



## Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee – Supplementary Agenda

**Monday 15 April 2019 at 6.00 pm**

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Kelcher (Chair)

Kansagra (Vice-Chair)

Nerva

Gill

S Butt

Gbajumo

Kabir

Mashari

#### Substitute Members

Councillors:

Aden, Ethapemi, Hassan, Johnson, Kennelly, Long and  
Stephens

Councillors:

Colwil and Maurice

**For further information contact:** Bryony Gibbs, Governance Officer  
020 8937 1355; [bryony.gibbs@brent.gov.uk](mailto:bryony.gibbs@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](http://www.brent.gov.uk/committees)**

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

### **Notes for Members - Declarations of Interest:**

If a Member is aware they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest\* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent and must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If a Member is aware they have a Personal Interest\*\* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent.

If the Personal Interest is also significant enough to affect your judgement of a public interest and either it affects a financial position or relates to a regulatory matter then after disclosing the interest to the meeting the Member must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item, except that they may first make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the matter, provided that the public are allowed to attend the meeting for those purposes.

### **\*Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:**

- (a) **Employment, etc.** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between the Councillors or their partner (or a body in which one has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences** - Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which the Councillor or their partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

### **\*\*Personal Interests:**

The business relates to or affects:

- (a) Anybody of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management, and:

- To which you are appointed by the council;
- which exercises functions of a public nature;
- which is directed is to charitable purposes;
- whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy (including a political party or trade union).

- (b) The interests of a person from whom you have received gifts or hospitality of at least £50 as a member in the municipal year;

or

A decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial position of:

- You yourself;
- a member of your family or your friend or any person with whom you have a close association or any person or body who is the subject of a registrable personal interest.

# Supplementary Agenda

Item	Page
<b>4 Minutes of the previous meeting</b>	<b>1 - 18</b>

To approve the minutes of the previous ordinary meeting held on 14 March 2019 and the minutes of the special committee meeting held on 3 April 2019 to consider a call-in of a Cabinet decision.



- Please remember to set your mobile phone to silent during the meeting.
- The meeting room is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES AND PUBLIC REALM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** **Thursday 14 March 2019 at 6.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair) and Councillors Nerva, Gill, S Butt, Gbajumo, Kabir and Johnson (in place of Councillor Mashari)

Also Present: Councillors Krupa Sheth and McLennan

### **1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members**

Apologies were received from Councillor Mashari. Councillor Johnson was attending as a substitute member.

### **2. Declarations of interests**

There were no declarations of interest made.

### **3. Deputations (if any)**

None.

### **4. Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 February 2019 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

### **5. Matters arising (if any)**

The Chair advised that a reply had been received to the letter sent to the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) from the Chair and Lead Member for Community Safety. The response from MOPAC would be circulated to the committee.

### **6. Chair's Report**

The committee considered the Chair's report which included comment on the agenda for the current meeting, reasons for the selection of topics, and detailed the work of the committee outside of public meetings.

RESOLVED: that the report of the Chair of the Resources and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee be noted.

### **7. Contracts 2023 - Merits & obstacles of bringing services back in-house**

The Chair advised that the committee would consider this item in two parts: first the committee would review the report from the Strategic Director of Resources regarding the merits and obstacles to bringing the Business Rates Service back in

house; secondly; the committee would receive a presentation from the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Lead Member for Environment on a proposed programme of work to design, deliver and integrate a range of front line environmental services due to be recommissioned for implementation in 2023.

At the invitation of the Chair, Margaret Read (Director of Brent Customer Services) introduced the report from the Strategic Director of Resources. Members heard that the Business Rates Service and associated IT Support had been retendered, with the contract award made to Capita Business Services Ltd following Cabinet approval on 12 November 2018. The contract was due to commence from 1 May 2019 and was for a period of five years. The report detailed an evaluation of the options for delivering the Business Rates Service, including advantages and disadvantages of in-house, shared service and outsourced delivery models. It was highlighted that a detailed options appraisal had been undertaken in 2017, at which time Cabinet had decided against bringing the service back in-house, noting that this would introduce a number of risks. In particular, as a small, specialist service with a big financial impact, it was prone to resilience issues. A key benefit of outsourcing the service was that it allowed services to be run at a larger scale therefore minimising vulnerability of the service to staff absence. Additionally, to bring the service back in-house would require investment in various specialisms including IT support. It was emphasised that the Scrutiny review was extremely timely as the council was now due to start planning for the next five year period.

The committee subsequently questioned whether better use of technology could address resilience issues. Members requested details of the number of businesses in the borough, queried whether relief was still offered for London Living Wage employers and questioned how the council supported the growth through mixed use developments. The committee further questioned whether contractors were incentivised to address hard to reach companies and whether the council made use of civil enforcement officers to aid debt recovery.

Responding to the queries raised Margaret Read advised that it was not possible to automate the service due to the complexities involved and the need for judgement in decision-making. The Council's Finance Department did monitor the number of businesses in the borough and this had not increased, though it was likely that the nature of Brent's businesses may have changed. Councillor McLennan (Deputy Leader) confirmed that the council continued to offer Business Rates relief to London Living Wage employers. Amar Dave (Strategic Director, Environment and Regeneration) confirmed that the council pursued mixed use developments but also sought to tailor the mixed-use offer as appropriate for specific sites. Margaret Read advised that the council ran a scheme under which the contractor helped identify businesses that may have been missed. The council also operated several initiatives to ensure that Brent's businesses received the assistance to which they were entitled. Civil Enforcement Officers were used where it was considered appropriate.

The Chair thanked the officers for their contribution to the discussion.

Members' attention was then drawn to the presentation on Environmental Services contracts, introduced by Councillor Krupa Sheth (Lead Member for Environment), Amar Dave (Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment) and Chris Whyte (Operational Director of Environment). The committee heard that a purposeful

strategy had been adopted to synchronise the end dates of existing delivery models for Environmental Service contracts to enable the council to determine their future status before recommissioning for implementation in 2023. In doing so, the council had the option to design and integrate a range of frontline services, including Arboriculture Services, CCTV maintenance, Highways Maintenance, enforcement activity, Parking Enforcement Services, SEN Transport, Street lighting maintenance and Waste and Public Realm Services.

Highlighting key elements of the strategy, Chris Whyte explained that this included an outcome based delivery model with a clear commissioning strategy and clearly defined specifications regarding the level, quality and timing of delivery. The programme had five key objectives: establishing the services to be included; determining service standards and specifications; designing an integrated Environmental Services delivery model for Brent from 2023; establishing the duration of any new arrangements; and, establishing how the council would manage any new arrangements. It was explained that all delivery options and contract timescales would be considered, allowing for radical thinking and innovation. Outlining the next steps, Councillor Krupa Sheth advised that a members' away day would be held as an important early means of establishing the scope and key principles of the programme of work. Amar Dave emphasised that in order to have everything in place for 2023 implementation, work needed to be undertaken in the next three to six months to support contract awards no later than 2021.

In the following discussion, Members endorsed a joined-up approach and sought comment on related commissioning models, HR issues and how soft boundaries with neighbouring boroughs could be addressed. The committee questioned how social value would be accommodated within delivery models and queried whether a phased approach would be considered. Questions were raised regarding accessing expertise necessary to get the best out of contracts and whether exit clauses were written in to all contracts if contractors did not deliver as expected. Members questioned whether consideration would be given to supporting local businesses via the programme.

In response, Chris Whyte advised that early thinking around themes for the programme, included an on-street enforcement presence, with potential to pull a number of services together under an 'eyes and ears' initiative. Members further heard that the approach to commissioning was clear and the council wanted to encourage use of a supply chain to support this work going forward, optimising opportunities for local people. It was acknowledged that when considering options such as in-house delivery, the council had no recent history of delivering these services directly and there were challenges associated with that, not least HR support. These contracts could encompass between 400 to 500 members of staff. Amar Dave explained that he had prior experience of running such services in house and advised that in many ways it worked very well and had lots of flexibility, but in such circumstances it was important to foster the right culture. It was highlighted that in addition to a thematic approach, consideration could be given to focussing on a geographical approach, or even by size or value of contract. A phased approach could also be applied if felt beneficial. Addressing members comments on social value, Councillor McLennan advised that a report was due to be submitted to Cabinet regarding broadening the definition of social value and increasing the percentage weighted for social value when assessing tenders for

contracts. Amar Dave advised that there were best practice models, such as those provided by the New Economic Foundation, with regard to social value which could be utilised.

Chris Whyte explained that in view of the scale of the exercise, outside expertise would be brought in to help guide the process. Technical, financial and economic insight was also critical and such support would be drawn from Local Partners, a company owned by the LGA and the Treasury, and from other teams in the council including Procurement and Legal. It was also often useful to gather bidders and suppliers together to gather their views on what would work for Brent in practice and it was necessary to be mindful of the planning of neighbouring boroughs. A project manager had recently been appointed to take forward the project and specialist legal advice was currently being procured via the legal team.

Members were advised that all the council's main contracts were underpinned by a complex performance framework, which was subject to monthly monitoring performance reports. Any failures recorded against contracts would be dealt with via a financial deduction. Councillor Krupa Sheth advised that she met with different contractors every two weeks to review performance.

The Chair thanked everyone for their contribution to the discussion and emphasised the importance of this piece of work.

RESOLVED:

- i) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment ensure a role is established for Scrutiny Members with regard to the Member Away Day and the scope and expectations relating to that role be detailed and circulated to members.

## **8. Air Quality Pledges**

Jennifer Barrett (Nuisance Control Team Manager) introduced the report on the progress made against the Brent Air Quality Action Plan 2017-2022, noting that the five year plan sought to cut local pollutant emissions from key sources. Provided as an appendix to the report was the Annual Status Report for 2017, which the council was required to provide to the Mayor of London.

Jennifer Barrett advised that one of the core objectives had been engagement with the public and schools, advising that air quality around schools had been identified as an urgent priority. The report detailed a number of projects with schools including a raft of activities being undertaken under the council's Breathe Clean project. This project built on previous work with schools, including school audits, tailored assemblies and the ongoing schools idling programme, to provide data allowing the council to better estimate exposure of children to poor air quality around Brent Schools. It was intended that by late Spring 2019, the council would have a shortlist of high-priority schools.

Outlining another key strand of activity, Jennifer Barrett advised that emissions from construction sites from non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) had the potential to significantly contribute to local pollution. A GLA sponsored programme around inspection of this equipment was now underway and all London boroughs were



expected to join at a cost of £4,000 – a sum significantly less expensive than implementing a programme individually. It was intended that the council would join the NRMM action group once arrangements had been confirmed.

The Chair thanked Jennifer Barrett for her introduction to the report and invited questions from the committee. Members sought assurance that this was a matter of high priority for the Cabinet and questioned what regular monitoring data was provided to the Lead Member. Members welcomed the initiatives described but questioned what intensive, urgent action was being taken to address those four areas identified at crisis point. The committee emphasised the importance of community engagement and questioned how Clean Air for Brent was being engaged and included in the council's activities. Members sought to understand the role of the Director of Public Health in the council's response to poor air quality and further questioned the potential impact of the Mayor's forthcoming ultra-low emissions zone, which only partially included Brent. Questions were raised on whether the Cabinet would challenge the car lobby and what enforcement powers officers had with respect to idling vehicles. The committee further pushed for confirmation of the number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) issued by the authority for idling. Discussing the pollution at construction sites, Members questioned what responsibilities developers had to fund mitigating actions to address the pollution caused at their sites and how closely the council worked with developers to achieve carbon neutral developments. Additional questions were raised regarding work with partners such as Transport for London (TfL) to address other significant sources of pollution. In concluding their questioning, Members queried what work was being done to encourage the uptake of more electric vehicles in the borough.

In response to the queries raised, Councillor Krupa Sheth (Lead Member for Environment) confirmed that Brent's air quality was an issue of significant importance. Jennifer Barrett cautioned that changes in results over shorter monitoring periods may not be particularly revealing. It was clarified that some of the intensive work being undertaken with streets surrounding schools targeted those specific areas identified as in need of urgent action. Councillor Krupa Sheth confirmed that she would meet with Clean Air for Brent as an important stakeholder in the activities going forward. It was confirmed that the Director of Public Health was involved with the work regarding air quality and one of the key things Public Health colleagues were currently working on was reviewing and updating the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Brent which provided an evidence base for the CCG when setting their commissioning intentions.

Councillor Krupa Sheth advised that Councillor Tattler (Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning) had met with TfL to discuss the implications of the ultra-low emissions zone for Brent and emphasised that discussions with all members of the council would be needed to determine the political will to support more proactive action against pollution from motor vehicles. Jennifer Barrett advised that Brent's enforcement officers did have the power to issue FPNs to drivers of idling cars if they refused to comply with a reasonable request to desist. However, no such FPNs had been issued to date. Furthermore, the maximum fine that could be awarded was £40 which was a minimal sanction. Other Local Authorities had been more successful using Public Space Preservation Orders (PSPOs) to increase the potential penalty. Brent was exploring this possibility and would take a more robust approach moving forward.

Jennifer Barrett confirmed that there were a range of funds that could be applied for and the schools most affected by poor air quality had been sign-posted to these. Where appropriate, schools and parents had been assisted in applying for Community Infrastructure Levy funds, and had also been very successful in undertaking fundraising to support projects. Via the Breathe Clean project, the council had worked closely with Brent's schools to identify local issues and needs.

Chis Whyte (Director of Environment Services) explained that there had been changes to the structure of Environment Services which brought together the strategic work around Air Quality management, including that of highways, sustainable transport, traffic movement and planning teams. Those structural changes supported the close working already taking place between the different teams.

It was confirmed that Councillor Tatler regularly met with TfL regarding the bus fleets used in Brent and Chris Whyte confirmed that that issue was extended to the council's own large vehicles, such as refuse vehicles and buses. The council proactively pursued grants and other opportunities to install electric car parking facilities in Brent and a diesel surcharge was applied to Brent parking permits.

The Chair thanked the officers for their contribution to the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

- i) That Brent's policy on air quality rigorously focus on our worst areas and spread best practice thereafter.
- ii) That the committee establish a scrutiny task group at the earliest opportunity with the target of taking the action plan and developing into a delivery strategy with measurable and periodic review points.
- iii) The Lead Member for Environment receive regular updates from officers on the air quality in the target hotspots, with the results sent to all members periodically, as appropriate.
- iv) That the Chair of the committee write to the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board to request that the Board consider air quality in Brent as a Public Health issue and that this be added to the Board's future programme of work.
- v) That the Lead Member for Environment meet with Clean Air for Brent and that members of the Scrutiny Committees be invited to attend.

**9. Update on initiatives to reduce barriers and increase recycling in flats and flats and above shops**

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Krupa Sheth (Lead Member for Environment) introduced the report updating members on the initiatives to reduce barriers and increase recycling in flats, advising that Kelly Eaton (Policy, Projects and Support Manager) was in attendance to help address the committee's queries. Kelly Eaton highlighted that over 50 per cent of Brent's housing stock was flats and the council worked proactively and creatively, seeking ways to support and achieve

better levels of recycling in these properties. Summarising the activities undertaken, Kelly Eaton explained that a large project continued with the Education Team of Veolia, the council's public realm contractor, which reduced the proportion of general waste bins in flats and increased the number of recycling bins. It had been found that this helped to reduce the amount of contamination of recycling waste, though this remained a key issue for these communal bins. Recycling and waste collection for flats above shops took place twice a day, seven days a week and these residents were no able to collect free recycling bags from libraries. The council was also examining ways of managing food waste flats – as all flats in Brent were now provided with facilities for recycling and recycling separate food waste.

In the subsequent discussion, members welcomed leaflets helping residents to understand what could and couldn't be recycled but noted that this information needed to be available at the point of use in a very simple and accessible way either on or near the recycling bins. Clarification was sought on the contamination of recycling waste, noting that residents had expressed confusion about why some loads were not collected. The committee further questioned how the assessment was made that recycling matter was being placed in the general waste bins. Turning the discussion to flats above shops, members highlighted the issue of unsightly bags placed haphazardly on pavements for collection, often insufficiently secured, causing spillages. A further query was raised regarding the turnover of tenants in these premises and the difficulties this caused for the work of Veolia's Education Team. In concluding their questioning members sought an overview of the work undertaken with Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) landlord licensing and estate agents to ensure that responsibilities around recycling were communicated to all new tenants. Suggestions were made regarding ways to better communicate and make available information on recycling in Brent including the provision of information on fridge magnets and posters for flats rented out by landlords. A member also noted that the letting website, Zoopla, also provided policy documents for an area if made available to them.

Kelly Eaton responded to the issues and questions raised. Members were informed that where contamination was a frequent issue for particular blocks of flats, the information provided to those residents would be tailored to the specific circumstances. Whilst this did include visits to individual flats, posters would also be provided in the bin sheds to identify what could and could not be recycled. Residents would also be informed of the recyclapedia app available. With regard to contamination, one small item would not condemn a whole collection. If following a brief visual inspection, there was deemed to be so much non-recyclable material in a collection to cause it to be rejected, a bin tag should be left to identify why it had not been collected and the refuse collection team should be notified to collect the bin in the following rounds. Whilst this was the expected process, it was acknowledged that this did not always proceed as smoothly as intended and members were encouraged to share any information from residents where this did not happen. Officers assessing whether recycling material was just being placed in general waste bins did so by looking at the volume of waste. It was known that approximately 70 per cent of household waste could be recycled and it was therefore reasonable to expect similar proportions of recycling to general waste in the communal bins.

Kelly Eaton advised that residents were informed that robust black bags with tie handles needed to be used for general refuse to prevent spillages. This formed part

of the 'Love where you live' campaign and it was hoped that there may be a decline in these issues as information continued to be made available to residents.

Commenting on the issue of frequent turnover of tenants in some types of properties, Kelly Eaton welcomed members suggestions and confirmed that a trial had previously been run whereby the council worked with estate agents to identify those new to the borough. The Neighbourhood Manager for Willesden Green was looking into repeating this trial. Members further heard that as a condition of landlord licensing, landlords were responsible for informing residents of the correct methods of disposal. There was close working with the licensing team to share information about related issues. A key issue for HMOs was insufficient garden/outdoor space to accommodate the waste for the number of residents at the property but unfortunately, there was little that could be done about that particular issue.

The Chair thanked the officers and members for their contribution to the discussion.

10. **Any other urgent business**

None.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm

M KELCHER  
Chair

**MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES AND PUBLIC REALM SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday 3 April 2019 at 6.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor Kansagra (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Nerva, Gill, S Butt, Gbajumo, Kabir and Mashari

Also Present: Councillors Hassan & Conneely (to present the call-in), Councillor Tatler (Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways and Planning – to respond to the call-in) and Councillors M.Butt, Johnson and McLennan.

**1. Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members**

None received.

**2. Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming everyone in attendance. Highlighting that a number of requests had been made to speak at the meeting he began by briefly outlining the way he was intending to conduct the meeting and way that the call-in procedure would be undertaken at the meeting.

**3. Declarations of interests**

There were no declarations made at the meeting.

**4. Deputations (if any)**

The chair advised that he had received a number of requests to speak at the meeting in relation to the Call-In on the Cabinet decision relating to the Carlton & Granville Centres site – South Kilburn, which would be considered under that item on the agenda.

**5. Call-In of Executive Decision - Carlton and Granville Centres Site - South Kilburn**

Having received the report from the Director of Performance, Policy & Partnerships detailing the background to the call-in referred to the Scrutiny Committee for consideration, the Chair began by inviting Councillors Hassan and Conneely to outline the reasons for the call-in and alternative action being sought as a result.

Councillor Hassan advised that whilst recognising the progress made since 2016 in terms of the changes made to delivery of the scheme, the call-in had been designed to reflect significant local concerns that remained in relation to maintaining the much valued community provision and use on the site. These concerns had been strengthened as a result of the proposed mixed residential use on the site

proposed under Phase 2 of the development, with local residents keen to safeguard the existing and future use of the site as a community facility given the need and limited amount of community space already within the South Kilburn area. Concerns were also raised in relation to the potential tension between a mixed residential and community use on the site and also in relation to the proposed community governance arrangements for management of the community facilities on the site with local residents keen to seek much wider community involvement as key stakeholders.

Councillor Conneely in co-presenting the call-in also supported the concerns raised in relation to the impact of the proposed housing development on the well-established community provision on the site. It was not felt that the existing proposals contained sufficient safeguards in terms of managing the co-existence of a mixed residential and community use on the site. Additional concerns highlighted included the need to ensure that any housing units provided were as social housing, given the Cabinet report on which the called-in decision was based had only referred to a preference for Council housing. Given the concerns raised, and need identified to maintain community provision on the site in view of demand in the area, Councillor Conneely felt there was also a need to consider alternative sites for the provision of the proposed social housing units within the area. Whilst recognising the need to address housing demand, it was felt there were other more appropriate sites in the adjacent area on which the housing element of the scheme could be accommodated with specific reference made to the Peel site development on which only 14% of the units were currently due to be provided at social rent. It was felt this would mitigate the potential loss and impact on community provision at the Carlton & Granville Centre site. On the basis of the concerns raised, Councillors Hassan and Conneely urged the Committee to consider referring the original decision back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

The Committee then moved on to consider representations from members of the public and other stakeholders who had requested to speak in relation to the call-in. Comments made were as follows:

Claude Boucher (representing the Kilburn Housing Co-operative Ltd) provided an outline of local community use on the site and its importance in meeting local community needs. As such he advised the Housing Co-operative were opposed to the proposed reduction in community services and facilities that it was felt the development would involve. Concern was also raised in relation to the consultation undertaken on the proposals and to the fact that no guarantee had been provided that the 23 residential units proposed for the site would be provided as council housing. Whilst supportive of the need to provide council housing, it was felt there were other more appropriate residential development sites where these units could be located with reference again made to the low number of social housing units within the Peel Precinct development and concerns regarding wider gentrification of the area. It was felt that further consideration was also required in relation to the impact of the Government's austerity based funding cuts on the most disadvantaged communities, which he felt also supported the need to preserve important and well used community spaces such as the Carlton and Granville Centres.

David Ellison (representing the South Kilburn Trust) highlighted what he felt had been the local levels of support for the Trust in terms of what they were seeking to

achieve in managing and seeking to extend, on a financially viable basis, access to community facilities on the site. He pointed out that since the Trust had taken on management of the Phase 1 community and enterprise hub at the Granville Centre in 2018 there had been over 20,000 visits and 400 community events involving a range of different providers. He also felt it important to recognise the positive impact the proposed Phase 2 development would have in addressing existing provision at the Granville Plus Nursery School. For these reasons he advised he was supportive of the Phase 2 proposals being progressed.

David Kaye (Co-Chair Kilburn Community Neighbourhood Plan Forum) also spoke against the current proposals highlighting concerns in relation to the lack of wider community involvement in terms of the development and current management of community provision on the site and any further reduction in community space with reference made to the proposals for the Enterprise Hub.

Following on, Dawn Sally Holder (local resident) also highlighted a number of concerns in relation to the proposed development and in support to the call-in. Issues highlighted included the potential loss of open community space as a result of the proposed housing development and also concerns relating to the local democratic accountability and engagement of the South Kilburn Trust as a key stakeholder and in the ongoing management of community service delivery at the site. As an example it was highlighted that none of the three local ward councillors were represented on the Trust.

Deirdre Woods and Leslie Barson (Grenville Community Kitchen) both spoke separately in support of the call-in. Deirdre Woods took the opportunity to highlight the unique architectural and heritage aspects of the Carlton and Grenville site, which she felt had not been reflected within the Phase 2 scheme proposals approved by Cabinet. If allowed to proceed in its current form she felt the scheme would damage the heritage legacy of the site and South Kilburn in general. Given the Community Kitchen's long standing use on the site, Leslie Barson supported the concerns raised regarding the impact which any reduction or loss of community space as a result of the scheme moving forward would have on the local area. She was concerned to ensure that space for multi-purpose community use and facilities was maintained on the site given the current levels of demand for a range of support services within the local community and supported a delay in implementing the plans in order to provide more opportunity for the whole community to be involved in helping shape the final scheme.

Dhelia Snoussi (local resident) also spoke in support of the call-in, advising that she shared the concerns expressed around the need to protect and preserve the multi-purpose community use and space on the site and in relation to the proposed housing element of the scheme. She supported the view that more appropriate alternative sites were available for delivery of the housing element of the scheme, again referring to the low density of social housing currently provided within the Peel site development and remained concerned to ensure that assurances were provided regarding its provision as social housing rather than any mixed tenure.

Dolores Miller (local resident) also speaking in support of the call-in took the opportunity to highlight the reduction in community space as a result of the Phase 1 development which had involved the Great Hall on the Granville site being transformed into enterprise space rather than retained as a multi-purpose

community facility. As with other supporters of the call-in she opposed the loss of any further community space given local demand in the area for this type of provision and facilities.

Dolors Vila (local resident) also highlighted concerns relating to management of the proposed mix residential and community use on the site. She referred to previous examples of clauses being included within tenancies for housing blocks elsewhere on Granville Road regarding the acceptance of community use on the site which had not worked, with complaints regarding noise etc arising from the use of the community facilities having eventually led to those activities having to be scaled back or stopped. She was therefore also in favour of this element of the proposals being referred back for reconsideration.

Lesley Benson (Granville Plus Nursery) then spoke in favour of the Phase 2 proposals agreed by Cabinet highlighting the establishment and involvement of the key Stakeholder Group in the development and design of the proposals. The Stakeholder Group had involved a wide range of existing local users and a series of consultation events and meetings designed to provide robust challenge to the scheme design in order to achieve a balanced mix in terms of community elements. The scheme proposals would include a reconfiguration of the existing nursery school site which would enable the school to address current issues in terms of capacity and the need for Special Educational Needs provision and were therefore strongly supported by the nursery school. Whilst noting the concerns expressed in terms of the mixed housing and community use proposed on the site, it was felt that the proposals delivered a coherent, financially viable and innovative scheme that would create more flexible opportunities for community use. The key Stakeholder Group had therefore endorsed the proposals with the need identified to ensure the local community were provided with accurate information regarding the nature of the scheme.

Having reflected on the previous contributions, Peter Denton (local resident) felt it was important for the Committee to focus on the wider social benefits arising from the existing community use on the site. He was also therefore concerned to ensure that multi-use community provision was maintained on the site and no further space was lost as a result of the Phase 2 development.

Peter Firmin (Chair of the Alpha, Gorefield and Canterbury Tenants and Residents Association) also spoke in support of the call-in, highlighting concerns in relation to the local democratic accountability and accessibility of the South Kilburn Trust as the organisation identified by the Council to manage service delivery of the community space and enterprise hub proposed under Phase 2 of the scheme. Specific concerns were raised in relation to the lack of local community representation on the Trust and difficulty experienced in being able to engage with their decision making process. He was therefore keen to seek wider community engagement in terms of the community governance arrangements for management of the community and enterprise space.

As a final contribution, Sheikh Babikir (representing Rumi's Cave Charity as a leaseholder on the Carlton site) felt it was important to highlight the level of existing community use within the Carlton Centre with, he pointed out, more than 2000 people a week using the current facilities and various community based support services (such as his charity) being provided from within the site. As an example



he outlined the range of services and support available from his organisation which included weekend, breakfast and afterschool clubs alongside legal and financial advice for adults which it was likely would be lost if the proposals to redevelop the Carlton Centre in their current form were implemented. He therefore urged the Committee to recognise the concerns raised in relation to the potential loss of community provision on the site given the detrimental impact on the surrounding community.

The Chair thanked all members of the public and stakeholders for their contributions and then invited Councillor Tatler, as Lead Member for Regeneration, Highways & Planning to respond to the reasons provided for the call-in and public representations made at the meeting.

Councillor Tatler began by outlining the Council's support for the Carlton & Granville sites as valuable community assets and recognising the need to maintain space available for community provision. Following the significant change of approach agreed by Cabinet in November 2016 regarding development of the site, the design process moving forward to Phase 2 had, she pointed out, been led by the Stakeholder Group established at the time to take account of views expressed by local community organisations with the Council's role, in this respect, being to act as facilitator.

Following the addition of the site to the revised South Kilburn Masterplan the Council had however been keen to explore the potential inclusion of housing on the site, given the ongoing pressure in relation to housing need with a range of options developed. Having taken account of the strong community presence on the site and results of consultation undertaken, the recommended design option approved by the Cabinet had involved the proposed delivery of 23 units which was a less dense scheme than originally identified and was felt to represent a more acceptable level of development in terms of the shared community use of the site. Whilst the final viability in relation to the affordability of the housing element of the scheme would need to be assessed, Councillor Tatler assured the Committee that the aim was to deliver these units as council housing. In terms of other sites available within the South Kilburn development to accommodate the provision of social housing, Councillor Tatler felt it was important to recognise (given the ongoing level of housing demand) that the Council would need to explore all options available to increase the level of affordable social housing provision on every available site across the borough. The aim being to achieve at least a minimum 50% target for affordable social housing. In seeking to address the concerns raised regarding management of residential and community use on the same site, she highlighted the safeguards available through the planning process and also the successful mix between community and residential use at Willesden Green Library.

In terms of the concern raised regarding the potential loss of community space on the site and impact on the local community, Councillor Tatler highlighted that the proposed option agreed by Cabinet would ensure a range of community use including not only improvements to the Granville Plus Nursery site but also a new community and enterprise space along with an accompanying Children's Centre and Family Hub. The space had been designed to include more flexible use of the facilities available in order to cater for a variety of needs which would also be supplemented by the roll out of the Kilburn Hub initiative at William Dunbar House. She also pointed out that the community and workspace elements had been subject

to extensive discussion with each of the proposed users and the Stakeholder Group.

Whilst drawing the Committee's attention to the fact that the decision taken by Cabinet had been focussed on the development options available rather than community governance arrangements for the scheme, Councillor Tatler finished by highlighting that Cabinet (in response to stakeholder feedback) were also seeking to explore the potential management options available in order to ensure as wide a level of community engagement as possible.

The Chair thanked Councillor Tatler for her response and then invited questions/comments from the Committee, with the following issues raised:

- (a) Given the concerns raised regarding the democratic engagement and accountability of the South Kilburn Trust, Members were keen to explore how this had been assessed in terms of any continued involvement in the community management arrangements for the Phase 2 development. In response Councillor Tatler advised that having worked closely with the Trust her view had been that they did engage well with the local community and had been positive and open in their approach towards development of the Phase 2 proposals, working as part of the wider Stakeholder Group. Carolyn Downs (Chief Executive) also felt it was important to highlight that given the charitable status of the Trust any concerns regarding their structure or democratic accountability would be matters for the Charity Commission or Trustees rather than dealt with under the call-in.
- (b) Further details were sought by the Committee of the basis on which the decision to recommend Development Option 3 as the preferred option from the four identified had been taken. Councillor Tatler confirmed that the identification of Option 3 as the preferred option had been based on close consultation with the Stakeholder Group and developed following consultation with existing users and a review of the existing buildings on site. The final option had represented a compromise in terms of the level of housing included, with initial proposals designed to include a larger number of units but this having been adjusted (following consultation) to endorse the principle of a less dense scheme and also to recognise issues raised relating to the build and management of the space given the shared community use.

In terms of the size of accommodation proposed within the development it was confirmed this would involve 2 x 4 bedroom properties; 4 x 3 bedroom properties; 8 x 2 bedroom properties and 9 x 1 bedroom properties. With regard to the recommended design option the Committee were keen to ensure that assurances were provided regarding the 23 units of housing being delivered as social housing. Whilst recognising the need to address issues in relation to viability, the Committee also felt that the aim should be to maximise the number of three or four bedroom 'family-sized' accommodation. In response, Councillor Tatler advised that the mix of accommodation proposed had been designed to reflect what it was felt would be achievable from a planning perspective and also in order to provide a more acceptable level of development. Whilst these decisions would also need to take account of viability and affordability assessments relating to funding options and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Councillor Tatler provided an assurance

that the Council was committed to the provision of council housing on the site. The Committee, whilst welcoming the assurance provided, felt there was a need for this position to be clarified by Cabinet given the fact that the report on which the called-in decision had been based only referred to a preference for Council housing and also recognising that the position would still be subject to a viability assessment in terms of both the size and tenure of the units achievable.

- (c) Clarification was also sought by the Committee on the level and mix of community space provision within the Phase 2 proposals. In response Councillor Tatler advised that there would be no loss of community event space available on site (currently totalling 445 sq metres). Having considered the need for community provision, she pointed out the proposals would, infact, provide an increase in provision to 588 sq metres which did not include the proposed community enterprise hub or reconfiguration of the existing nursery provision on site. Recognising the comments raised by members of the public and other stakeholders when speaking in support of the call-in, further details were sought on the reasons loss of community space had been cited as a concern, which Councillor Conneely advised had reflected the overall loss of community space under Phase 1 of the development. This had, she pointed out, included the loss of the main hall in the Granville Centre in order to provide enterprise and small office space with concerns also highlighted about the proposed layout and mix of the space to be provided for community use including a lack of any space for large scale events.

Commenting on the new design proposals, Councillor Tatler felt it important to recognise that these included 2 new halls (although separated by the community garden) and more functional space which could be flexibly managed in terms of layout and a more innovative and creative use.

- (d) Further details were sought on the timescale for implementation of the scheme, with Councillor Tatler advising that she was keen to progress the scheme as soon as possible given the fact that its development had involved a two year process and close collaboration over its design with local stakeholders. Although still subject to the necessary planning consideration, she pointed out the scheme was also seen as integral, in terms of its community offer, to the wider development of the South Kilburn area.
- (e) Recognising the concerns raised in relation to the community governance arrangements for management of the development moving forward, the Committee were keen to further explore the options being considered highlighting that the report to Cabinet on which the called-in decision had been based only appeared to refer to the South Kilburn Trust. Highlighting the wider engagement and representative nature of the established Stakeholder Group, Members sought clarification on whether consideration had been given to using this Group to structure the future community management arrangements for the site around. In response, Councillor Tatler reminded Members that she had already advised the future community management options for the site were subject to review. Whilst not able to make any final decisions at this stage she confirmed that a full review of available options would be undertaken with the aim to ensure the final community governance arrangements were as representative as possible. The Committee were once

again keen to ensure this assurance was confirmed by Cabinet with the preference identified being a model involving the Key Stakeholder Group with a broader local community membership rather than involving only the South Kilburn Trust as the key management stakeholder.

- (f) In response to concerns raised regarding the way in which the mix between residential and community use on the site would be managed, Councillor Tatler advised that she had already recognised the need to consider the type of safeguards which could be provided for tenants, especially in relation to noise. These matters were being actively considered by the Council's Housing Management Team and would also be matters for consideration under the planning process with the Committee keen to ensure that adequate safeguards were in place in order to avoid limiting use of the community facilities.
- (g) In terms of other issues raised, the Committee also requested further details on:
- the design of the scheme in terms of open space and concerns regarding tackling anti-social behaviour and safety concerns in the area. Councillor Tatler advised that these issue had been addressed within the design of the scheme, which would involve the provision of community open space. In relation to safety concerns, one of the additional benefits arising from the on-site housing element was the enhancement of community safety through the provision of 24 hour passive surveillance of the outdoor space and other wider design principles.
  - The concerns raised in relation to the heritage and architectural aspect of the design proposals. In response, Councillor Tatler advised that from her perspective the proposals had been designed to retain the heritage and architectural value of the site and existing buildings which had been one of the principles within the design brief.
  - The proposals relating to the redesign of the nursery site and impact should these not proceed. In response Emma Sweeney (Project Officer) advised that the proposals had been designed to improve the current provision on site recognising the significant constraints of the current configuration and layout in terms of capacity and also Special Education Needs provision. The new design, whilst involving some disruption during the construction phase and changes in configuration, had been developed to support a free flow educational model with assurance provided by Councillor Tatler that the need to address safeguarding provision had also been included within the design proposals.
  - The ongoing viability of the current community use on site, should the development and management of Phase 2 of the scheme not proceed as agreed by Cabinet. Having been invited to initially comment, Councillor Hassan felt there was sufficient interest and existing levels of use to ensure continued provision on site with a number of different organisations having expressed an interest in managing the site and alternative sites available for provision of the housing element. In response, Councillor Tatler felt it was important to stress that a range of

options had been considered reiterating that all development sites were subject to ongoing review in relation to the Council's social housing targets. The scheme had also, it was pointed out, been designed to address future financial viability in terms of issues such as running costs and rental charges.

- In terms of the operation of the proposed community Enterprise Hub, Councillor Tatler advised that she would, in response to a query from the Committee, be willing to look at the potential to establish a minimum level of local social enterprise provision within the Hub.

As no further issues were raised, the Chair thanked everyone for their contributions and then invited the committee to consider the recommendations set out in the report in relation to the outcome of the call-in.

As a result of the discussion that followed the Committee **RESOLVED** by a majority decision (with only Councillor S.Butt voting in favour of confirming the original decision):

- (1) That on the basis of the views and comments expressed at the meeting, the called-in decision regarding the Carlton and Granville Centre Site – South Kilburn” be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration.
- (2) In referring the decision back for reconsideration the Committee insist that Cabinet only considers proceeding with the scheme on the basis that clear written promises are provided in relation to the following issues:
  - (a) In terms of the recommended design option, the 23 units of housing being sought must all be provided as social housing. Whilst recognising the need to address issues in relation to viability, committee were also keen to ensure a predominance of three or four bedroom ‘family-sized’ accommodation;
  - (b) Appropriate noise-reduction safeguards be provided for tenants within the new housing units in order to manage the relationship between the mixed residential and community use on the site. Such a provision to ensure that noise concerns do not limit the use of the facility by the community;
  - (c) A minimum level of local social enterprise provision be guaranteed within the Enterprise Hub; and
  - (d) Community governance options being developed in terms of future management of the site are based around the Key Stakeholder Group and involve a broader local community membership. Such governance options must have open membership to the local community, with democratic selection processes.
- (3) That following on from (1) & (2) above, the Committee receive a further report back in 3 months’ time enabling them to continue monitoring progress on development of the scheme and how the assurances being sought had been addressed.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm

COUNCILLOR KELCHER  
Chair