analysis, but it is being re-looked at in this analysis, given the impact. It should also be noted that the function hall/large meeting rooms are also not being re-provided within the preferred option.

Of note from the previous equality analysis in respect of the business units and function hall/meeting rooms was that: There is only one consistent fortnightly room hire of the current function hall. There were 29 casual bookings of the function hall over the last year and there is no guarantee that such bookings will be repeated. Equalities data is not available with regard to casual use although anecdotal evidence would suggest that the profile is reflective of the ward. There is consistent use of the existing meeting rooms at BPCLC by four faith groups (1 Muslim and 3 Christian). Inclusion of meeting rooms that can accommodate approximately 40 people has not been included in any of the facility options.

The business units at BPCLC are offered at a commercial rent. There are a range of voluntary and commercial organisations as well as Council teams that rent business units. We don't hold demographic information on these groups but the nature of the work of their work would indicate that no particular equality strand will be proportionally adversely impacted by the proposals. The provision of business units is not proposed within any of the new facility options. Officers will work with these organisations to signpost them to alternate Council owned units.

The wider development will provide new housing which could be accessed by the community, whilst the affordable offer is on a sliding scale and will be a matter dealt with through the planning process, the increase in housing supply in the area is positive.

There is also the possibility of employment for the local population through the construction process and also through the new hotel development.

The redevelopment will provide an improved local environment which will have a positive impact on the local community. By pursuing a deal with GMH and Harborough, the Council is bringing forward a holistic redevelopment of the Bridge Park site including the Unisys Buildings, which have stood empty for a number of years. The Heads of Terms allows for the Leisure Centre to remain open whilst the current one is being built. The other benefit of this approach is that the comprehensive nature of the development helps overcome potential flood issues on the site, increases overall housing numbers, develops a desirable sustainable local environment impacting overall values as the outlook between the two sites is enhanced and the open space within the Scheme can be planned comprehensively.

The redevelopment will require the acquisition of the car breakers yard site which will have an adverse impact on the owner and those who work on the site. Equality data is not known. As this would be an acquisition through either negotiation or CPO there would be a financial payment. Given equality data is not known the car breakers yard is not discussed in detail below, but it should be noted that there is an adverse impact on the car breakers yard.

By pursuing a deal with GMH the Council is however not releasing the option of disposing of the Council land to the market and not giving other organisations the chance to bid for the opportunity if this had been available on the open market. The land price has been robustly tested in order to align with best market price and external consultants to Brent have undertaken detailed development appraisal, valuation and sensitivity testing work confirming the GMH and Harborough proposal to represent best value. A big positive of this transaction is that it brings momentum and is a catalyst to redevelopment of the land standing empty – the former Unisys buildings. External Stakeholders will have the opportunity to bid for work on the Leisure Centre.

Overall the proposals would be positive on equality groups with the exception of those utilising the business units and the function room/meeting space, the car breakers yard or those who may have bid for the Council land should it have been released to the market. The Council does not hold equality information on the groups within the business units, but equality impacts have been extrapolated based on the nature of the organisation. The Council can also not anticipate the equality groups who may have applied for the opportunity to bid for the council land, although the size of opportunity would result in companies and corporates being most likely to bid.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups?

- Yes

If you answered 'Yes', please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are disproportionately impacted

- Age
- Religion or belief
- Other (please specify)

Age

The Montessori Nursery currently operates on the Bridge Park site. The 0-4 age group will be negatively affected by the Montessori Nursery not continuing to operate on the Bridge Park site.

A new leisure centre, housing and employment opportunities will have a positive impact across age groups.

According to the 2011 census, Stonebridge had the most males and females in the 5-to-19 age group in a ward, the

breakdown is:

Age Census 2011:

0-4:	8.86%	(1,498)
5-19:	26.11%	(4,413)
20-34:	22.15%	(3,744)
35-49:	21.10%	(3,566)
50-64:	13.10%	(2,215)
65+:	8.68%	(1,467)

New housing in this area will provide a positive opportunity as this population ages and seeks to move out of parental accommodation.

Overall, whilst there is an adverse impact for the nursery, overall for age this will be positive due to the opportunities the redevelopment brings.

Religion or belief

The largest religion followed in Brent remains Christian at 41.5% in the 2011 Census however this has declined from 47.7% in 2001.

Religion of the Stonebridge ward was:

Religion 2011 census:

Buddhist:	0.44%	(74)
Christian:	49.86%	(8,436)
Hindu:	6.32%	(1,069)
Jain:	0.10%	(17)
Jewish:	0.17%	(29)
Muslim:	28.20%	(4,772)
Sikh:	0.16%	(27)
Other religion:	0.50%	(84)
No religion:	6.72%	(1,137)
Religion not stated:	7.54%	(1,275)

85.7% of the residents in Stonebridge had a religion.

There are two Christian organisations using business units at Bridge Park - Melody Tabernacle (a Christian Ministry) and New Life Christian Centre. Religious groups have also been affected by function hall/meeting rooms not being re-provided in the new Leisure Centre option. Overall there will be a negative impact for religion/belief

Other

PLIAS Resettlement is a community based not for profit organisation, and registered charity. The support services offered are available to residents of the London boroughs of Brent and Harrow and other boroughs in West London. PLIAS Resettlement was formed in September 2004 and was officially established in December 2005. Their main objective is to provide numerous services, primarily targeting offenders and ex-offenders, in order to support their reintegration back into society.

This group is not covered by the Census data. Metropolitan Crime data shows Brent to have average crime rates for London. It is not known the impact that PLIAS has in Brent or the immediate area.

The loss of this service from the area if new accommodation can not be found is assumed to be negative.

People from low income backgrounds and Traveller Community

All neighbourhoods in the ward feature within the 25% index of multiple deprivation 2010.

The median household income in Stonebridge is below the Brent median figure of £31,601 at £22,188.

There are approximately 5,903 residential properties in the ward, most of which are social rented

Stonebridge ranks as the lowest ward in terms of median household income.

Brent's only travellers' site is also situated in the ward at Lynton Close.

As such the loss of the commercial and function hall/large meeting space will have an impact on local residents who utilise these services. However, the positive benefits of the redevelopment will be felt by these residents through a new state of the art leisure centre being provided, possible employment opportunities, new housing opportunities and an improved urban environment.

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

- Yes

PLIAS Resettlement is a registered Charity and not-for-profit organisation that supports the reintegration of ex-offenders back into the community.

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

- Yes

Stonebridge ranks as the lowest ward in terms of median household income.

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

- Yes

If you answered 'Yes', please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

- Religion or belief
- Other (please specify)

The removal of space for the Religious group's particularly Christian organisations and the ex-offender charity is likely to be sensitive for these groups

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

- Yes

To encourage residents to participate and engage with us in order to help us to shape local priorities and improve our performance in service delivery across the protected groups. There has been consultation on the Leisure Centre option and there will be further consultation opportunities through the planning process.

To ensure that sound equality practices underpin our Procurement and commissioning processes. Whilst the opportunity to develop the Council land is by a land sale agreement. The tendering for the professional team will use sound equality practices.

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes

Comments

I have gathered information from the previous equalities analysis, tenancy schedule for the commercial units and ward profile.

I have reviewed the effect the proposal will have on different groups.

Going forward with the project, further engagement will be required with the commercial tenants and users of the function hall/large meetings rooms to capture their equality characteristics.

Rate this EA

N/A

Impact Assessment Data

5. What effects could your policy have on different equality groups and on cohesion and good relations?

5.1 Age (select all that apply)

- Positive

The previous equality analysis identified a positive impact on age and this analysis continues to identify a positive

impact on age.

A new Leisure Centre which will have a swimming pool will be positive as the previous Equality Analysis identified that for 16 – 25 years olds swimming was the second most popular sport activity in England with it the most popular for those aged 26+ (Active People Survey 7). With a high young population, the provision of new housing in the local area which the population could take advantage of is a positive in that it provides the opportunity for young people to move out of their family home, but also provides for the opportunity to stay in the local community. However, it is not known if new housing would be affordable, especially given that Stonebridge ranks as the lowest ward in terms of median household incomes. Current planning policy requires a target of 50% affordable homes subject to development viability. This development will be looking at a much lower percentage level due to the need to provide a capital receipt and advance CIL to fund a new leisure centre.

There will be a negative impact for those of/require nursery provision or who would use business space. The Ofsted report for the Montessori nursery in October 2014 identified that there were currently 19 children on the roll, all in the early years age range, out of a total number of places available of 30. The user numbers are small and the report does show that the nursery is not used to full capacity.

The 2013 Executive paper stated that "Officers will however look at further options to replace the nursery during the proposed consultation process". It should be noted that options to replace the nursery have not been explored.

5.2 Disability (select all that apply)

- Positive

The previous equality analysis identified a positive impact on disability and this analysis continues to identify a positive impact on disability

The previous equality analysis identified that: The estimated direct cost of physical inactivity to the NHS across the UK is £1.06 billion. This is based upon five conditions specifically linked to inactivity, namely coronary heart disease, stroke, diabetes, colorectal cancer and breast cancer. (Department of Health: Start Active, Stay Active). As a borough Brent has lower than average self-reported good health. Unemployment constitutes a significant risk factor for health as it is associated with general ill health, including ill health, disease and depression. Stonebridge and Harlesden wards have the highest rates of unemployment in the borough. Brent has one of the most inactive adult populations in London and England. Sport England's Active People Survey 7 (APS7) results show that nationally 46.9% of adults undertake zero sport and active recreation once a week, reducing to 46.1% in London. In Brent 52.8% of Brent's adult population undertake no sport or active recreation. The results showed that Brent's males are more active than females with those undertaking sport and active recreation 3 times per week for 30 minutes which varies slightly from the membership profile:

20.9% were male and 16.8% were female.
26.1% were aged 16 – 34, 17.1% aged 35 to 54 and 8.2% aged 55+.
20.9% were white and 17.4% were non white

The previous equality analysis identified that: Stonebridge has statistically significantly lower than average rates of reported good health with 16.8% of the ward's residents have a limiting long-term illness.

In November 2013, 1.5% (125 people) of Stonebridge residents of working age - aged 16 to 64 - were claiming disability benefits (Nomis). This rate is higher than the 0.8% rate for Brent, and the 0.9% rate for London.

The proportion of residents who felt that they had good health increased from 68.3% in 2001 to 79.9% in 2011.

In the census, 1 in 6 (16.5%) Stonebridge residents considered that their health had a limiting impact on their day to day activities. This is higher than the rate for Brent of 14.5%.

As such ensuring good quality leisure facilities in the area is important to help improve the health of the local population.

New developments will also be up to the necessary building standards which includes access to and use of buildings and sanitary conveniences in buildings.

5.3 Gender identity and expression (select all that apply)

- Positive

This equality analysis has not identified any specific impact on this equality group, the overall development will have a positive impact therefore a positive impact would be expected.

The 2014 Equality Analysis identified a positive impact

5.4 Marriage and civil partnership (select all that apply)

- Positive

This equality analysis has not identified any specific impact on this equality group, the overall development will have a positive impact therefore a positive impact would be expected. A possible impact could be the removal of function hall/large meeting space could remove a venue for weddings/civil ceremonies, however as per the previous Equality Analysis there are other venues.

The 2014 Equality Analysis identified a positive impact

5.5 Pregnancy and maternity (select all that apply)

- Positive

This equality analysis has not identified any specific impact on this equality group, the overall development will have a positive impact therefore a positive impact would be expected.

The 2014 Equality Analysis identified a positive impact

5.6 Race (select all that apply)

- Unknown

Whilst the equalities data on race is not available for the tenants of Bridge Park and the function room/meeting room users, there is an assumption, especially in regards to the Church users, that there is a significant Black and Asian use, this would be inline with the ethnic breakdown of Stonebridge which is:

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British – 47%

Asian/Asian British – 17%

The previous equality analysis identified that a survey carried out by Sporting Equals into the 2010 APS3 results concluded that swimming has a higher than average non-white participation profile and is a relatively popular sport with all ethnic groups. It is more popular with white and non-white females compared to white and non-white males. Swimming is often carried out as a family recreational activity with BME groups, which is why it is so popular.

The 2014 equality analysis concluded that there would be a positive impact for race, this analysis recognises that there maybe an adverse impact associated with the church users, but there is not the data to verify this.

5.7 Religion or belief (select all that apply)

- Negative

The previous 2014 analysis identified an adverse impact, this analysis continues to conclude that there will be an adverse impact.

The previous equality analysis identified that there was consistent use of the existing meeting rooms at BPCLC by four faith groups (1 Muslim and 3 Christian). The current business space includes two church groups. As such these groups will be adversely affected as there will not be the business or meeting space re-provided in the new development.

5.8 Sex (select all that apply)

- Positive

This equality analysis has not identified any specific impact on this equality group, the overall development will have a positive impact therefore a positive impact would be expected.

The 2014 Equality Analysis identified a positive impact.

The previous analysis identified that the provision of a pool is likely to attract a greater percentage of female users.

5.9 Sexual orientation (select all that apply)

- Positive

This equality analysis has not identified any specific impact on this equality group, the overall development will have a positive impact therefore a positive impact would be expected.

The 2014 Equality Analysis identified a positive impact.

5.10 Other (please specify) (select all that apply)

- Negative

There will be an adverse impact for those who use the ex-offenders charity provision at Bridge Park.

6. Please provide a brief summary of any research or engagement initiatives that have been carried out to formulate your proposal.

What did you find out from consultation or data analysis?

Were the participants in any engagement initiatives representative of the people who will be affected by your proposal?

How did your findings and the wider evidence base inform the proposal?

The current list of occupiers using business space at Bridge Park
Census 2011 data/Stonebridge Ward Profile
Leisure Centre consultation was carried out in 2013 and used to inform the previous equality analysis which has been discussed in this analysis
HM Government, The Buildings Regulation 2010, Access to and use of buildings
Met Police data

What did you find out from consultation or data analysis?

The previous equalities analysis provided background to the results of the previous analysis. It identified that whilst there were adverse impacts, overall the new Leisure Centre would have a positive impact on the majority of equality groups.

The public consultation which ran had 5 options for the Leisure Centre redevelopment which did include a "do nothing" option which would have left the site with the business, function and meeting room provision. The consultation had approximately 95% of the respondents who voted for an option other than do nothing.

Responses included:

1. Significant enthusiasm for the idea of a swimming pool, some drawing attention to the considerable distance from other swimming pools, and suggestions for how this could be operated, for instance: male and female only sessions, more lanes, and a salt water pool.
2. Concerns about the loss of the existing facilities, particularly the commercial units and Christian Centre, and because the building is a landmark.
3. Suggestions as to alternative facilities which could be provided: dance studio, pool/snooker tables, cafe, spa/beauty treatments, squash and table tennis: and different modes of operation: local staff, sport/activities for those with learning disabilities, and no more footballers.
4. Concerns about Brent losing ownership and control, and particularly the partnership with UNISYS a company considered to have a poor record in Brent.
5. Concern about cost, whether in terms of development costs, raised charges when the new centre opened, or that budgets should be better spent elsewhere.

Previous consultation results are discussed with the 2014 Equality Analysis.

In respect of the June 2015 paper comment 4 & 5 are relevant. The others relate to the specification within the leisure centre.

Were the participants in any engagement initiatives representative of the people who will be affected by your proposal?

The 2013 consultation received 177 responses, due to the small sample size it was stated that it made any options comparisons based on the equality strands difficult to statistically validate.

The consultation was publicised by:

- Emailing 2,000 of the leisure centre members using registered emails
- Leafleting households close to the centre
- Advertising consultation on the council's Twitter and Facebook pages
- Council press release and an article in the Brent and Kilburn Times

The commercial tenants were invited to the initial consultation, though their response was that there was no need for them to attend as there would be no future for them in the redevelopment

An exhibition was held at BPCLC during August and September showing all five options. Two face to face events were held at BPCLC on the 20 August and 12 September. Participants were asked to rank these options 1 to 5 with one being their most preferred option.

Once again it is noteworthy this 2013 consultation was in respect of leisure centre options.

How did your findings and the wider evidence base inform the proposal?

The previous Cabinet paper and Equality Analysis established that there was a desire for a new Leisure Centre at Bridge Park and that this would have an overall positive impact. The 2013 Cabinet paper agreed the proposal of working with GMH.

This Cabinet report continues to recommend entering into the Heads of Terms. The analysis does however identify groups who will be specifically affected by these proposals and where further equality information does need to be acquired. This will then help to inform how the Council can engage with these groups to help identify alternative accommodation. It should however be noted that the Council could not "ring fence" accommodation to groups.

7. Could any of the impacts you have identified be unlawful under the Equality Act 2010?

- No

Not to my knowledge

8. What actions will you take to enhance any potential positive impacts that you have identified?

Current planning policy requires a target of 50% affordable homes subject to development viability. This development will be looking at a much lower percentage level due to the need to provide a capital receipt and advance CIL to fund a new leisure centre. However, affordable housing should be provided

Buildings will be built in line with current building requirements.

The Council will work with colleagues to identify whether local residents can take advantage of employment opportunities as the scheme progresses

As outlined within the report the Council is to review the current mix of facilities to see to see if the on-going revenue costs required can be removed to allow for the Leisure Centre to operate without any funding from the Council. This will be positive as it will allow the service to continue and should not be impacted by Council cuts.

9. What actions will you take to remove or reduce any potential negative impacts that you have identified?

Further engagement will be made with groups who are currently adversely affected by the proposals to help to identify alternative solutions. In terms of the business space we will sign post organisations to Council space available, but this will need to be applied for through the Councils standard procedures. We will give the organisations as much notice as possible and keep them informed, in particular the commercial tenants.

The previous equality analysis identified alternative function and meeting room space within a 3 mile radius of the Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre. As the redevelopment progresses a revised list will be drawn up to disseminate to groups.

10. Please explain the justification for any remaining negative impacts.

There are two remaining negative impacts:

1. Organisations/individuals who could not relocate their business/activities with the loss of business, meeting or function space
2. Organisation/individuals who have not been able to take advantage of the opportunity to redevelop the Council land

1. It is unknown how many organisations/individuals would not be able to relocate. It is deemed that a new Leisure Centre and Housing will have a positive impact on a greater number of people than this loss. There are few places within the borough where a new development of c.500 units could be located with the development providing for the opportunity for a new Leisure Centre to be built through the receipts and CIL. The business tenants currently in Bridge Park are small scale and could potentially re-locate elsewhere. The car breakers site may not be able to locate elsewhere due to the size and nature of the business, however, the car breakers owner would receive a financial payment for the site. As identified within the previous equality analysis there are a range of other meeting and function space within a three mile radius which could be utilised.

2. There is not mitigation against those who have not been able to take advantage of the opportunity to develop the Council land. The deal with GMH provides the following positive impacts:

A joint proposal regenerates both Bridge Park and the Unisys Buildings and values will be better if both sites are brought forward to enhance the other

Bridge Park will not be closed until the new sports centre is built and the new centre is built up-front as a first phase. The new sports centre will be fully funded by the development through a land payment and CIL.

The risk of the enabling housing development lies with GMH and not the council.

Organisation Sign-off Data

11. What did this equality analysis conclude?

- The proposal was found to have some justifiable negative impacts

12. Please write a brief summary of your equality analysis which should be included in the 'diversity implications' section of any reports.

The proposals show that there will be an overall positive impact as a result of the redevelopment. The redevelopment will provide a new state of the art leisure centre, with the current leisure centre staying open whilst the new one is built. New homes will be built and there will be potential employment opportunities through the build stage or within the new hotel. The deal with GMH will bring about the redevelopment of the Unisys site, which has stood empty for more than a decade and bring about an improved local environment. Stonebridge ranks as the lowest ward in terms of median household income and has the only traveller site within the borough located in the ward. As such providing improved facilities and investment into the area should hopefully have positive impacts for the community.

There will be adverse impacts as part of the redevelopment, which are discussed below and in detail in the attached Equality Analysis.

The redevelopment will require the acquisition of the car breakers yard site which will have an adverse impact on the owner and those who work on the site. As this would be an acquisition through either negotiation or CPO there would be a financial payment.

Business space and large meeting room space is not being re-provided, this will have an adverse impact on those utilising this space. Particularly this will have an impact on "religion or belief" with a number of religious groups utilising commercial space or space within the centre. There is also a nursery which uses the business space and a group called PLIAS which primarily targets offenders and ex-offenders, in order to support their re-reintegration back into society. The previous equality analysis identified community space within a three miles radius which those utilising the function hall/meeting room space could use. In total there are around 20 individuals/organisations using the business space at Bridge Park (including 4 Council departments). The Council will seek to help sign posts business organisation to available premises, but any premises the Council had would need to be openly marketed. It should be noted that the business units are not fully occupied with 9 units vacant and 3 under offer out of 42 units.

Through pursuing a deal with GMH the Council is not releasing the option of disposing of the Council land to the market and not giving other organisations the chance to bid for the opportunity if this had been available on the open market. The land price has been robustly tested in order to align with best market price and external consultants to Brent have undertaken detailed development appraisal, valuation and sensitivity testing work confirming the GMH & Harborough proposal to represent best value. A big positive of this transaction is that it brings momentum and is a catalyst to redevelopment of the land standing empty, the former Unisys buildings. External Stakeholders will have the opportunity to bid for work on the Leisure Centre.

The equality analysis has identified that there is a lack of information on the equality characteristics of those using the function hall and meeting room space and the business space users. The Council will seek to gain equality information to better inform the redevelopment going forward, and to be able to assist those who are affected.

13. I confirm that this equality analysis represents a fair and reasonable view of the implications of this proposal on equality and that appropriate actions have been identified to address the findings.

Enter your name

Sarah Chaudhry

Enter your designation

Head of Strategic Property

Enter your department

Regeneration & Growth

Enter today's date

15-05-2015

Comments

Commercial negative impact and proposed mitigation. Brent will signpost users to alternative space. Including the councils own buildings and if available and tenants wish to apply they would need to go through the councils application process.

In respect of community use. We will sign post them to alternative provision. The last equality analysis identified the space available in a 3 miles radius and we will update this information closer to the time.

Those commercial interests that are not able to buy the land. There is no mitigation proposed. As the party we are contracting in is in a unique position. And provided the best value test is satisfied which it is as we had an external third party consultants report confirming best value. Then we will work with the adjoining landowner to bring forward not only the leisure centre redevelopment but also the development of new homes and a new hotel on the former Unisys site.

Next Review Date

2015-08-31

Outstanding Actions

No outstanding actions