

## Environment and Neighbourhoods Budget options

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 1
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving Organisational Efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Sports and Parks
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow/George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	Restructure the Sports and Parks Service, including the Environmental Policy and Projects Team.
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	£930K*
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	34

\*This figure does not include contract payments for sports centres and cost of Bridge park

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	354	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	tbc	tbc	-

### Proposed savings

The Sports and Parks service includes the day to day management and development of sports services (including the Sports Development Team), parks and open spaces and cemeteries, the Healthy Lifestyles Team and the Environmental Projects and Policy Team. The grounds maintenance element of the service transferred (along with approx. 65 staff) to Veolia as of September 2014. The long term development of these services will remain with the council as does the management of the two sports centre contracts and Bridge Park Community Leisure centre. The client side grounds maintenance element of the public realm contract is now managed by the Recycling and Waste team. The transfer of services out of Sports and Parks presents the opportunity to look at a restructure of the service as a whole.

The proposed new structure will merge the Sports Development Team and the Healthy Lifestyles to a single team that focuses on developing healthy lifestyle opportunities and general physical activity rather than on sports participation. This means there will be a much reduced focus on sports development activities but retains the focus on developing healthy lifestyles, reflecting the council's role within the public health agenda.

It will also result in the stopping of all work undertaken by the Environmental Policy and Projects Team except for that relating to carbon reduction.

The new structure will be subject to consultation with staff.

## **How would this affect users of this service?**

A significant amount of sports development work will cease as a result of this reduction. This will include not organising teams for events such as the London Youth Games and ceasing most school holiday and term time activities, older people's activities and very limited support for local sports clubs. Much of the focus of the sports development team's work is on increasing participation amongst groups identified as being low participants in sports activities, including young people, older people, people with disabilities, BME groups and disabled people and this will significantly reduce. The team secure external funding for sports activities and development in the borough and this income generation will cease.

The reduction in the work of the Environmental Policy and Projects Team will reduce the size of the team by two members of staff, leaving only the staff that work on the carbon reduction programme. This will mean there will be no new green charter produced, no re-establishment of the sustainability forum, no fair trade accreditation and an end to wider work around the sustainability agenda.

## **Key milestones**

Consult with staff on restructure

Communicate service changes to service users, community organisations and sports clubs.

Implement new structure

## **Key consultations**

Consultation will be needed with service users and staff, as above.

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Reduced levels of physical activity in the borough – some work may be picked up by the community sector.

A reduction in a focus on club development and coach development may have an impact on the number and quality of sports clubs – it may be possible for CVS and National Governing Bodies of Sport to pick this up.

General poor publicity about stopping of activities for young people, especially during school holidays – will need strong comms plan.

There will be no specific work on a green charter although some areas of work across the council will continue within other services including action on air quality, green travel and food growing.

Likely pressure from London Youth Games Ltd for Brent to continue to compete in the event.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Gerry Kiefer
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gerry Kiefer, Head of Sports and Parks
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 2
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Leveraging in resources and income
<b>Service(s):</b>	Sports and Parks
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	<b>Review of financing of free swimming</b> Review of free swimming programme producing a wider programme to be funded via Public Health.
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£60,000</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	60	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>			

### **Proposed savings**

This proposal ceases the current free swimming provisions at the two swimming pools. Currently free swimming is offered at Vale Farm and Willesden sports centres to Under 5's, Over 60's and Disabled People during all public swimming times and for five hours each weekday during school holidays to 16's and under.

A wider programme of free water-based activities will be provided instead.

### **Key milestones**

- Develop new programme in partnership with contractors
- Advertise new arrangements
- Start new activities from April 2015

### **Key risks and mitigations**

There will be minimal risk as services will be picked up as part of a new wider programme of activities.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Neil Davies
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gerry Kiefer, Head of Sports and Parks
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 3
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping services completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Sports and Parks/School Improvement Service
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow & Ruth Moher

<b>Proposals:</b>	Removal of PE Advisor – joint funded with Children & Young People. Removal of contributory funding for advisory teacher for PE and Sport.
-------------------	---

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	Post sits within School Improvement Service £50,000
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	50	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	1	-	-

### **Proposed savings**

The Sports and Parks service currently contributes £50k to the post of advisory teacher for Children and Young People to ensure that the quality of PE and sport in Brent schools is achieved and maintained. Additional costs for this post are either provided by C&F revenue budget or schools buying into the service

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The post was originally introduced to improve the standard and quality of PE and sport in schools and increase the amount of PE and sport being delivered within and outside the curriculum.

This is now much improved and funding is available for schools from other sources to undertake this type of work.

### **Key milestones**

- Children and Young People to progress and discuss with schools

### **Key consultations**

- PE advisor
- Schools for impact on loss of advisory post

### **Key risks and mitigations**

- Alternative funding is available direct to schools for this type of work.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	C&YP
Deadline:	TBC

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gerry Kiefer, Head of Sports and Parks
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 4
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Welsh Harp Environmental Education Centre
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<p><b>Close Welsh Harp Environment Education Centre</b></p> <p>The proposal would close the centre and cease the provision of environmental education for schoolchildren at this centre.</p>
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<p>£27,000</p> <p>Projected Expenditure - £36,102</p> <p>Projected Income BAU – £23,000</p>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	See below

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	13	14	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	1.6 but not LBB employees.	Nil	Nil

### **Proposed savings**

To close the Welsh Harp Education Centre from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2015. There are no direct employee costs but two staff cover lessons at the centre: one paid for by income, one via Carey's sponsorship.

The centre is mainly used by primary school and this would cease.

### **Key milestones**

Timeline:

- March 2015 – if closure agreed, give formal notice to Waste Collection, BT Line Rental, Cleaners, and staff.

### **Key consultations**

- Careys
- Schools would need to be consulted.



## **Key risks and mitigations**

This closure will impact on environmental awareness teaching for young people. Carey's have been funding one teaching post and may be interested in a greater role which could keep the centre open.

There is a risk of vandalism and damage to the building once closed. For year 1 a small amount of saving has been retained for security.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Neil Davies
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gerry Kiefer, Head of Sports and Parks
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 5
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Grant to Energy Solutions Ltd.
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

Proposals:	<p><b>Cease grant funding to Energy Solutions</b></p> <p>The proposal is to cease E&amp;N's funding to Energy Solutions which provides a fuel poverty and energy advice service.</p>
------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	£50,000  (Current SLA £90K. £50K from E&N, 38K from Housing)
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	No direct Brent Employees.

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	50	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	0	0	0

### **Proposed savings**

Cessation of grant to an external organisation. Part of the grant is paid by E&N and part by R&G.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The removal of the funding would stop the provision of free and impartial energy efficiency advice to householders and small enterprises. Specifically it would stop the provision of a freephone advice line, online support, attendance at local events, provision of advice surgeries, home visits, referrals and fuel poverty case work.

The impact of this would be that households would have to go elsewhere for advice which has previously enabled them to obtain energy refunds, energy related property improvements and fuel debt management

Energy Solutions provide a range of other services for different parts of the Council. The impact of the cessation of this funding on Energy Solutions ability to deliver these other projects is unknown.

### **Key milestones**

Late February – advise Energy Solution of cessation of grant. The SLA requires two months notice to be given although verbal notice has already been given.

### **Key consultations**

Energy Solutions

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Residents maybe unable to obtain fuel poverty advice elsewhere although under the green deal and Energy Company Obligation contract, Lakehouse Contracts Ltd could address this issue.

Energy Solutions can access external funding which the Council is not eligible for and use this to undertake work in the Borough. It is unknown if the cessation of E&N's funding will reduce their capacity to access external funding for other work.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Naomi Baker
Deadline:	<i>31 March 2015</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gerry Kiefer, Head of Sports and Parks
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 6
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Brent Transport Services
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<b>BTS - in-house drivers/passenger attendants</b> End the use of in-house driver and passenger attendants. This is a full year effect of a previous budget decision
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£360,000</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>11.9 **</b>

\*\* Staffing Budget for the 11.9 fte drivers and passenger attendants affected

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	75	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	9.8fte	0	0

### **Proposed savings**

BTS employed 9 drivers and 5 passenger attendants directly; the drivers on full time contracts, the passenger attendants part time. A further 80 drivers and 90 passenger attendants are provided by Drake International Ltd. The required hours are not full time but largely in the morning and afternoon. A review of this arrangement was undertaken and seven drivers and three passenger attendants volunteered for redundancy. This saving is a full-year effect of that change.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Users of the service will not be affected.

### **Key milestones**

Agreement to VR proposal by HR and Finance	1 June 2014
Consultation with staff completed	18 June 2014
VR panel agree individual VRs	26 June 2014
Staff last day of service	31 August 2014

### **Key consultations**

No further consultation is required

### **Key risks and mitigations**

The key risk is that pressures on the remainder of the BTS budget mean that this budgeted change is not achieved. This is mitigated by careful budget management.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read. Operation Director – Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 7
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Brent Transport Services
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	Ending participation in the WLA project. This is the full year effect of the previous budget decision.
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>Expenditure £4,795k</b> Income £(5,407)k Net £(432)k
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>21.6 fte **</b>

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	38	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	0	0	0

### **Proposed savings**

This is the full year effect of ending participation in the WLA Passenger Transport Transformation Programme. A subscription of £68kpa was payable to the programme which with minor reductions in other overheads gives a £75k full year saving. £37 was budgeted for in 2014-15 and the balance of £38k is budgeted for 2015-16.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Users of the service will not be affected.

### **Key milestones**

Notice was given to Hounslow as the Lead Borough for the WLA Passenger Transport Transformation Programme before the start of the 2014-15 financial Year.

### **Key consultations**

No consultation is required

## **Key risks and mitigations**

The key risk is that pressures on the remainder of the BTS budget mean that this budgeted change is not achieved. This is mitigated by careful budget management.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read. Operation Director – Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 8
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Brent Transport Services, C&F SEN, ASC
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	One Council Passenger Transport Transformation Project. This reflects savings associated with a review of Brent Transport Service.
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>		
	<b>BTS</b>	<b>Outside E&amp;N</b>
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>Expenditure £4,795k</b> Income £(5,407) k Net £(432)k	<b>c. £400k tbc</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>12 fte in house</b> <b>90fte contractor staff</b> <b>(After EN6)</b>	

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	583	100	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	3fte	0	0

### **Proposed savings**

A review of passenger transport operations within the London Borough of Brent (LBB) was completed in March 2014 by external consultants Edge Public Solutions as Phase 1 of a One Council project. That review made a series of recommendations for changes to the way transport operations are undertaken that have the potential to generate substantial cost reductions with limited adverse effects on the level or standards of service provided.

A Phase 2 combined PID and Business Case have now been approved by Programme Board which anticipates an overall net saving of £883k by the 2016-17 Financial Year. £440k of these savings are already built into departmental budgets for 2014-15 and 2015-16 meaning that the further betterment anticipated is now £443k, £343k in 2015-16 and £100k in 2016-17. The £440k of savings already anticipated includes £240k in E&N's budget for 2015-16, making total savings of £583k in 2015-16 and £100k in 2016-17.



## **How would this affect users of this service?**

Users of the service may be affected in a number of ways:

- We expect quality of the service and customer satisfaction to rise during the lifetime of the project.
- Some users presently travelling in single occupancy vehicles may travel on buses.
- Some users may switch to personalised budgets and make their own travel arrangement.
- Cessation of the BCT Taxi scheme will affect a few heavy users of this service who will have to use other taxi arrangements

## **Key milestones**

Agreement of PID/Business case	July 2014
In house improvements in place	July 2015
Agreement of future operating model	June 2016
Project completion	July 2016

## **Key consultations**

Consultation and engagement will be required with service users and carers, carers groups, schools and day centres throughout the project.

Consultation will be required with staff over re-structuring options

## **Key risks and mitigations**

These are detailed within the One Council Project document and cover the life of the project.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	PMO
Deadline:	Predictive by October 2014 Final by July 2016

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read. Operation Director – Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 9
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Community Safety
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	The Council funds 2 PC's and 3 PCSO's on a 'buy one, get one free' arrangement with MOPAC and the decision was previously made to stop this arrangement from September 2014. This saving is the full year effect of no longer funding this arrangement from 2014/15.
-------------------	--

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	£75K
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	-

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	75	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposed savings**

The saving is achieved by no longer making the 'contribution' to funding PC's and PCSO's in the borough. This is a full year effect of ceasing the funding in 2014/15.

**How would this affect users of this service?**

N/A

**Key milestones**

N/A

**Key consultations**

N/A

**Key risks and mitigations**

N/A

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:

	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Williams, Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 10
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Community Safety and Emergency Planning
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow/Margaret McLennan

<b>Proposals:</b>	To consider a new approach to managing Anti-Social Behaviour services across the borough, including consideration of a joint arrangement between the Community Safety Team and the BHP Community Safety Team.
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	Comm Safety - £230,000 BHP - TBC
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	Comm Safety – 4 BHP – 4

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	0	100	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	-	TBC pending outcome of service review	-

### **Proposed savings**

The saving, if possible, will come from having a single team or a more streamlined approach to managing ASB across the borough; currently there are separate teams in Brent Council and Brent Housing Partnership. It may also be possible to structure a new team so that it can 'trade' with the smaller housing associations and therefore reduce costs by delivering an income. A high level peer review has been commissioned and will look at current performance and put forward suggestions for a more effective and efficient approach. A further more detailed review may be needed depending on the findings of the high level peer review. As a consequence any savings, which are dependant on restructuring across two organisations will not be realised until 2016/17.

Until the peer review is complete it won't be clear what the real savings could be, but £100k is considered a minimum possible.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

With less officers it is likely that there will have to be greater prioritisation of service delivery, which means that responses will differ depending on levels of risk. Some residents may feel that this is a degradation of service. This could be ameliorated by improved methods of service delivery; again, the peer review will be vital in establishing this.

## **Key milestones**

March 2015 – completion of peer review

December 2015 – agreement on possible new joint service

April 2016 – New arrangements in place

## **Key consultations**

BHP would have to consult with tenants if there are any proposed changes to the service. Staff consultation will be needed if a restructure is proposed.

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Fewer staff in post would potentially give less capacity to deal with ASB cases as they emerge. A prioritisation process would have to be instigated to grade cases according to risk and give a different level of response accordingly. This may prove unpopular.

Better partnership response and developing community capacity should mitigate this by lessening the reliance on the council and BHP teams to deal with neighbourhood level issues and allowing them to focus on higher-risk ASB and the utilisation of new tools and powers following the enactment of the ASB Crime and Policing Act from October 2014.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	Yes
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	Yes
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Yes
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Chris Williams, Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning Tom Bremner, Brent Housing Partnership
Deadline:	December 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Williams, Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning Tom Bremner, BHP
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 11
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Community Safety and Emergency Planning
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Deneslow

<b>Proposals:</b>	<b>Emergency Planning Team</b> To reduce the Emergency Planning Team by one post leaving only two posts. This is likely to require a shared service arrangement with another borough in order to maintain 24/7 cover.
-------------------	--

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	£176K
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	3

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	25	27	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	1	-	-

### **Proposed savings**

The saving will come from the total salary costs (ie including on-costs) for one post within the service linked to developing a shared service with another borough.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

This is a statutory role and any new approach will need to take account of the level of support for emergency planning and business continuity across the council and the borough as a whole. It will require a change in approach to the service in order to maintain a 24/7 cover rota. As this is currently such a small team it will be difficult to maintain 24/7 cover if no other authority is interested in developing a shared service.

A change in the operation of the team may result in less support for managers in developing business continuity plans for all service areas. Managers will need to take on more of a responsibility for developing plans and maintaining them up to date.

### **Key milestones**

March 2015 – explore alternative arrangements with other borough/s.  
 April 2015 – Consult with staff on new arrangements  
 Sept 2015 – New structure in place

## **Key consultations**

Staff will need to be consulted on any proposed restructure.  
Businesses will need to be informed of what level of support is available.

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Providing a response to emergencies in the borough is a statutory duty. Reducing the service may impact on the ability to provide the required 24/7 response. A new system will have to be developed to ensure there is always an experienced response available. Options around this need further exploration with a partner borough.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Williams, Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning
---------------------------------	---



<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 12
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Leveraging in resources and income
<b>Service(s):</b>	Recycling and Waste
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<b>Charging for garden waste</b> Introduction a charge for garden waste via a subscription service at £40 per year per household. This was agreed by Cabinet in July 2014.
-------------------	---

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	N/A
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	N/A

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	140	238	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

### **Proposed savings**

The savings will be achieved through the income generated by the charge for green waste. The contractor have guaranteed £400K of income in each year after the first year. This is a minimum level; any income over £400K will be passed through as additional savings to the council.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Residents would have to 'opt in' to the scheme. If they don't they will be supported via subsidised compost bins to compost green waste at home or they can take it to the CA site where it can be left at no charge.

Residents who do not have a garden and do not produce green waste will be unaffected.

### **Key milestones**

This was agreed at Cabinet, 21<sup>st</sup> July 2014.

Mobilisation programme underway with Veolia communications planned from December 2014.

## **Key consultations**

The decision to introduce the charge has already been made.

## **Key risks and mitigations**

The estimated income is based upon 17 000 residents opting in to the new scheme. The risk to achieve this level rests with the contractor.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Completed as part of the cabinet report.
Deadline:	July 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte, Head of Recycling and Waste
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 13
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Leveraging in resources and income
<b>Service(s):</b>	Recycling and Waste
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<p><b>Charging residents for bulky waste collections</b></p> <p>To replace the current free service with one that makes a £15.00 charge to residents for each Bulky Waste Collection Service. This will effect a 50% reduction in service volumes so creating a saving.</p>
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	0
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	N/A

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	174	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

### **Proposed savings**

Currently, there are approximately 27,000 collections each year amounting to approximately 750 tonnes of bulky waste. The collection of this waste requires 2 crews using 15 tonne caged vehicles with each crew comprising of a driver and a loader. Currently, this is a free service to residents who may book up to three, free collections each year.

Replacing the current free service with one that makes a £15.00 charge to residents for each Bulky Waste Collection Service booked will create a 70% reduction in service volumes.

However, these potential savings will need to be partly re-invested (£19K) into the Street Cleansing Service to counter the potential for additional fly tipping / dumping of bulky waste.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The implementation of this charge will have a negative impact on Customer Satisfaction because a new charge will apply. Residents may be affected even if they are not users of the service. They may simply be impacted by an increase in fly tipping on streets and an overall decline in "street scene" standards.

In addition, potential re-use items may be dumped on the street exposing them to all weather conditions rendering them unsuitable for re-use which would impact on recycling tonnage projections and the overall recycling rate, potentially by up to 260 tonnes of re-use items per annum.

The potential impact of increased dumping will negatively impact on cleansing standards will affect Veolia's ability to achieve the stated contract targets.

### **Key milestones**

- EIA
- Service Redesign
- Consultation
- Communication and engagement with service users
- Admin and payment process systems implemented
- Contract variation
- Charging starts

### **Key consultations**

- All potential service users
- Veolia

### **Key risks and mitigations**

There may be a negative impact on the overall service design for street cleansing which will be placed under additional pressure.

The implementation of a charge may deter the majority of residents from booking a bulky collection. A previous charging regime in Brent saw bookings drop by 70%, with an amount of that waste finding its way onto the streets as dumped waste.

The potential impact of increased dumping will negatively impact on cleansing standards will affect Veolia's ability to achieve the stated contract targets.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Y
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Chris Whyte
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte, Head of Recycling and Waste
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 14
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Parking and Lighting
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<p><b>Parking Contract</b></p> <p>Re-letting of the parking contract with SERCO – full year effect of contract savings.</p>
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£4009k</b>
	Expenditure £8m Income £16m Net Income £8m
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>22fte</b>

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	172	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	Nil	Nil	Nil

### **Proposed savings**

This is the full year effect of the savings made from the collaborative re-tendering of the parking enforcement and back office service in 2012-13. The final saving was £850k from a previous contract price of £4.5m per annum. The contract began in July 2013 giving part year savings offset by 75% of the set up costs in 2013-14, full year savings offset by 25% of the set up costs in 2014-15 and this final tranche of the savings in 2015-16.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Users of the service will not be affected by this saving, the changes required having already been implemented.

### **Key milestones**

None – already implemented

### **Key consultations**

None – already implemented

### **Key risks and mitigations**

None – already implemented

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read, Operational Director, Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 15
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Parking and Lighting
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<p><b>Parking Services</b></p> <p>Savings from the Parking Service over a three year term.</p> <p>Cost reduction and income generation opportunities. Consider CEO deployment, unattended enforcement, visitor parking charges and a number of other initiatives.</p>
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£8k</b>
	Expenditure £8m Income £16m Net Income £8m
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>22fte</b>

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	2,160	921	134
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	Nil	Nil	Nil

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>15.1 CEO Deployment</b>	528	Nil	Nil
<b>15.2 Unattended enforcement</b>	975	200	Nil
<b>15.3 More efficient reviewing</b>	Nil	Nil	65
<b>15.4 Season Ticket Parking</b>	28	29	Nil
<b>15.5 Event Day Parking</b>	32	32	Nil
<b>15.6 New Car Park Sites</b>	54	54	Nil
<b>15.7 Visitor Parking Charges</b>	360	435	25
<b>15.8 Extending IVR</b>	27	4	Nil
<b>15.9 Online Case Management</b>	9	9	Nil
<b>15.10 RingGo</b>	Nil	59	20
<b>15.11 New cashless parking schemes</b>	73	25	Nil
<b>15.12 Demand led tariffs</b>	50	50	Nil
<b>15.13 P&amp;D Machine Removal</b>	24	24	24
<b>TOTAL</b>	2,160	921	134



	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	Nil	2	Nil

### **Proposed savings**

This proposal summarises cost reduction and income generation opportunities across the parking service over the three year period 2015/16-2017/18. This period is close to the initial five year term of the joint parking enforcement and back office services contract between Serco plc and LBs Brent, Ealing and Hounslow.

#### **15.1 Additional CEO deployment**

The De-Regulation Bill is expected to stop the use of CCTV for parking enforcement except in a very limited number of cases from around April 2015. CCTV enforcement is effective in tackling some of the more difficult obstructive and dangerous parking practices. Double parking, footway parking and parking in areas where stopping is prohibited are difficult to enforce through CEOs on foot because the driver remains close to the car and will often move the vehicle to avoid enforcement action. It is, of course impractical to deploy CEOs permanently at problematic locations.

Nevertheless it will be possible to tackle non-compliance through additional deployment of CEOs to areas previously enforced through cameras. We are provisionally planning for an additional 12,000 deployed hours at a cost of £16.00 per hour leading to an additional cost of £192k. It is anticipated that this would lead to an additional 14,400 PCNs with income per PCN of around £50 leading to total income of £720k and net betterment of £528k per annum.

#### **15.2 Unattended enforcement**

The Council has begun introducing unattended cameras systems for bus lane and some moving traffic offences. The use of CCTV for these offences will be unaffected by the proposals in the De-Regulation Bill.

Unattended cameras have a number of advantages over conventional enforcement by CCTV:

- The cameras capture every offence which takes place during the hours of restriction rather than relying on an operator to monitor a number of screens and notice the offences.
- Offences still need to be reviewed by an operator but productivity is very much greater for reviewing rather than capturing offences.
- The dedicated CCTV Control Room may no longer be required.

Enforcing existing sites through unattended systems could be achieved for a capital cost of £400k which would deliver annual revenues of £1,050k.

Further savings of £225k p.a can then be made in staffing costs in the CCTV control room.

Allowing for the cost of repaying the capital, the total revenue budget saving available may be £1.175m per annum.

#### **15.3 More efficient reviewing of CCTV offences**

The remaining expenditure on reviewing contraventions needn't be based in Brent. This activity may be conducted in an alternative location in the UK to deliver savings on salaries;

or even offshore. This might lead to savings of £15k if reviewing was moved to another part of the UK, or £40k if moved offshore.

In addition, the parking CCTV enforcement suite would no longer be required. The Council could sub-let the facility to another authority. Potential income could be £50k per annum.

#### **15.4 Season ticket Parking**

The Council currently offer a Season Ticket although this is felt to be over-priced and designed to dissuade commuters from driving and towards using sustainable modes of transport. However, demand has largely shifted these motorists to alternative options provided by the private sector. Setting a lower and more desirable price to encourage use of under used car parks should generate extra income.

#### **15.5 Event Day Parking**

Parking in the car parks close to Wembley Stadium is restricted to a maximum of 2 hours on Event Days. The intention of this is to preserve parking for use of local shoppers / residents. Private operators take a different approach, and substantially increase tariffs on Wembley Event Days.

The Council could also increase the parking tariff on Event Days, and eliminate the 2 hour maximum stay limitation on users.

#### **15.6 New Car Park Sites**

There are some off-street sites within the borough which may benefit from having new parking controls. Some of these car parks are connected with local sports fields and are therefore uncontrolled; Northwick Park is an example of this. Other car parks, including Disraeli Road Car Park have never had controls in place; the background to this lack of control is unclear although there is a demand for controls to be implemented.

#### **15.7 Visitor Parking Charges**

The majority of the Service's Permit prices are indexed to RPI with annual increases applied in April (based upon January inflation). Excluded from this are Visitor Parking sessions, for which, the tariff is £1.50 per day. This is markedly cheaper than visitor parking sold in neighbouring boroughs, and is out of kilter with other parking prices in the borough (pay and display). As a benchmark, the London Borough of Ealing charges their residents £4.50 for a similar service for a full day's parking.

This presents an option to the Council to increase the Visitor parking tariff. It should be noted that the rationale for increasing the tariff is not to raise revenue, but to control levels of demand. The Service sells 30,000 visitor vouchers per calendar month. The cost of parking in a CPZ on the border of Westminster or Camden for the full day at a cost of £1.50 is very attractive. This needs to be balanced against the price point for pay and display parking in order to ensure that products are used for the purpose they were originally intended. The Council also need to consider the sale of this product at such a low tariff whilst continuing to promote sustainable modes of transport in the borough.

One option would be to raise the tariff incrementally until a balance has been achieved with other products, and borough benchmarks. This would, by default, generate a saving for the Council (whether it was through a static level of visitor scratch card use, or an increased uptake in correct products such as Resident Permits or Pay and Display parking.)

Through gradual increments over a three year period, the Council could anticipate increased income in the region of £820,000.

## **15.8 Extending IVR**

With Serco we will implement end to end customer service for Visitor Parking without human intervention. That is to say that residents will still be able to book visitor parking via telephone; but without the service being manually handled (which results in a cost to the Council). Assuming a reduction in call handling by agents of 75% the eventual saving will be around £31k.

## **15.9 Online Case Management**

The Service are close to launching an online case management tool, which not only enhances the customer experience but also reduces costs. Should customers choose to submit representations (challenges to the Council) these are currently scanned and indexed to the Council's database (which generates a £36k annual cost to the service). Channelling 50% of the customers onto a new web portal will mean that representations will be auto-indexed to cases; this means that the Council will eliminate scanning and indexing costs. This will generate an £18k saving.

## **15.10 RingGo**

The contract made between Cobalt (RingGo) and the Council expires on the 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016. At this point, the Council will have the opportunity to opt into the WLA Contract, which also provides cashless parking through RingGo, but at an improved rate. Estimated savings are based on current volumes of RingGo use.

## **15.11 New cashless parking schemes**

LB Ealing have successfully introduced new cashless parking schemes for low cost daily commuter parking where controls did not previously exist. LB Brent has options for introducing similar schemes including: the North Circular Road - Slip Road – Approx. 100 spaces, and Park Royal Industrial Estate – Approx. 150 spaces

## **15.12 Demand led tariffs**

This proposal is to review pay and display / cashless parking tariffs according to localised market forces, and boundary areas. That is to say that, where demand for kerb space is at its highest, the tariff should be raised, and where demand is at its lowest the tariff should fall. The majority of Brent's pay and display infrastructure is located in the south-east of the borough where demand is highest; this suggests that pricing according to localised market forces will generate modest additional revenue. A net saving of £100k pa is suggested although with modest certainty. A substantial review would be needed to implement this and it is likely not to be achievable until October 2015.

## **15.13 Pay and Display Machine Removals**

The Council have already agreed in principle to reduce the numbers of pay and display machines from the 731 currently provided.

Expenditure on machines is incurred for cash collection and machine maintenance

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Different elements of these proposals would affect different service users differently. Key changes would be:

- ◆ The increased deployment of CEOs would mitigate some of the adverse congestion and road safety consequences of the ban on the use of CCTV for parking offences.

- ◆ Unattended enforcement would improve road safety and reduce traffic congestion through improving compliance, but would probably lead to the detection of a greater number of offences.
- ◆ The Event Day parking proposals would probably be of benefit to potential event goers, but could increase traffic levels in the Wembley area on event days.
- ◆ Bringing into use the new car park sites might have an adverse impact on those presently using the sites for free, but should have a beneficial impact on sports users at Northwick Park, and would improve matters for businesses near Disraeli Road.
- ◆ Increasing visitor parking charges is likely to be unwelcome to many residents
- ◆ Extending the IVR system and Online Case Management should improve accessibility of our services and improve the experience for customers.

### **Key milestones**

Implementation of these proposals will require considerable detailed planning and milestones have not yet been set.

### **Key consultations**

Consultation will be required over all of the changes which require fresh Traffic Orders. Wider consultation over some of the proposed tariff changes would be needed.

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Key risks and mitigations will be identified through detailed project planning.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No
EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Head of Service
Deadline:	December 2014

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read, Operational Director, Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 16
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Parking and Lighting
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<p><b>Street Lighting</b></p> <p>Replace existing street lighting with LED lighting to new British Standards and, optionally, a Central Management System – this would require investment of around £7m.</p>
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£4,440k</b>
	Expenditure £4,440k Income** £(800)k Net expenditure £(3,640)k
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>2fte</b>

\*\* Income is predominantly PFI Grant (£790k)

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	0	0	750
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	Nil	Nil	Nil

### **Proposed savings**

Brent's street lighting is provided through a 20 year PFI contract which is coming to an end in 2018. The contract has provided lighting to the British Standard in place at the date of the contract. The lighting has no management system and has no capability for adapting light levels to circumstances. The annual cost is £4.440m of which £1.340m is for electricity and £790k of which is met from PFI grant.

Options are being developed for the replacement of the lanterns with energy efficient LED lighting. These will offer cost savings of between £750k and £780k per annum in the expected energy bills. They will require investment of between £6.560m and £7.752m which, if undertaken through prudential borrowing would offer payback periods between 8 years and 6 months and 9 years and 7 months. Other sources of capital financing are being considered.

The financial model discussed is based no rise in energy prices. Assuming energy price increases further improves the rate of return and payback.

The model assumes the use of adaptive lighting which would provide lower light levels in accordance with modern British Standards when it is least needed.

The higher end of the cost ranges quoted and the lower end of the range for rate of return assumes a Central Management System. This will allow further marginal control of light levels and times of operation which will, in principle, allow further reductions in energy use. These have not yet been modelled. Absence of a CMS will require a prudent and inflexible approach to setting light levels and times of operation which will, in the long term, limit savings.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Lighting to modern standards will involve a change in the quality of illumination to a whiter light, and potentially lower levels of illumination at times when streets are little used. Some residents may prefer the older lighting quality and light levels.

### **Key milestones**

March 2015 – Cabinet report to consider business case

### **Key consultations**

Consultation with Members and the public over the changes in quality and levels of lighting.

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Concern over reduction in lighting levels may happen. In the initial stages only new energy efficient lanterns are being proposed. The opportunity to dim lights in future may become an option if the management system is installed.

Procurement decisions and failure to get best value from procurement at the end of the PFI period may be a risk. Mitigated by procurement planning.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Michael Read
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read, Operational Director, Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 17
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Parking and Lighting
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	<b>Street Trees</b> In 2015/16 undertake £50k less of tree maintenance work. Re-procurement of street tree contract from April 2016 to maintain this funding reduction.
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£620k</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>2fte</b>

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	50	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	Nil	Nil	Nil

### **Proposed savings**

Re-procurement of street tree contract. The existing Street Tree Contract started in April 2012 for 4yrs with an option for a 2 year extension.

The present contractor has been the term contractor in this borough for over 20 years. We propose to achieve a saving of c.£50k through retendering either in conjunction with another borough, as a single authority.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Users of the service would be unaffected

### **Key milestones**

Review of existing tree strategy complete  
Soft market testing  
Decision on procurement plan - Cabinet  
Decision on contract award  
New contract starts

December 2014  
February 2015  
March 2015  
December 2015  
April 2016



## **Key consultations**

Consultation with Insurance Team over tree strategy  
Consultation with residents over tree strategy

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Risk that the tender approach does not deliver the saving required – mitigated by good procurement and timely soft market testing.

Risk that reductions in tree maintenance lead to increased subsidence damage claims – mitigated by consultation with Insurance Team

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read, Operational Director, Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 18
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Libraries, Arts and Heritage
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	Transfer management of libraries to trust arrangement resulting in business rates savings.
-------------------	--

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	£3,586K
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	45

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	0	160	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	0	0	0

\*Until the rateable value is fixed for the new centre at Willesden Green (and the library portion of it), it is hard to be more accurate.

### **Proposed savings**

To change the management of the library service to a trust arrangement. The exact arrangement will need to be determined. Within London, five authorities deliver their services in conjunction with other authorities, one delivers through a charitable trust established by the Council which also delivers other services such as leisure centres and seven have outsourced delivery to a social enterprise or a private sector provider. Elsewhere in the country, some library services have been outsourced to a staff-managed mutual or social enterprise, and larger library services have been commissioned to run smaller ones.

Charitable organisations are eligible for an 80% rebate on NNDR. Changes to rules on business rates in 2013 mean that 70% of the cost of this rebate is borne by Central Government with the remainder being covered by the local authority. Therefore the saving to the Council on business rates of transferring a library service to the charitable sector is 56% of the total rates bill - in Brent this amounts to a saving of approximately £160K. The exact level of savings would depend on the tenders received.

It will take approximately 12 months to complete this work and switch to a new management arrangement.

## **How would this affect users of this service?**

- There would have to be public consultation and a full impact assessment before proceeding.
- There would be no direct impact on service users as there will be no reduction or significant change in service levels or quality.

## **Key milestones**

- Consultation and impact assessment
- Specification produced
- Tendering process (min 12 months)

In order to achieve this, a considerable amount of work would be needed to address legal issues and prepare a suitable specification, and the service would need to go through a market-testing process.

A robust contract, service specification and performance regime would be essential and would require considerable work to develop if service standards were to be maintained.

## **Key consultations**

- Full public consultation would be essential together with a very clear message about the reason for the change.
- Staff consultation

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Risk: Public opposition if local people wish the service to remain managed directly by the Council. A high risk considering the 2011 library closures.

Mitigation: Robust service specification to ensure service would be as good as previously, in terms of the service standards set out in the Libraries Transformation Project.

Risk: Fall in performance and service quality.

Mitigation: A specification that seeks to maintain service standards.

## **Equality impact screening**

If there were substantial changes to services provided then a full impact assessment would be crucial.

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes

Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Yes
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Neil Davies
Deadline:	March 2016

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Mckenzie Head of Libraries, Arts and Heritage
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 19
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	Libraries, Art and Heritage
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	Reduce library stock budget
-------------------	-----------------------------

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	£550k
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	0

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	£100	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	0	0	0

### **Proposed savings**

The proposed saving will come from reducing the amount spent on library stock from £550,000 to £450,000. This budget covers all stock, not simply books. The proposal will reduce the budget to the CIPFA benchmarked average.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Benchmarking with other London boroughs shows that Brent spends a relatively proportion of money on library books, audio visual material and online resources in comparison (comparing number of libraries and population).

Reducing the stockfund by £100,000 to £450,000 would see Brent with just above average stock spending in comparison to other London boroughs.

For the stock spending per 1000 population' indicator the reduction would see Brent move from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile in the CIPFA tables for London boroughs.

### **Key milestones**

None significant

### **Key consultations**

There is not a need for specific consultation but the service will continue to work with library users to ensure stock reflects local needs.

## **Key risks and mitigations**

They key to maintaining the quality of the service for customers is ensuring that we buy the right material for residents and improvements have already been made to the supplier contract monitoring. The current project to raise our performance on library visits and issues will run alongside this reduction, monitoring any dips in performance and putting improvements in place.

The Libraries Transformation Project report to Executive of April 2011 did not contain a specific recommendation of the level of the stockfund. However, £550,000 has been maintained since then to enable the service to build its resources and performance.

## **Equality impact screening**

This is a universal service that affects all areas of the community. We are not intending to reduce in any particular areas of stock, rather a proportionate reduction in spending across all areas. As before, where there are specific needs we will target stock buying to ensure that all residents have access to the material they need. Therefore this should not adversely affect a particular group.

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Neil Davies
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue Mckenzie Head of Libraries, Arts and Heritage
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 20
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Libraries, Arts and Heritage
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	Ceasing the grant to the Tricycle Theatre and Cutting the Arts Service
-------------------	--

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£330K</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>2</b>

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	50	75	205
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>			2

### **Proposed savings**

This saving will be achieved in two stages.

Initial savings will come from cutting the grant to the Tricycle Theatre. The Tricycle Theatre grant from Brent Council is £198,000 per annum and is used for an outreach programme within the borough of Brent focused on schools and local community organisations. It is proposed to taper down the grant over a three year period, during which time officers will work with the theatre to identify alternative funding.

The second phase of savings would be achieved by cutting the council's Arts Team (two posts). This team will be key to the opening and development of activities at Willesden Green Cultural Centre so it is proposed that the service is retained until March 2017 to oversee this work and ensure the income levels are achieved for this new facility. All wider arts development activities will stop during 2015 with the focus of arts development work being based on the new centre.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The work between Brent Council and the Tricycle Theatre is a productive partnership. Over 16,000 young people from Brent were involved in creative learning programmes and over 23,000 Brent residents visited the theatre and cinema in 2013/14. Young people benefit from projects that develop their confidence and skills, increasing employment chances; barriers between communities are broken down through creative expression; refugees tell their stories and the local economy benefits from visitors to the Tricycle and the presence of a high profile cultural asset in the borough.

The arts team comprises two staff who work with arts organisations to put on arts development activity including cultural events and programmes.eg Brent Dance Month. They provide advice and support to local artists and groups. They also manage the grant and service level agreement with the Tricycle Theatre. General arts development activity and support for arts groups across the borough will cease. The arts budget would be refocused to enable events management and income generation at the new centre at Willesden Green. This would cease in 2017/18 and the savings would be delivered.

### **Key milestones**

Autumn 2014 - Consult with Theatre and give six month notice.  
 April 2015 Tricycle grant reduced  
 June 2015 Library at Willesden Green opens, arts service refocuses work to this facility.  
 April 2017 Arts service ceases.

### **Key consultations**

Key stakeholders for the Tricycle grant  
 Artists and arts groups for the transfer/change in nature of the arts budget  
 Staff consultation - arts team

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Adverse impact on young people and target groups who benefit from the service. Brent Council's contribution, at 8% of the Tricycle's total budget, is a relatively small sum but crucial to the continuation of the creative learning programme which benefits many Brent residents and provides key services to promote community cohesion. This may be mitigated by gradually tapering down the grant and working with the Theatre to identify alternative sources of funding that will allow outreach/education work to continue.

### **Equality impact screening**

The Tricycle Theatre currently use the grant from Brent Council to deliver a range of activities to young people and target groups in Brent. The general arts development activity covers a wide range of user groups.

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Yes
Marriage / civil partnership	No



EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Sue Mckenzie
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Sue McKenzie, Head of Libraries, Arts and Heritage
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 21
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Service Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Transportation service - School Crossing Patrols (SCP)
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane
<b>Proposals:</b>	Crease Four options for the future of SCPs

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s)</b>	<b>£177K</b> £183,947 + £6,000 income
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE)</b>	9.16 FTE + 1 funded by school (33 SCP's + 1 funded by school)

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	177	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	33*	0	0

\*Note: SCP's are contracted for 2 hours per day during term time only.

### **Proposed savings**

#### **Option 1: Cease providing all SCPs**

There would be no SCP's, no supervisors, and no option for schools to pay for the SCPs once this service has been cut.

#### **Option 2 : Devolve SCPs to schools, but continue to supervise**

The schools will fund their own SCPs (from non LEA budget) and contribute towards the supervisory costs. The current cost to schools is £6,000 pa. One school currently has this arrangement in place.

The number of SCP's and supervisors will depend on the number of schools willing to pay.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

#### **Option 1: Cease providing all SCPs**

There is no statutory duty requiring the Council to provide a SCPs. However, this option would affect all schools currently provided with SCPs. The pupils at these schools would be subject to increased risks crossing the road without the assistance of a SCP.

## **Option 2 : Devolve SCPs to schools, but continue to supervise**

No impact on current users for those schools willing to pay for SCPs. Same as option 1 for those schools unwilling or unable to pay for SCPs.

### **Key consultations**

- consultation would be needed with staff, schools and public.

### **Key risks and mitigations**

This may have a negative affect on traffic flow as pupils will cross the road individually when arriving at the site. SCP's are trained to assist with traffic flow by gathering groups of children and crossing them together allowing traffic to pass between groups. Further traffic management arrangements as discussed below may help this:

- Reviewing and adjusting/refreshing if necessary signage and road markings in the vicinity of the site. Risks can be mitigated through provision of traffic calming features such as a signal controlled crossing, a zebra crossing, traffic calming, and 20mph zone at all school locations. Installation of one or more of these measures would be subject to a public consultation and securing funding to implement.
- Visiting the schools affected by the changes to offer additional road safety education training, prioritising materials and training for children identified as particularly at risk of road accidents. This is currently delivered through our theatre in schools programme. Funding would be required to deliver to all 23 schools that currently have a SCP. This is an annual programme that would need funding every year to capture the new cohort of pupils, so would be an additional financial demand.
- Ensuring additional enforcement of 'school keep clear' markings and yellow lines around the affected sites. This would place a pressure on the Parking service.

It is likely there will be a negative response to this from schools and parents. During the 2011 review the majority of respondents were against the proposals to reduce SCPs, and several petitions were received from schools together with unfavourable press coverage. Implementation of the risk mitigations mentioned above, subject to costs, may help mitigate these concerns.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment. This assessment form and the guidance for its completion can be found at:*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Rachel Best, Transportation Planning Manager
Deadline:	March 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Tony Kennedy, Head of Transportation
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 22
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Regulatory Services
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	Review of Regulatory Services
-------------------	-------------------------------

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£2848K</b>  Expenditure £2,848k Income £(591)k Net expenditure £2,257k
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>70fte</b>

\*\* The budget and staffing is for Regulatory Services in Environment and Neighbourhoods alone. It does not include Planning, Building Control or Private Sector Housing. The budget also excludes the Harrow contribution to Trading Standards.

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	50	100	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	1-2	1-2	0

### **Proposed savings**

A review of Regulatory Services is proposed with three main strands:

- ◆ To identify the minimum acceptable level of service required to meet the council's statutory obligations and then to consider systematically what added value comes from service levels above the minimum and their priority.
- ◆ To examine the scope for shared services which would reduce costs to participating authorities, and identify any partners willing to consider introducing such arrangements
- ◆ To examine the scope for achieving further savings by outsourcing some or all of the services in question.

## Relevant considerations

### **Statutory minimum service levels and priority.**

This element of the review may not yield savings. Staffing has reduced since 2010-11 by 25 fte from 95 to 70 fte. A very recent Food Standards Agency inspection of the food team suggest that it needs to increase substantially in size to meet statutory obligations. Other functions may be in a similar position when subjected to rigorous review.

### **Scope for shared services**

Modest savings can be expected in shared management arrangements, and some further savings and greater resilience in small specialisms eg acoustics or contaminated land. The existing Trading Standards partnership with Harrow may provide a foundation. Savings will be contingent on achieving a successful partnership agreement.

A similar proposal in SW London involving 5 authorities anticipated £535k pa initial savings of roughly £107k pa per authority. Eventually, only two participated reducing initial savings even further.

### **Potential for outsourcing**

The potential needs to be explored. There are limited examples of other boroughs taking this option.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The impact of reductions to the statutory minimum will depend on the visibility of the service in question. Frequently used services such as noise nuisance could have significant impact very quickly. Reductions in protective services such as food safety may not be noticed until a failure in protection such as a food poisoning outbreak occurs.

### **Key milestones**

These will be set out within the concept paper as part of the review process.

### **Key consultations**

Consultation with residents to inform decisions about any service reductions.  
Consultation with affected staff over TUPE transfers

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Failure to find willing partners – mitigated by early search and compelling business case

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Yes
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Michael Read
Deadline:	January 2015

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read, Operational Director Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 23
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Driving organisational efficiency
<b>Service(s):</b>	E&N Registration & Nationality
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	Extend current joint service with Barnet to another council
-------------------	---

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£930K</b>  Expenditure £930k Income £(1081)k Net income £(150)k
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>35fte</b>

\*\* Income and expenditure are for Brent alone; Staffing is for Brent and Barnet.  
To be made consistent later

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	50	50	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	Nil	Nil	Nil

### **Proposed savings**

In 2014-15 Brent and Barnet formally merged their Registration and nationality services under Brent's management. This merger benefitted Brent's budget by around £140k per annum. The benefits for both boroughs come from sharing management and other costs and from opportunities to extend and increase discretionary income.

The proposal is to see whether a further partner or perhaps two can be found to participate in this shared service bringing further financial benefits to all parties. The possible saving is entirely contingent on willing partners being found. The possible saving is expected to be less than that achieved from the Brent/Barnet merger because the benefits will need to be spread across more partners.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The proposal is likely to increase choice, flexibility and customer satisfaction as a wider range of services and increased opening hours are put in place.



## **Key milestones**

Identification of possible partner	January 2015
Cabinet agreement and signing of partnership agreement	May 2015
Joint service starts	October 2015

## **Key consultations**

Consultation with affected staff over TUPE transfers

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Failure to find a willing partner – mitigated by early search and compelling business case

Changes to Nationality legislation make the joint service less economic – mitigated by seeking new sources of income

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Michael Read, Operational Director, Environment and Protection
---------------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 24
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Community Safety and Emergency Planning
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	Cease all council – managed CCTV
-------------------	----------------------------------

2014/15	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£500K</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>8</b>

	2015/16	2016/17 Additional	Future years Additional
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	400	100	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>			

### **Proposed savings**

To stop all council-managed CCTV operations in the borough, including the operation of the CCTV control room resulting in the deletion of 8 posts.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

The service provides both a proactive and reactive presence across the borough, with 190 high-quality cameras able to both spot and track incidents as they occur and provide evidence for investigations. Cessation of this service would remove the proactive ability to identify incidents and allocate resources as they occur, leading to a greatly reduced ability to control emerging incidents. Equally, the borough would lose the ability to provide evidence for criminal investigations and court cases, which would impact on the ability of the criminal justice system to achieve positive outcomes to prosecutions. Removing CCTV would potentially increase the risk of harm to Brent residents and visitors.

Community confidence would be greatly impacted by this decision. Nationally, 90% of residents agree with the use of CCTV by local authorities, and to remove this service would negatively affect the fear of crime across Brent.

The national stadium at Wembley hosts up to 37 major events per annum, with up to 90,000 spectators visiting the site on each occasion, including high profile events such as the 2020 European Championships final, UEFA Champions League final, and the FA Cup Final and semi-finals as well as all England home games, NFL matches and music concerts. The stadium relies on an integrated CCTV network to manage crowd control, egress and

dispersal at events. There is some sharing of access to cameras between Brent and Wembley Stadium. This ability would be severely hampered and may affect the success of the FA to bid for major future events.

Brent's Emergency Planning processes rely on the use of CCTV to monitor and manage situations as they occur. Without this resource the ability to respond to emergencies would be severely hampered.

Brent's CCTV network is integrated with that of Transport for London and there is mutual access to the cameras of each organisation. This symbiotic relationship assists both organisations in maintaining public safety on the transport network.

### **Key milestones**

To be confirmed once final decisions are taken.

### **Key consultations**

Groups requiring consultation will include:

- Residents
- Businesses
- Community groups
- Metropolitan police
- British Transport Police
- Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)
- Wembley Stadium/The Football Association
- Transport for London

### **Key risks and mitigations**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Negative impact on public confidence	Communications campaign to tackle fear of crime Signal crimes approach to reduce fear by changing environment
Inability to identify emerging incidents	Reliance on telephone reporting by residents and businesses
Increased confidence of criminals resulting in an increase in crime	Pre-emptive work on those deemed most likely to commit crime Additional patrolling by police in hotspot areas
Inability to assist police and other response agencies with incident management	Police revert to pre-1990s approaches to incident management
Loss of ability to manage emergencies	Train additional officers as Emergency Response Officers and hence increase visible presence on the ground
Inability to provide evidence for criminal justice proceedings	Increase training for officers as professional witnesses
Inability to manage stadium events	Transfer infrastructure to Wembley

	Stadium Ltd
Impact of lack of CCTV on ability to bid for future international events at Wembley Stadium	Transfer infrastructure to Wembley Stadium Ltd
Inability to assist in tracing missing or vulnerable individuals	Greater use of social media to share images and use the community
Loss of ability to protect officers in potentially dangerous circumstances	Officer safety training increased
Loss of ability to track the behaviour of known dangerous individuals, e.g. those on the Sex Offenders Register	Improve sharing of imaging among officers
Inability to monitor those on civil orders	Improve sharing of imaging among officers

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Williams, Head of Community Safety and Emergency Planning
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 25
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Sports and Parks
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	James Denselow

<b>Proposals:</b>	Close A Sports Centre
-------------------	-----------------------

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£400K</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	Depends on centre to be closed

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	£350	£50	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>	TBC	<b>TBC</b>	

Note: This figure is a best estimate as there are different costs/savings associated with each sports centre.

### **Proposed savings**

This proposal is to close one of the three council owned sports centres.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

This is very likely to result in a considerable drop in levels of participation in sports and physical activity, although the exact effect wouldn't be known until a decision is made on which centre to close. It would affect both individual users of the centres as well as sports clubs and community organisations that use the facilities. It would have a detrimental affect on the health of Brent residents.

### **Key milestones**

A timetable for closure would be developed once a decision has been made.

## **Key consultations**

- Staff
- Property services
- Contractors
- Centre users – individuals and sports clubs/community organisation
- (The exact consultation would need to be adapted to the centre it is proposed to close).

## **Key risks and mitigations**

Brent has recognised low levels of participation in physical activity and high levels of diabetes and obesity. The closure of a sports centre is likely to further these problems. Some users would be able to use another sports centre, although this would be limited by capacity levels to meet the demand and ability to travel. Some sports clubs require specialist facilities which may not be available within a local centre. It may be possible to locate to a nearby centre in another borough.

Willesden Sports centre is a PFI contract expiring in 2031. Vale Farm sports centre is part of a tri-borough leisure contract expiring in 2023. Should the Council chose early termination of either of these contracts then the Council would be required to make substantial compensation payments as defined within the Contract documentation.

Many of the Business Unit tenants within Bridge Park Community Centre have leases whereby the Council requires redevelopment of the site to permit early termination.

Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre is located in an area of high deprivation, poor health, low physical activity, high unemployment and a large young population. Closing this centre would have a significant detrimental effect on some of the Borough's most vulnerable residents.

Closure of a sports centre would create significant property costs and risks associated with the ownership and management of a substantial vacant building. e.g. security, guardianship, rates, insurance, utilities and costs associated with its reuse.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	Yes
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Gerry Kiefer
Deadline:	TBC

Lead officer for this proposal:	Gerry Kiefer, Head of Sports and Parks.
---------------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	ENS 26
<b>Budget theme(s):</b>	Stopping Services Completely
<b>Service(s):</b>	Recycling and Waste
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	George Crane

<b>Proposals:</b>	Reduce levels of cleansing and litter picking in streets, parks and other open spaces.
-------------------	--

<b>2014/15</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s):</b>	<b>£400k</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	

	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17 Additional</b>	<b>Future years Additional</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Proposed saving:</b>	400	0	0
<b>Proposed staffing reduction (FTE)</b>			

### **Proposed savings**

This proposal is to reduce the service specification for the public realm contract in three areas: no litter clearing on (residential) roads, b) no pavement mechanical sweepers, and c) no weekend litter service in parks.

This will require negotiation with the contractor but indicative prices for this work submitted during the tendering process suggest this is the level of saving that would be achieved if members were to make this decision.

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

This would result in a lower level of cleansing within streets and parks and is very likely to result in lower satisfaction levels from residents and park users.

### **Key milestones**

March 2015 – negotiate changes with contractor  
 April 2015 – mobilise service changes

### **Key consultations**

This will require negotiation with the contractor



## **Key risks and mitigations**

The main risk is the drop in satisfaction with the cleanliness of streets and parks. There may be an opportunity to involve local people more in keeping the public realm clean by arranging community clean-up days, litter picks with 'friends of parks' groups, etc. However, this is unlikely to fully mitigate the effect of the reduction in cleansing levels.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed saving to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	N/A
Deadline:	N/A

Lead officer for this proposal:	Chris Whyte, Head of Recycling and Waste
---------------------------------	--