

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Notice of Meeting

THE EXECUTIVE

Tuesday, 13 April 2004 - Civic Centre, Dagenham, 7:00 pm

Members: Councillor C J Fairbrass (Chair); Councillor C Geddes (Deputy Chair); Councillor J L Alexander, Councillor G J Bramley, Councillor S Kallar, Councillor M E McKenzie, Councillor B M Osborn, Councillor J W Porter, Councillor L A Smith and Councillor T G W Wade

Declaration of Members Interest: In accordance with Article 1, Paragraph 12 of the Constitution, Members are asked to declare any direct/indirect financial or other interest they may have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting

5.04.04

Graham Farrant
Chief Executive

Contact Officer Barry Ray
Tel. 020 8227 2134
Fax: 020 8227 2171
Minicom: 020 8227 2685
E-mail: barry.ray@lbbd.gov.uk

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2004 (Pages 1 - 3)**

Business Items

Private Items 9 and 10 are business items. The Chair will move that these be agreed without discussion, unless any Member asks to raise a specific point. There are no Public Business Items.

Any discussion of a Private Business Item will take place after the exclusion of the public and press.

Discussion Items

3. **Asbestos Management in Non-Domestic Properties (Pages 5 - 12)**
4. **Response to London Riverside Integrated Transport Strategy (Pages 13 - 18)**

5. **The Heath Park Estate - Open Plan Front Gardens (Pages 19 - 20)**
6. **Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent**
7. **To consider whether it would be appropriate to pass a resolution to exclude the public and press from the remainder of the meeting due to the nature of the business to be transacted.**

Private Business

The public and press have a legal right to attend Council meetings such as the Executive, except where business is confidential or certain other sensitive information is to be discussed. The list below shows why items are in the private part of the agenda, with reference to the relevant legislation (the relevant paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).

Discussion Items

8. **Revenues Staffing Review (Pages 21 - 48)**

Business Items

9. **Request for Rehousing Outside of Council Policy - Rehousing from Service Tenancies (Pages 49 - 54)**
10. **Structural Repairs and Major Refurbishment at 1-43 Kilsby Walk (Pages 55 - 56)**
11. **Any other confidential or exempt items which the Chair decides are urgent**

THE EXECUTIVE

Tuesday, 30 March 2004
(7:00 - 8:17 pm)

Present: Councillor C J Fairbrass (Chair), Councillor C Geddes (Deputy Chair), Councillor J L Alexander, Councillor G J Bramley, Councillor S Kallar, Councillor M E McKenzie, Councillor B M Osborn, Councillor J W Porter, Councillor L A Smith and Councillor T G W Wade

Also Present: Councillor T J Justice, Councillor Mrs D Hunt and Councillor Mrs V M Rush

347. Minutes (23 March 2004)

Agreed.

348. Local Futures - 'Borough Profile of Barking and Dagenham'

Received a presentation by John Fisher on the Profile of Barking and Dagenham in respect of the economy, society and the environment.

349. The Third Sectors Access to the Service of the Criminal Records Bureau

Received a report seeking to enable the voluntary sector in Barking and Dagenham to gain access to the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) disclosure service.

Agreed, in order to enable the voluntary sector to conduct effective CRB checks independently from the Council, that:

1. The Barking and Dagenham Volunteer Bureau act as an umbrella organisation for disclosure checks for the voluntary sector in Barking and Dagenham;
2. A written review of the process be submitted to the Executive in January 2005 to ensure the safeguarding of children and vulnerable people who receive the services from local voluntary sector organisations;
3. Further discussions be held with the Council for Voluntary Services about their potential to be an umbrella organisation for CRB checks; and
4. Voluntary sector organisations who wish to undertake their own CRB checks continue to be entitled to do so.

350. Private Business

Agreed to exclude the public and press for the remainder of the meeting, as the business was confidential.

351. Changes in Management Arrangements in Social Services

Received a report proposing changes to the management structures within the Social Services Department.

Agreed, in order to create a more flexible senior management structure to meet the changing needs of the services delivered, to:

1. The interim arrangements as set out in the report and waive the Councils Constitution (Contract Rules 4.1e) in respect of the appointments alluded to in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.3 of the report;
2. The proposed changes to the management structure as set out in Appendix A and B of the report; and
3. Set up a panel in order to enable the recruitment to the post of Head of Strategy and Performance.

352. Refocusing of the Leisure and Environmental Services Department

Received a report outlining proposals to re-organise the Leisure and Environmental Services Department.

Agreed, in order to ensure that the Council delivers the community priorities effectively, in particular, 'Cleaner, Greener Safer'; 'Raising General Pride in the Borough' and 'Developing Rights and Responsibilities with the Community', to:

1. The proposed structure for the Leisure and Environmental Services Department as set out in Appendix 1 of the report for consultation with affected staff and the Trade Unions as outlined in Appendix 2 of the report;
2. Rename the Department to 'Regeneration and Environment', in order to reflect the recent changes incorporating regeneration services, on the condition that this should be at minimal cost; and
3. A progress report to be submitted to the Executive, following consultation, to confirm that savings targets have been achieved and to seek approval for new posts that fall within the LSMR range.

353. Award of Print and Distribution Contract for Citizen Magazine

Received a report seeking approval for the award of the Print and Distribution contracts for the 'Citizen' magazine.

Agreed, in order that the Citizen magazine can be printed and distributed, assisting the Council in achieving the Community Priority of "Raising general pride in the Borough", to:

1. Award the print contract for the Citizen magazine to Mayhew McCrimmon for the period of 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2007 at a cost of £86,436 per annum; and

2. Award the distribution contract to LTC for a year with the option to extend for three years at a cost of £48,840 per annum.

354. The Shape Up Programme

Noted a report setting out details of the Shape Up for Homes programme, including the current situation and projected final position of 19,872 houses refurbished and central heating installed in 10,437 properties. The report also set out the projected completion date of July 2004 and projected final costs.

Agreed the allocation of up to £3m from the Decent Homes Delivery programme in order to complete the Shape Up for Homes programme.

355. Virement for Completion of Refurbishment of Travellers' Site

Further to Minute 404 (15 April 2003), received a report detailing unforeseen costs associated with the renovation of the Traveller's site.

Agreed a virement of £73,000, from the Private Sector Housing Renovation Grant budget, to cover the unexpected legal and ancillary costs associated with the renovation of the Traveller's site.

356. * Head of Housing Services Redundancy Proposal

Further to Minute 294 (17 February 2004), received a report proposing the voluntary redundancy of the Head of Housing Services as part of the restructure of the Housing Landlord Service.

Agreed to the voluntary redundancy of the Head of Housing Services with effect from 30 September 2004 (or such earlier date as may be mutually agreed between the Council and the Head of Housing Services).

* Item considered as a matter of urgency with the consent of the Chair under Section 100 (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE**13 APRIL 2004****JOINT REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
AND THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE STRATEGY**

ASBESTOS MANAGEMENT IN NON DOMESTIC PROPERTIES		FOR DECISION
<p><i>This report deals with the need for funding under the Capital Programme and this decision is reserved to the Executive.</i></p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>At the end of December 2002 new legislation was introduced requiring sampling, identification and management of asbestos in non-domestic premises by May 2004. In order to comply with the Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2002 (CAW) it is felt advisable that the Council instigates a corporate strategy for the management of asbestos in non-domestic properties. It is also necessary for resources to be allocated, including Capital Funding to meet management requirements of the CAW Regulations 2002 and in particular Regulation 4. This report also provides information on work already undertaken and the current status of asbestos management.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Executive is recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree to the corporate strategy for the management of asbestos in non-domestic dwellings as outlined in this report; 2. Agree to the allocation of resources to meet management requirements of the CAW Regulations 2002, including Capital funding totalling £2,185,000, and the re-profiling of this funding to £1,400,000 in 2004/05 and £785,000 in 2005/06; and, 3. Note that it is intended to report in relation to asbestos management in Council owned residential properties at the end of June 2004. <p><u>Reason</u></p> <p>To assist the Council in achieving its Community Priority of “<i>Making Barking and Dagenham, Cleaner, Greener and Safer</i>”, and to comply with Legislation.</p>		
<p>Contact officers Jim Mack</p>	<p>Head of Asset Management and Development</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 3300 Fax: 020 8227 3896 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 E-mail: jim.mack@lbbd.gov.uk</p>
<p>Stephanie May</p>	<p>Head of Health and Safety</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 2201 Fax: 020 82272918 (fax) E-mail: stephanie.may@lbbd.gov.uk</p>

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the end of December 2002 new legislation (Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2002) was introduced requiring sampling, identification and management of asbestos in non-domestic premises by May 2004. The duty to manage asbestos in Council premises is covered in Appendix I attached as the Council has a duty to manage asbestos there is an expectation that works will still need to be completed in 2005/06.
- 1.2 A team of three officers was set up approximately two and a half years ago to establish an asbestos database and management system on a corporate basis. The Asbestos Manager and his team are part of the Leisure and Environmental Services Department (LESD). Surveys are being carried out in connection with capital schemes and the database is now fully operational and is being populated with survey data.
- 1.3 Action has also been taken to address identified problems and a corporate asbestos working party has been set up, with the Head of Asset Management and Development as chair, to promote a corporate approach to common issues and the management of asbestos. To date the group has made progress in addressing:
- sharing of data and information (historical, current and experiential) of where asbestos is present in Council premises
 - producing a master list of duty holders as required by the Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2002
 - developing training and awareness packages, and importantly,
 - working towards the development of a corporate strategy for the management of asbestos.
- 1.4 The introduction of the new CAW Regulation 4, although applying to non-domestic premises, has meant that a strategy for the management of asbestos in Council owned dwellings also needs to be considered; not the least because such premises are also at times places of work for Council employees and others who act on our behalf, such as Thames Accord Ltd. and contractors. In addition, public and / or communal areas in domestic premises are included in the Duty to Manage requirements.
- 1.5 Whilst this report primarily deals with non residential properties it is intended that a report will be presented to the Executive at the end of June to complete 2004 with regard to the actions needed in relation to the management of asbestos in Council owned residential premises.

2. Resource Issues

- 2.1 There are resource implications in complying with the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 (CAW Regulations). The items outlined below are priority areas which need to be addressed in order to meet the May 2004 deadline set by the Regulation. The Council can not comply with Section 4 of the Regulation by May of this year. It is hoped that the Regulation Body, the Health and Safety Executive, will be satisfied with the Council's plan to try to demonstrate conformance with the Duty to Manage asbestos in non-domestic premises. The programme of work will be spread between 2004 and 2006.

2.2 Asbestos Management System (AMS)/Corporate Asbestos Register (CAR)

This system shows the type and location of asbestos in premises, whether a survey has been carried out and what action has been taken to manage the asbestos if present and known.

The database is operational and although some progress has been made in populating this database, which is the main system for asbestos management in the Council, there is a need to ensure assimilation of data from the NBA (the company which set up the database as a result of Stock Condition Survey of residential properties) and Major Repairs Allowance (relating to major repairs and refurbishment) databases held by Housing & Health and the Council's CORMIS database. Currently there are pockets of information held in different formats and these need to be both consistent and made available across departments. There is an initial cost associated with down loading Asbestos data onto the corporate system, which is estimated at £20,000, however, further funds may be required to enable updating and dissemination of collected data. The lead in time for this is 3 months from placing the order.

2.3 Non-Domestic Premises Survey and Sampling

There are three categories of survey types:

Type 1 - No samples are taken.

Type 2 - Samples are taken and the type of asbestos and quantity is identified.

Type 3 - Sampling taken prior to major works or demolition.

The estimated cost of carrying out Type 2 surveys on operational properties (excluding schools and housing) is £190,000, it is also generally accepted that in schools and public buildings Type 2 surveys should be carried out. However, within housing services with many structures being of the same design it is felt that a mixture of Type 2 and Type 1 surveys will produce necessary information and will also ensure good value. Type 3 surveys will be completed as part of each major refurbishment project (e.g. Town Hall), the cost of which will be born by the project. Some of these funds have been included as part of other bids; however, there will be a need to have a contingency budget to deal with urgent asbestos removal although this cannot be fully quantified at this point in time. It is recommend, based on the experience of surveys carried out on School properties that a sum of £500,000 is initially set aside for the urgent removal of asbestos in operational buildings. Although for each instance of major asbestos find, consideration may need to be given as to whether it would be better to close the facility.

2.4 Non-Domestic Contingency Funding Schools

As a guide, during 2003/04 15 out of 60 schools have already been surveyed for DEAL. An additional £350,000 was required to deal with urgent remedial action (that is asbestos removal) as a result of the surveys. This suggests that an additional £1,050,000 (£350,000 x 3) will be required for the remaining 45 schools. Survey costs for schools have already been budgeted out of the 2004/5 major repairs fund. The implication is that contingency funding will be required to cover urgent remedial action following on from work already completed by DEAL.

2.5 Duty Holder Awareness and Training Package

Although some work has already been done in this area there is a need to develop a duty holder pack to ensure staff with responsibilities for buildings where asbestos is or may be present understand their obligations to manage asbestos. The estimated cost for this to include production, printing, distribution and training is £10,000.

2.6 Domestic Premises

The following items are related to costs associated with domestic premises.

2.6.1 Housing Common Areas

Whilst the new CAW Regulation 4 relates to non-domestic premises, there has been debate over what is domestic and non-domestic. Clarification from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and other authorities in a similar position advise that inside the entrance door to the flat or house is domestic, outside the door it is non-domestic.

The Council has 52 blocks above six storeys and the cost for sampling and surveying these blocks is £100,000.

There are 1,200 blocks of low-rise properties and the cost for surveying and sampling these blocks is £250,000.

2.6.2 Housing Domestic Dwellings

Domestic dwellings are not covered by the CAW Regulation 4. The simple option is that the Council does nothing inside domestic dwellings. However, as 22,000 homes mean 22,000 work places for some Council staff and contractors a full option appraisal with costs will be presented to the Executive at the beginning of June 2004. This will also assist the Council in making a comparison of its performance against Beacon Authorities with a similar housing stock. It will also provide the facilities to enable operatives to access information of where asbestos containing materials can be found and so enable the operatives to effect safe working and stop the disturbance of encapsulated asbestos.

2.6.3 Housing Domestic Voids and property types will be the subject of a further report in June 2004.

2.7 Contaminated Land

Although not covered by the new Control of Asbestos at Work Regulation 4 2002 land contaminated by asbestos can potentially pose a risk to health. The Council has adopted a Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy that describes how we will investigate and manage these situations. A five year inspection programme has been developed and funded by the Council to carry this work forward.

2.8 Programme and Project Management

In order to ensure effective management and delivery of surveys and subsequent action to deal with removal it will be necessary to appoint a programme manager whom will report to the corporate working group. A project manager will also be required to drive out delivery. The estimated costs are £55,000.

2.9 Financial Implications / Cost Summary

The £2,185,000 has been accommodated for in the Council's 2004/05 Capital Programme, however, due to the delays in drawing this project together it is anticipated that funding will need to be re-profiled as shown below. A break down of the cost shown is attached as Appendix II and unless indicated otherwise in Appendix II all costs are Capital.

Capital	2004/05	2005/06	Total	
Original Capital	£2,110,000	£ 75,000	£2,185,000	
Re-profiled	£1,400,000	£785,000	£2,185,000	
Revenue				
To be met from existing budgets.	£ 30,000		£ 30,000	

The above cost does not include monies that may be required to remove asbestos from housing common areas. As mentioned earlier, a further report will be submitted in relation to housing domestic properties at the end of June 2004. In order to comply with the CAW Regulations, the Council does need to take action now and progress cannot wait for all issues to be resolved.

It should be noted that if funding is made available for this issue then there will be less scope to fund other projects.

A detailed project appraisal has been submitted to the Capital Programme Management Office (CPMO) and the project has been assessed as satisfactory across all four assessment areas (i.e. achieved four greens).

3. Other Issues

- 3.1 There is a possibility that the Council may be open to claims from parties where existing Term Contracts exist because of contract issues that may involve variations to working practices. These issues are still being investigated.

4. Consultation

The following people were consulted during the production of this report.

Finance

Julie Parker, Director of Finance

Joe Chesterton, Head of Financial Services

Lee Russell, Head of Central Finance

Social Services

Julia Ross, Director of Social Services
Andy Bere, Asset Manager, SS
Steve Whitelock, Head of Finance, SS
Peggy Green, Peggy Green – Senior Business Support Officer

Education, Arts and Libraries

Roger Luxton, Director of Education, Arts and Libraries
Mike Freeman, Head of Assets and Administration
Andy Carr, Asset Manager, DEAL
Paul Pearson, Head of Finance DEAL

Leisure and Environmental Services

Bob Cooper, Interim Head of Finance (LES)
Gary Frost, Health & Safety Adviser
Graham Stocker, Building Surveying Manager
John Hunt, Corporate Asbestos Manager
Ravinder Sangha, Corporate Asbestos Inspector
Sarah Oxley, Corporate Asbestos Database Manager
Jack McKeown, Departmental IT Manager
Colin Beever, Head of Property Services

Housing and Health

David Woods, Director of Housing and Health
Keith Harris, Head of Procurement & Commissioning,
Colin Rigby, Head of Finance (DHH)
Jim Ripley, Head of Landlord Services
Ken Lyons, Project Sponsor
Rob Williams, Environmental Protection Best Practitioner
Melanie Farrow, Health & Safety Adviser
Darren Henaghan, General Manager-Community & Environment

Thames Accord (C/o Housing)

Adrain Honeywell, Technical Director
Derek Eves, Health and Safety Advisor

Corporate Strategy

Paul Feild, Corporate Lawyer, Legal Division
Stephanie May, Corporate Safety Advisor (Health and Safety)

Background Papers

Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2002 (CAW)

Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2002

The **duty to manage** requires those in control of premises to:

take reasonable steps to determine the location and condition of materials likely to contain asbestos;

presume materials contain asbestos unless there is strong evidence that they do not;

make and keep an up to date record of the location and condition of the ACMs or presumed ACMs in the premises;

assess the risk of the likelihood of anyone being exposed to fibres from these materials;

prepare a plan setting out how the risks from the materials are to be managed;

take the necessary steps to put the plan into action;

review and monitor the plan periodically; and

provide information on the location and condition of the materials to anyone who is liable to work on or disturb them.

ACM = Asbestos containing materials

SUMMARY TABLE OF COSTS

- The £1.05m budget should be against the item 'Contingency budgets Asbestos removal schools' and not 'Survey Costs covered by Existing Budget'
- The £500k budget should be against the item 'Contingency budget for removal operational buildings' and not 'Contingency budget Asbestos removal schools'

ITEM	COST	REQUIRED TO MEET 2004 DEADLINE
Collation of data basis AMS/CAR NBA & MRA assimilation. IT	£20,000 Capital	Yes £20,000 2004/05
Operational Buildings Non-Domestic Surveys & Sampling	£190,000 Type 2 Surveys Capital	Yes £115,000 2004/05 £ 75,000 2005/06
Duty Holder Pack	£10,000 Revenue to be met from existing LES budgets	Yes
Housing Common Areas	£350,000 Capital	Yes £215,000 2004/05 £135,000 2005/06
Housing Domestic Voids and property types	Subject to further report inn June 2004	
Education Additional Resources Education 0.5 person	£20,000 Revenue to be met by existing staff and existing Education budgets Covered Revenue to be met by existing staff and existing Education budgets.	
Survey costs covered by existing budget		
Contingency budget Asbestos removal schools	£1,050,000 Capital	£675,000 2004/05 £375,000 2005/06 No - but to deal with emergency action.
Contingency budget for removal operational buildings	£500,000 Capital	No - but Capital funds will be required to meet emergency removal. £325,000 2004/05 £175,000 2005/06
Cost for producing final asbestos Management document / manual	£20,000 Capital	Yes £ 20,000 2004/05
Programme management and project management costs	£55,000 Capital	Yes £ 30,000 2004/05 £ 25,000 2005/06

THE EXECUTIVE**13 APRIL 2004****REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

RESPONSE TO LONDON RIVERSIDE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY – FINAL SUMMARY REPORT 30 JANUARY 2004	FOR DECISION
<i>This is a key issue and the decision is therefore reserved to the Executive by the Constitution under the Scheme of Delegation.</i>	
<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>The proposed Transport Strategy covers the southern Riverside area of parts of both the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham and the London Borough of Havering. It calls for a step change in transport provision in order to attract investment in regeneration in the area that will significantly affect the community. Transport investment is clearly fundamental to this. The London Riverside needs help to become a “competitive location” for residential choice as well as commercial investment, since it has identifiable (non-transport) disadvantages at present. It needs high quality regional and local transport links if we are not to waste the potential development opportunity of major sites in London Riverside. Without transport investment in the area, there is no reasonable prospect of being able to achieve the quantity or quality of development which the London Riverside urban strategy aspires.</p> <p>The future development of integrated transport services in the London Riverside area could have important regeneration implications for the Borough. Residents and businesses are concerned about the level of integrated transport provision in the area. It is, therefore, important that the Government takes the views of the Council into account when considering the future development of transport and regeneration in the Thames Gateway.</p> <p>This report identifies the local transport networks and services that need to be improved as well as the links to the regional transport routes that run through the area. It highlights the next steps that need to be taken to improve transport in the area. These are listed in the recommendations.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Executive is recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree that jointly with London Riverside Ltd and London Borough of Havering we: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Initiate discussions with London Buses to investigate ways of strengthening bus network connections in both boroughs. (b) Undertake a feasibility study of public transport crossing over Rainham Creek to connect Centre for Engineering and Manufacturing Excellence (CEME) and Ferry Lane, in the London Borough of Havering (LBH). 	

- (c) Undertake with the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) project scoping of extension of Barking Gospel Oak line services to Rainham; (LBH).
- (d) Undertake with the SRA project scoping for new stations at Renwick Road and Beam River, LBBD & LBH. It should be noted there are conflicting aspirations between the two boroughs regarding the construction of these two stations.
- (e) Identify with Transport for London (TfL) for project scope of new interchange facilities at Dagenham Dock and Rainham; LBBD & LBH.
- (f) Press TfL for a commitment to upgrade to a non bus-based system such as trams; LBBD & LBH.

The Strategy proposes the implementation of a bus-based East London Transit (ELT) further phase to Rainham by 2008. It should also be noted that now the Thames Gateway Bridge has been approved there is pressure to extend the next phase of the East London Transit from Barking to Gallions Reach across the Bridge to connect with the Greenwich Waterfront Transit to provide a public transport link across the River Thames.

- (g) Secure from TfL the implementation of Renwick Road grade separation; (LBBD)
- (h) Work with Docklands Light Rail Ltd to develop an alignment for an extension to Dagenham Dock by 2010; It should be noted that this date has been revised by TfL to 2012 (LBBD)
- (i) Develop with SRA and TfL and others the London Riverside/Thames Gateway Metro; (LBBD & LBH), and,

2. Authorise the Head of Planning and Transportation to undertake these next steps.

Reason

This will assist the Council in achieving its Community Priority of *“Regenerating the Local Economy”*.

Wards Affected

All of the Borough, but particularly the regeneration areas in the South Riverside area of the Borough. It should be noted that some of these proposals affect the London Borough of Havering only.

<p>Contact: Peter Wright</p>	<p>Head of Planning and Transportation</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 3900 Fax: 020 8227 3896 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 Email: peter.wright@lbbd.gov.uk</p>
---	--	---

1. LBBB Response to the Final Summary Report

- 1.1 This report presents the response of the Council to the London Riverside Integrated Transport Strategy final report. This reports sets out the background of relating transport to proposed development in the London Riverside area. It recognises the area has got to be made more attractive - both absolutely and relative to other competing areas. That means, partly, making it more convenient, with strategic "spinal" and high quality local public transport. It also creates distinctive riverside communities with life, character and activity, as well as protecting and improving green space where this is of value.
- 1.2 Transport investment is clearly fundamental to this. The London Riverside needs help to become a "competitive location", for residential choice as well as commercial investment, since it has identifiable (non-transport) disadvantages at present. It needs high quality regional and local transport if we are not to waste the potential, especially on the major opportunity sites such as London Riverside.
- 1.3 If aspirations in terms of homes and jobs and sustainable communities are to be met, close attention must be paid to the planning of transport at the local level, combined with a commitment to integrated planning and funding. Securing high density sustainable developments in the London Riverside will require a step change in the level of commitment to and resources for the building and procurement of local transport systems. Without this, there is no reasonable prospect of being able to achieve the quantity or quality of development to which the London Riverside project aspires. The local transport systems must provide for connections to the strategic transport hubs, and must integrate core local transport spines with other services.
- 1.4 The production of a Borough Wide Transport Strategy is the key task for the new Strategic Transportation Group being formed in the Planning and Transportation Division. This work will commence this financial year. However, in the absence of a transport strategy for the Borough as a whole at present, the Executive is asked to agree to lobby on specific issues and projects rather than agree the Transport Strategy as a whole. The reason for this is that there may be competing transport schemes elsewhere in the Borough that may have a higher potential to assist in the regeneration of the Borough than some of those in London Riverside and should therefore be a higher priority for the Council.
- 1.5 In summary, the key elements of London Riverside Integrated Transport Strategy are:
 - 1.5.1 **Chapter 2** - "Strategy Development" reviews the scope of work undertaken, the fundamental principles of discouraging excessive car usage and the need to establish public transport networks to underpin higher density development. The current highway network will require to be upgraded if it is not to act as a constraint on the development potential of the area.

1.5.2 **Chapter 3** - “Land – Use and Development Opportunities” outlines the following strategies:

- The ‘Do the Minimum’ scenario over the next 20 years, based on current market forces, without any further major planning intervention shows a predicted 4,699 residential units and 12,775 jobs with limited public transport provision.
- A High Growth 2020 vision based on a blanket assumption of higher density development across the whole London Riverside Action Group (LRAG) area , which allows for 22,334 residential units and 32,000 jobs in the area supported by a high quality transport system.
- Based on high-density development focused at public transport intersections.
- Higher densities and mixed uses will add vitality and spread of growth to other sites,
- Which involves burying power cables below ground (but retaining the power station).

1.5.3 **Chapter 4** - “Area Transport Issues” provides an area focus and analysis. It concludes that for growth to be successful there will need to be a shift of mode away from car to public transport but new road capacity will still be needed. It is the modal shift which is critical, because if its scale is insufficient, then even with new road space it will be highway capacity that will force a limit on development potential. It suggests that London Riverside development potential is directly dependent on the capacity of the Docklands Light Rail (DLR)/East London Transit (ELT) package.

1.5.4 **Chapter 5** - “Elements of Public Transport Strategy” reviews in turn the strategic and local transport investment issues, in relation to the development potential that could be attracted and/or unlocked. It explores the contribution that C2C services can bring, new stations, Crossrail, London Underground extensions, Docklands Light Railway (DLR), ELT orbital bus links, ferry connections, infrastructure scheme costs. The analysis of the public transport choices, is seen as critically important to getting the most out of the major sites, is structured as a comparison of two scenarios - "Bus-based transit" and "Tram/Light Rail Transit (LRT) based transit". It is argued that, whilst the capacity provided by bus-based transit will be adequate for most areas, it will not be adequate for London Riverside, where the Docklands Light Rail is proposed to be extended from Gallions Reach to Dagenham Dock. There is limited experience of such systems having any impact on development and modal choices. This makes it a high-risk strategy compared with the more credible and committed rail-based (tram/LRT) systems, in a development environment as unattractive as that of the Thames Gateway.

- 1.5.5 **Chapter 6** - “Highways” analyses the main highway and junction capacities of the A13, the Thames Gateway Bridge, and Parking Strategies. The A13 eastwards from Dagenham to the M25 is a newly constructed high quality strategic route. Capacity is currently being increased westwards to reduce delays at junctions such as Movers Lane and Prince Regent’s Lane. The latter schemes are expected to give faster access to the A406 North Circular Road and the Blackwall Tunnel. Barking Reach will have direct access to the A13 at a new grade separated junction. By 2016 the A13 to the West across the River Roding would be operating at 97% capacity in the morning peak; this suggests that there is likely to be congestion on this route in the peak hour. The adjacent Ripple Road north of the A13 is also close to capacity.
- 1.5.6 **Chapter 7** - “Freight” reports on the significant amount of freight industry in the area, as well as it being a significant movement corridor for through freight movements on road and rail networks. There is likely to be increasing pressures for available space on both the road and rail networks particularly between passengers and freight on the rail network.
- 1.5.7 **Chapter 8** - “Transport Strategy” reviews the short, medium and long-term strategies for two alternative land use development options and the transport demand generated by these options. Highway capacity is heavily used in much of the Thames Gateway, leaving little scope for major traffic growth. The River Thames imposes an East / West orientation to travel and where crossing the River Thames is possible at Blackwall and Dartford, access routes are very congested at times. The highway schemes discussed earlier may improve local access in some areas, but do not fundamentally alter an overall pattern of increasing road congestion in the Thames Gateway.
- 1.5.8 **Chapter 9** - “The Way Forward” sets out the key tasks and recommended actions. The vision for the London Riverside area can be achieved, but requires a much greater commitment to public transport investment than has been envisaged to date. The timescale is likely to be longer than that assumed, partly due to the long-term nature of major transport investment, and partly due to demand. Although there is significant market interest, realising the full potential of this area is dependent upon major investment in local public transport. Without an integrated high capacity public transport system, development intensity would not reach its full potential. Consequently, if strong public transport orientation cannot be achieved in the short-term, the bulk of development may need to be held back until major public transport infrastructure and road connections are committed.

2. Financial Implications

- 2.1 The cost of recommendation (i) (e.g. feasibility studies and appraisals) will be met from external funding, except for a small internal transport budget. Staff resources are included in the Regeneration Best Value Review and will be allocated to the Strategic Transport Group.

3. Consultation

3.1 External

A workshop was held on 2 May 2003 at which the strategy was discussed with the following:

Docklands Light Railway
Heart of Thames Gateway Partnership (now London Riverside)
Greater London Authority
London Development Agency
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Newham
Thames Gateway London Partnership
Transport for London

3.2 Internal

The following people have seen this report and are happy with it as it stands.

LESD:

Bob Cooper, Interim Head of Finance, LESD
Mike Mitchell, Head of Environmental Management
Mike Livesey, Head of Civil Engineering
Jeremy Grint, Head of Regeneration
Kevin Munnely, Regeneration Manager
Gordon Glenday, Group Manager, Sustainable Development

Housing and Health:

Ken Jones, Interim Head of Housing Strategy

Regeneration Board on 30 March 2004.

Portfolio Holder - Councillor Kallar has also been advised of the contents of this report.

Background Papers

London Riverside Integrated Transport Strategy – Final Summary Report 30/1/04
(published by Sinclair Knight Merz, 2-8 Maltravers Street, London WC2R 3EE
Web: www.skmconsulting.com)

THE EXECUTIVE**13 APRIL 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HOUSING AND HEALTH**

THE HEATH PARK ESTATE – OPEN PLAN FRONT GARDENS	FOR DECISION	
<p><i>This report advises Members of the current position in relation to retained front gardens on the Heath Park Estate and seeks confirmation that the open plan status of the Estate should remain.</i></p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>This report is to inform Members of a recent enquiry from a resident on the Heath Park Estate and to seek confirmation that the open plan status of the Estate should remain.</p> <p><u>Wards Affected</u> - Eastbrook</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p>The Executive is asked to decide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether the open plan status of the Estate should remain or if the current restrictions not to allow front garden parking and boundary fences should be lifted. 2. That decisions on the course of action to be taken where there is already a breach of the restrictive covenant in consultation between Officers and the Ward Members. <p><u>Reason</u></p> <p>To review or re-affirm the present policy of retaining front garden land on Right to Buy sales and decide if residents should be allowed to have front garden parking and provide boundary fences.</p>		
<p>Contact: Jim Ripley</p>	<p>Head of Landlord Services</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 3738 Fax: 020 8227 5705 Minicom: 020 8227 5755 E-mail: jim.ripley@lbbd.gov.uk</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 Members will be aware that part of the Heath Park Estate comprising of 350 houses in Bosworth Road, Calverley Crescent, Frizlands Lane, Listowel Road, Nasey Road, Rusholme Avenue, Trefgarne Road and Wythenshawe Road, is reserved as an open plan Estate. When properties have been sold under the Right To Buy, the Council

have retained ownership of the front gardens. The Housing and Health Department has continued to maintain the front gardens of these sold properties in addition to the properties which are still occupied by tenants and the annual cost to the Housing Revenue Account for this work is approximately £8,000.00. This amount is considered to be fairly minimal to maintain the pleasant open aspect of the Estate

- 1.2 In all cases a restrictive covenant within the transfer on sale precludes the owners from carrying out any external works without the prior permission of the Council. As a matter of course in order to preserve the open plan appearance of the Estate, applications to erect front boundary fences and applications for front garden parking are refused.
- 1.3 A letter has recently been received on behalf of an elderly person living on the Estate who is experiencing nuisance from youths and neighbours who cut across her garden, bang on her windows and damage planting in her front garden (Council Land). The letter requests permission to be given to the owner/occupier to have a boundary fence erected adjacent to the front garden path in the hope that it will stop this nuisance. In line with the current policy the request has been refused. The person who made the request, the owner's son-in-law has appealed against this decision.

2. Conclusions

- 2.1 If this request is agreed it would create a precedent for other owner occupiers to request permission to carry out similar work. It should be noted that some owner occupiers have, without the Councils permission erected front boundary walls or provided front garden parking. If Members re-affirm that the current restrictions should not be lifted, then consideration will be needed as to what action should be taken in each individual case. It is suggested that these decisions be taken in consultation between Officers and the Ward Members. The Ward Members have been consulted on this matter.

Background Papers:

None.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank