London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Notice of Meeting

THE EXECUTIVE

Tuesday, 18 January 2005 - 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 H J Collins, Councillor S Kallar, Councillor M A McCarthy, Councillor M E McKenzie, 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

07.01.05

John Tatam
Director of Corporate Strategy

Contact Officer: Alan Dawson
Tel. 020 8227 2348
Fax: 020 8227 2171
Minicom: 020 8227 2685
E-mail: alan.dawson@lbbd.gov.uk

AGENDA

1.   **Apologies for Absence**

2.   **Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 21 December 2004 (previously circulated)**

Business Items

Public Item 3 and Private Items 11 to 16 are business items. The Chair will move that these be agreed without discussion, unless any Member asks to raise a specific point.

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

3.   **Attendance at Society of IT Managers Autumn Conference 2004 (Pages 1 - 3)**

Discussion Items

The London Borough of
Barking & Dagenham

4.   **Urban Design Framework and Public Realm Strategy for the Borough: Interim Fencing and Boundary Treatment Design Guidelines for the Borough (Pages 5 - 37)**

5.   **Land Disposal (to follow)**

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.   **Use of Right-To-Buy Receipts: Refurbishment of Oldmead and Bartlett Houses - Preparing for a PFI Bid (Pages 39 - 41)**

Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 8)

9.   **Update on Re-Provision of Disability Day and Residential Services (Pages 43 - 54)**

Concerns a Staffing Matter (paragraphs 1 and 11)

10.   **University of East London: Report on High Court Proceedings and Urgent Action Taken Under Paragraph 17 of Article 1 of the Council's Constitution (Pages 55 - 60)**

Concerns Legal Proceedings (paragraph 12)

Business Items

11.   **Restructuring of the Arrangements for the Delivery of the London East Connexions Partnership's Connexions Service (Pages 61 - 64)**

Concerns the Business Affairs of a Third Party (paragraph 7)

12.   **LSMR Posts in Revenue Services (Pages 65 - 107)**

Concerns a Staffing Matter (paragraph 1)

The London Borough of
Barking & **Dagenham**

13. **Regrading of Two LSMR Posts Within the Policy and Performance Service (Pages 109 - 124)**

   Concerns a Staffing Matter (paragraph 1)

14. **Restructure Within the Policy and Performance Service (Pages 125 - 133)**

   Concerns a Staffing and Labour Relations Matter (paragraphs 1 and 11)

15. **Roding & St Teresa's RC Primary Schools: New Kitchen / Dining Accommodation (Pages 135 - 138)**

   Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraphs 7, 8 and 9)

16. **Site Investigation at Thames View Estate (Pages 139 - 143)**

   Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 8)

17. **Any other confidential or exempt items which the Chair decides are urgent**

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE

18 JANUARY 2005

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

ATTENDANCE AT SOCIETY OF IT MANAGERS AUTUMN CONFERENCE 2004	FOR INFORMATION

This report provides feedback from attendance at conferences in accordance with the Council's Conference, Visits and Hospitality Rules, which states that the Executive must approve such attendance and receive a feedback report.

Recommendation

The Executive is asked to note feedback from the following:

- Society of IT Managers Autumn Conference 2004

Contact Officer: Peter Millett	Production Services Manager	Telephone: 020 8227 2055 Fax: 020 8227 2060 E-mail: peter.millett@lbbd.gov.uk

1.   Background

1.1   The Society of Information Technology Management (SOCITM) is the recognised body of Public Sector IT managers, Socitm supports its members in modernisation, best value and e-government programmes, and works closely with national and local government to share best practice and achieve excellence in the delivery of public services.

1.2   The organisation holds two conferences one in the spring and one in the autumn. These conferences are held at various venues around the United Kingdom, the Spring one being a one day event and the Autumn one over three days, starting with the President's welcome and a keynote speech on Sunday evening.

1.3   The event combines Keynote speakers with workshops and an exhibition of relevant Information Technology software and hardware suppliers. Speakers included, Sir Michael Bichard, chair of the inquiry into the intelligence handling of the Soham murders, David Taylor author of *The Naked Leader* and Peter Hetherington regional affairs editor of *The Guardian*. Workshops include 'achieving a transactional status website, connecting to the NHS, achieving BS7799 the most widely recognised security standard.

1.4   Approval to attend this conference was given by the Executive on 20 July 2004 (Minute 50).

2. **Event Summary**

Sunday 10th October

The conference opened with a presentation from David Taylor, Author of the Naked Leader. He gave an excellent presentation on leadership that enthused the start of the conference. He had the audience engaged throughout his presentation, the theme of which was: decide what your objective is, decide what you need to do to achieve it, then just get on and do it.

Monday 11th October

Presentation from the Scottish Local Authorities Management Centre:

Urged IT managers to go back to their authorities and sell the e-government agenda to their elected members, to ensure sufficient funds would be allocated to this work by local politicians. They felt that the key was to focus on what they felt deeply mattered to members: their ability to connect with citizens. If this was achieved then the reasons for why investment should be made in the broader IT agenda would be more convincing.

A presentation on how West Lothian are using technology in innovative ways to support elderly and vulnerable people remain in their homes who would have otherwise had to be taken into care. This was interesting and as technology prices fall could come into the mainstream of helping people. Wiring up the homes of the elderly with smart technology will deliver better care at a fraction of the cost of a stay in a care home.

The rest of the day was used for 40 minute facilitated workshops on Transactional Web Sites; ITIL/ BS1500 Service Management; BS7799 Information Security; Information Sharing with other public services. This format was interesting but could have been longer to get more benefit.

Throughout the conference there was an exhibition by almost a hundred suppliers of services and solutions, some useful contacts were made on various issues including : wireless networks; servers consolidation, applications solution suppliers etc. There were also many opportunities to network with colleagues.

A presentation from Peter Hetherington of the Guardian wasn't technology related and he spoke about regional agenda, post the establishment of the Scottish and Welsh assemblies.

Tuesday 12th October

Andrea Di Maio of the Gartner Group gave a presentation on joined up government and the business value of IT, E-Government strategies, open source software policies.

In a subsequent session Martin Scarfe hosted a debate on the national projects for local e-government, he said the projects were co-operating on a piece of work to group their products and materials across the 14 priority service outcome areas, as well as the six Gershon efficiency areas. There was some debate on how effective this has been, take-up has been poor. The suggestion was made that the money could have been better spent by giving it direct to Authorities.

The conference closed with the much awaited Sir Michael Bichard, of the Soham inquiry, presented on IT coming of age. This was interesting; however there was only one passing reference to the Soham report, which was disappointing. However the focus on Information Management with the Freedom of Information Act coming into effect in January 2005 was extremely useful.

3.   Benefits and Costs

    3.1   The benefits of attending the conference are the opportunity to network with peers both in workshops and throughout the conference, secondly the chance to speak to suppliers of new products and to discuss and research advances in new technology in an informal and friendly environment and finally to understand how other authorities are meeting the challenges set by central government and learning from their experiences. It is important that we continue to attend such events to keep up with current thinking and to enable us to share ideas, experiences and learning.

    3.2   The estimated cost of this event was £1475 plus travel costs.
The actual cost of the event was:-

- Event cost for three people   £1475
- Flights and transfers to Edinburgh   £250
- Total cost   £1725

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE

18 JANUARY 2004

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT

URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK AND PUBLIC REALM STRATEGY FOR THE BOROUGH: INTERIM FENCING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE BOROUGH	FOR DECISION

This report deals with issues of a policy nature, the decision on which is reserved to the Executive by the Scheme of Delegation.

Summary

A comprehensive Borough-wide Public Realm Strategy and action plan for the Borough will be produced during 2004/05. This builds on the findings and recommendations of the Street Scene Policy Commission, and will provide detailed guidance in relation to the design of all public areas, including boundary treatments, ensuring that environmental quality is secured for the benefit of residents, workers and those interested in investing in the Borough. The interim Fencing and Boundary Treatment Design Guidelines will be enveloped by the Strategy and will be linked to the design of other streetscape elements, but are proposed as interim guidance until such time as the Public Realm Strategy has been completed, consulted upon and adopted by the Council in 2005. A wider Urban Design Framework is currently in production, which will identify key elements of the Borough, distinctive environmental quality and key requirements to enable the key areas of the Borough to be better connected, better used and more attractive.

Recommendation

The Executive is recommended to:-

1.   approve the Fencing and Boundary treatment Design Guidelines as a document for wider consultation;

2.   approve the subsequent use of the Fencing and Boundary treatment Design Guidelines as Interim Design Guidance until incorporated into the wider Public Realm Strategy for the Borough;

3.   support the exploration of issues pertinent to the successful implementation of the strategy, such as programming, finance, procurement, management and maintenance regimes, safety requirements, impact on DDA requirements; and,

4.   support the production of the Urban Design Framework and Public Realm strategy, as tools to ensure improvements to the natural and built environment and public spaces.

Reason
Urban design focuses on the qualitative aspects of the Planning, regeneration, sustainable development and liveability agendas. It is at the heart of assisting the Council achieve its Community Priorities of *'Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener and Safer",* *"Raising General Pride in the Borough" and "Regenerating the Local Economy'* through securing high quality design in all areas, whilst ensuring safety and security and accessibility for all, within realistic financial parameters.

Wards Affected
All Wards in the Borough.

Contact		
Bernadette McGuigan	Group Manager Urban Design	Tel: 020 - 8227 3881
		Fax: 020 - 8227 3896
		Minicom: 020 - 8227 3034
		E-mail): bernadette.mcguigan@lbbd.gov.uk;

1.   Background

1.1   Urban Design is a new area for the Council. Urban design is about creating spaces and places of quality that enable the community to use and enjoy them in a number of ways. The improvements to the environment that can be achieved through Urban Design guidance can have a positive impact on all of the Council's Community Priorities and on the wellbeing of the residents and users of the Borough.   The interim Fencing and Boundary Design Guidelines, are aimed at reducing the visual 'clutter' produced through the provision of a wider variety of fencing / boundary treatments, and improving the appearance and consistency of the use of boundary treatments without compromising on safety, security or special requirements.

1.2   Government policies, the London Plan and best practice now require developers to submit design statements for key developments. The Urban Renaissance and sustainability agendas, place more emphasis on good quality design of the environment as an essential part of securing sustainable communities for the future.

1.3.   The quality of the Public Realm; i.e. those areas of the Borough that are accessible and used by the public, is crucial to the image of the Borough, to attracting inward investment and achieving positive regeneration benefits. To ensure high quality in the built and natural environment we need to be particular about design details and standards, management and maintenance, lead by example in the works undertaken by the Council and be direct in our negotiations with developers.

2.   Proposals For The Production Of Design Documents

2.1.   At present the Council does not have Urban Design Guidance which enables a holistic and comprehensive design approach to be adopted across the Borough. As part of the new Urban Design Group's work, we will be producing an Urban Design Framework (UDF) and a Public Realm Strategy (PRS) for the Borough.

The UDF will be a strategic document that embodies key aspects of and ties in with the community strategy, the London Plan, the Urban Renaissance and sustainability agenda, and the new Local Development Framework (LDF). The UDF will present an interpretation of the qualitative and physical aspects of the 2020 Regeneration Vision for the Borough and will help to structure regeneration and development proposals for the future.

2.2.   The Public Realm Strategy will include more detailed proposals regarding design elements that play a part in making the public places and spaces in the Borough. The Public realm strategy builds on the findings and will encompass the recommendations of the Street Scene Policy Commission of 2001. The Public Realm Strategy will be in the form of design guidance that can be issued to developers and used by Council Departments to provide an improved and visually attractive Borough, using existing Capital and Revenue Programmes, external funding and Section 106 funding mechanisms and through a prudent programme for replacement and repair. Elements that will be included in the PRS are indicated an Appendix A of the Fencing and Boundary Treatment Guidelines, which are attached as **Appendix A**.

3.   Implementation, Procurement And Financial Impacts

3.1   Action plans will accompany both the UDF and the PRS, to ensure that those aspects that are within the remit of the Council are rolled out in accordance with the principles of the UDF and the detail of the PRS. The intention is that the Public Realm Strategy will influence the spending and programming of works in the public realm, to ensure a more cohesive and co-ordinated approach. The aim is to focus on the public realm to holistically produce a good quality environment in all aspects of the public realm, rather than focussing on individual elements alone.

3.2.   This will influence and impact upon Council spending plans in future years. In some cases, there will be cost savings where fencing is removed completely, in other areas there may be costs involved in replacing, renewing or in the provision of new boundary treatments in accordance with the guidance. However, the extent of the financial impacts cannot be gauged until further work and scrutiny of Capital and Revenue costs have been carried out. It is recognised that the cost of this policy will have to be contained within existing resources, and this may impact on the priority of renewal and replacement programmes and a review of the Policy direction outlined in the Corporate Protocol for fencing.

3.3.   Procurement of services may also need to be reviewed in the light of the Public Realm Strategy proposals, to ensure that adequate services and appropriate quality materials in line with the agreed strategy can be procured in line with Best Value. In relation to the procurement of Fencing and Boundary treatment products, the 'Fencing of Land' advice from the Land sub Committee, dated 30 September 1997, is currently still in force, this will need to be reviewed and may be superseded by new procurement advice to enable the implementation of the Guidelines.

3.4.   As part of the considered approach to the Public Realm Strategy, we will need to produce the Strategy in parts, reflecting specific themes and elements. Some of these such as the Fencing and Boundary treatment Design Guidelines will be issued as interim guidance, until the PRS is adopted or incorporated into the LDF

This will enable the guidance to be used in determining planning applications and in influencing Council spending on new fencing,

4   The Fencing And Boundary Treatment Design Guidelines

4.1.   Fencing and Boundary treatments provide the 'envelope' for the Public Realm, and are often overlooked in streetscape and public realm strategies. However the impact that boundary treatments have on the image of the Borough are immediate. Whether boundaries appear attractive and in good repair, unobtrusive and barely visible, or broken down, vandalised, ill-maintained, excessive, intrusive, and impenetrable, your impressions of an area are often conditioned by the state and appearance of boundary treatments. This impacts on how people feel about an area, how inclined they are to spend time there, or invest in an area.

4.2   For this reason, boundary and fencing treatments have been tackled first, as a key element in the public realm. The guidelines attached as **Appendix A**, demonstrate the scale of the problem in Barking and Dagenham, suggests a design approach and outlines a simple matrix of styles that may be applied to different applications. It is recognised however, that we are not dealing with a 'one size fits all' situation, and that there may be circumstances where a greater flexibility will be required to produce a more creative or innovative solution. In addition, other Agencies standards of construction and finish may need to be implemented for reasons of safety for example. The guidelines only tackle those boundaries that form part of the public realm, and do not deal with boundaries within the private realm such as back garden areas, for example.

5.   The Next Steps

5.1   Extensive collaboration with the relevant Executive Portfolio Holders and Council Officers is anticipated on both the UDF and PRS, alongside extensive consultation with external stakeholders and the community. Both studies will be broken down into themes, such as the Fencing and Boundary treatments, and presented to Councillors in due course, prior to public consultation.

5.2   The UDF and PRS, will both have action plans attached, outlining a future programme for the implementation of the guidance. In addition, this will focus on the six Community Forum areas, to enable local management practices and effective community engagement at a local level.

5.3   The Council will need to lead by example, through implementation of the approved public realm guidelines in relation to regeneration proposals, land, buildings and Services that the Council is involved in or responsible for. This will require a thorough review of procurement practices and contractual specifications, with the relevant Council departments, to ensure that this happens. It is proposed that this should happen in tandem with the consideration of thematic parts of the Public Realm Strategy. This also needs to consider a programme for effective replacement of inappropriate fencing in particular applications, for which an audit of existing boundary treatments on Council owned land may be appropriate. This would help to determine priority for replacement programmes. This will have to reflect budgetary processes, regeneration and improvement initiatives and tenants/ residents / public opinion.

5.4   In addition, management and maintenance practices may also need to be reviewed to ensure that the quality of the environment is retained. This will include an assessment of management and maintenance programmes, and the efficient use of Revenue budgets and additional funding packages.

5.5   The Fencing and Boundary treatment Guidelines for Barking and Dagenham will be accompanied by an assessment of processes, as outlined in 5.3 and 5.4 above, as part of the next steps in this process.

6.   Consultation –

The following people have been consulted during the preparation of this report.

DRE:
Jeremy Grint. Head of Regeneration
Peter Wright, Head of Planning and Transportation
Jim Mack, Head of Asset Management & Development
Mike Mitchell, Head of Environmental Management
Mike Livesey, Group Manager Civil Engineering
Allan Aubrey, Head of Leisure and Community

Corporate Strategy:
Naomi Goldberg, Head of Policy & Performance

Finance:
Joe Chesterton, Head of Financial Services
David Waller, Interim Head of Finance, DRE

H&H
Keith Harriss, Head of Procurement & Commissioning
Jim Ripley, Head of Landlord Services
Ken Jones, Head of Housing Strategy

SS
Phillip Baldwin, Regeneration & Community Involvement Manager

DEAL
Andy Carr, Assets Manager

Lead Members:
The following are aware of the proposals.

Regeneration, Councillor Kallar.
Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener, Safer, Councillor McKenzie.
Raising General Pride in the Borough, Councillor Wade.
Housing, Health and Adult Care, Councillor L Smith.

Background Papers
- Street Scene Policy Commission: Final report and recommendations – Joint Report of DLES and DH&H, to the Assembly meeting 23 May 2001.
- Corporate Protocol for the Fencing of Land. Appendix A: Report to the Land Sub Committee 30 September 1997. (and subsequent Policy Advice to Social Services

Committee, Leisure and Amenities Committee, Technical Services Committee,
Housing Committee between November and December 1997)

Fences Design Guide

www.barking-dagenham.gov.uk

The London Borough of
Barking & **Dagenham**

2

Fencing and Boundary design Guidelines

Context

These guidelines will form part of a wider Public Realm Strategy and Streetscape design guide for the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham. The strategy will be adopted as interim Planning Guidance and will be incorporated into the emerging Local Development Framework. The Public realm strategy and streetscape guide, will build on the foundations of the Urban design Framework for Barking and Dagenham, which focuses on the form and structure, key spaces, places and distinctiveness of the Borough.

Timber / metal seating

Stone seating

Litterbins

Bicycle stands

Tree surrounds

from "The Barking Code"
prepared for LBBD by Barnes + Nice

The primary aim of the Strategy and design guide will be to improve the aesthetic and functional qualities of the spaces that people experience and use every day. The Strategy and design guide therefore will cover all aspects of the design and quality of elements that combine to form the public realm.

Items such as seating, lighting, paving, litter bins, signage, tree planting, and other elements will be examined in relation to need, location, style, colour and durability. In addition, key issues such as safety, security, long term maintenance, procurement and implementation will also be explored. All of these aspects need to work together to create the desired improvements across the Borough, and to raise our aspirations for quality design. *Appendix A* indicates the contents of the draft Public Realm Strategy and Streetscape design guide.

3

Improving the quality of the public realm, not only helps in creating a more pleasant Borough that works and functions better, but is about creating distinctiveness, improving the image of Barking and Dagenham and providing the right kind of basis for inward investment opportunities for the benefit of all.

The strategy and design guide will be produced in loose leaf format to facilitate amendments, additions and ease of use. It will focus on the different elements that make up the public realm, special areas and character areas of the Borough and the contribution that the public realm makes or should make to these areas.

The strategy and design guide will be used to influence the decisions made by developers, designers, residents, businesses and the Council in creating and contributing to the Public Realm. It will be used in negotiations on planning applications, Section 106 agreements and in refining Council spending programmes.

A 5 year action plan for implementation in each Community Forum area will also be prepared to support the Strategy and the Local Development Framework in delivering improvements in line with the seven Community Priorities. It will also enable the community to engage in the decisions made about the Public realm in their area.

4

Part 1: Introduction

There are a number of different boundary treatments used in Barking and Dagenham.
Boundary treatments and the maintenance of them can signify a lot about a place, whether it is desirable, undesirable, maintained, accessible, vulnerable or safe. They can also speak volumes about the pride the local community and organisations working within that community have in the area, and the value that the area holds for them, physically, economically and psychologically.

The impact of boundary treatments on those living working and moving through an area is instant. The condition, type and location of boundary treatments have a direct impact on the image of an area by providing an instant snapshot of the general economy, funding on maintenance and improvements. The image of the area can affect the level of inward investment and attention to quality and detail that those considering investing in the area will give, or feel is necessary to provide, to bring the locality up to a standard that they can feel proud of or are prepared to invest in.

In considering the streetscape and public realm, the boundaries, i.e. fences, walls, landscaping, often provide the envelope within which the public realm is contained. They provide the interface between the public, semi-public, and

5

private realm and define spaces according to use and function. The design of boundary treatments therefore is a critical element of the public realm. Too often in design guidance however, fencing is given scant coverage, and is not covered in a holistic way.

Improvements to the Public realm and to fencing and boundary treatments, is an area where the council working with inward investment agencies, developers and local businesses can do much to change the image of the area for the better and attract the opportunities that the local communities desire and need across a number of sectors from employment to housing, social and leisure facilities.

The purpose and use of these guidelines

In approaching the issue our objectives are to create an harmonious, well designed and quality environment, which improves the image and appearance of Barking and Dagenham, without compromising on safety and security.

Our aim in this guide is to provide a range of fencing and boundary products that are widely available from manufactures. The guide provides a choice of boundary treatments for a number of different applications, to enable the developer, householder or council to choose a fencing/boundary treatment style within a matrix which is consistent with the design principles and aspirations that the Council have for the area, without compromising on key aspects such as safety and security. However, we also aim to reduce the need for so many of the boundary treatments in the Borough by providing a more limited palette of materials that have more universal usage. This approach is outlined in **Part 3.**

The guidelines also include the Council's requirements for the implementation and long term maintenance of new fences and boundaries, to ensure that the public realm 'envelope' is kept in good order and helps to achieve the step change in image that we aspire to. These are outlined in **Part 6.**

These guidelines only cover fencing and boundary treatments that form part of the public or semi-public realm, in other words adjoining areas where the public have free and general access, including fronting onto roadways or public spaces. It will not deal with fences or boundaries that fall within the private realm, such as

6

back or side garden boundaries, although we would encourage these standards to be adopted where ever possible.

The guidelines will be used in all pre-application discussions with developers and designers and will be used in negotiations regarding boundary treatments at planning application stages. In cases where planning approval is not required, i.e. where fences etc do not reach the height, they will be used in a targeted campaign to raise awareness of public realm design issues to influence the choices made by individuals on boundary treatments.

The guidelines will also be adopted and used by the Council, Its' partners and appointed contractors, in Council funded or sponsored schemes.

7

Part 2: Analysis

In order to understand the nature and extent of improvements that need to be made to achieve a step change in image, we need to observe and analyse what is happening in the Borough at present, and look at good examples and analyse why they achieve our objectives.

Why do we have fences and boundaries?

There are a number of reasons why we have fences or boundary treatments. Primarily they delineate ownership, provide security, privacy or a combination of these functions. There are good and bad examples of how these functions are addressed through boundary treatment choices. Occasionally fences or boundaries may also provide noise attenuation or decoration. However some types of boundary treatment seem to have no other purpose but to keep people from trespassing.

However, we are a nation of boundary builders! It is almost part of our culture. Boundaries are not used to the same extent in middle America for example, where many homes, social and community facilities do not have any fences or boundary demarcation at all.

We may not be able or want to go as far as that, but we need to question what function the boundary serves and why. We also need to examine the type of boundary treatment that is being proposed and what contribution it makes to the streetscape. It should only be a positive contribution in all senses. If the boundary treatment is not necessary, is too high for the required purposes or of a style, colour or material that detracts from the overall appearance of the street and public realm, it will not be looked on favourably.

8

What kind of boundary treatments are used in Barking and Dagenham?

In taking simple trips across the Borough we identified around15 different types of boundary treatment. There are bound to be more than this, when different combinations are considered.

Some of these boundaries are necessary, others perhaps are not and other treatments may be more appropriate to provide demarcation.

The 15 boundary treatments identified are:-

Perimeter Fencing

Protective Railings

9

Trip rails (Post and rail)

Walls

Hedges

Shrub planting

10

Planters

Trees

Grass verges

Hard landscaping

11

Buildings

Shipping containers

Earth bunds

Kerbs

Or…….. a combination of these together or adjacent to one another!

13

Do we need all of these Boundary treatments?

There is merit in having a variety of boundary treatments to add to the distinctiveness and legibility of the Borough. However, too much leads to a chaotic mishmash of treatments that look, and are, unplanned and detract visually from the environment.

We have too many 'boundaries' in Barking and Dagenham, most of which seem to be used to delineate ownership, to separate different 'zones' and may not be necessary. The need for boundary treatments needs to be challenged in certain applications, such as around amenity greens. This does not mean that all fencing should be removed or rejected, but the need should be examined in accordance with the matrix. The images below show some examples of boundary treatments that may not be necessary.

The removal of certain boundary treatments can create more usable space, and contribute to a more unified and harmonious environment. Other ways of delineating space which contribute to the overall public realm, can and should be found. The images below show examples of where and how this can be achieved.

In addition, each of the examples outlined in the section above have an enormous range of style, height, design, colour, composition, which together with wear and tear, quality of construction and maintenance means that there are countless examples of boundary treatments used in the Borough. This adds to the visual chaos and detracts from the quality of the environment.

14

To standardise boundary treatments completely by having one style throughout the Borough, would be inappropriate. It would detract from creating a distinctive environment that has local recognition, and reduce legibility. There is a need to balance variety with harmony. This can be achieved through careful consideration and a consistent approach to the treatments used and through the provision of a well considered but restricted palette of options for each application.

Security and safety issues

Fencing and boundary treatments are often erected to ensure safety of individuals or provide security of premises. These are still key considerations in the selection of boundary treatments. The aim of these guidelines is to suggest appropriate treatments which do not detract from these needs but also present a more unified and attractive visual alternative to many of the severe fencing styles currently used, often in inappropriate applications, such as galvanised palisade fencing.

Old style industrial palisade fencing

New style wire mesh

15

Part 3: Design Principles and the application of the matrix

Key Design Principles

The key design principles used in the Public Realm strategy and Streetscape design guidance document are followed through all elements and applications. These key design principles are shown in *Appendix B*. They may not seem entirely appropriate or relevant to the subject of fencing and boundary treatments as they should be seen to apply to the holistic treatment of the Public Realm.

However, with regards to the design approach to fences and boundary treatments which provide the 'envelope' of the public realm, the following **SACCS** principles should be applied.

- **S**imple
- **A**ppropriate
- **C**o-ordinated
- **C**onsistent
- **S**treamlined

What are the Key design issues we need to look at?

Having a range of different boundary treatments to tackle, the key issues to tackle are:

- Challenging the need for fencing or boundary treatments where the function and purpose is not clear, enabling freer access to public and semi-public areas.
- Creating harmony by reducing the variety of boundary treatments that lead to visual chaos
- Choosing appropriate boundary combinations that work well together and adjacent to one another to reduce visual chaos
- Providing a suitable and acceptable range of colours that will provide consistency in treatment
- Providing alternative boundary treatments to palisade fencing, that provide adequate levels of security

By tackling these issues we can begin to generate a set of design principles set out in the next section. These direct a range of boundary choices for different applications, which meet the Council's objectives and aspirations, raise design standards and improve the overall image and inward investment opportunities of Barking and Dagenham.

16

Where are boundary treatments applied?

We apply boundary treatments in 6 main areas in Barking and Dagenham. These can be broadly categorised as:-

1) Infrastructure
- Roads
- Railways
- Waterways

2) Parks and green spaces

3) Housing areas
- Parking areas
- Amenity greens

4) Industrial sites
- Industrial estates
- Other employment sites

5) Commercial properties
- Shops
- Retail warehouse outlets

6) Community facilities
- Schools
- Playgrounds
- Surgeries and health facilities
- Sports facilities
- Leisure facilities

The matrix below therefore relates to these 6 key areas, and provides a range of style variations that might be applied. The only exceptions to this are along trunk roads and main Borough Roads, where the TFL Streetscape design guidelines should be used, and in designated 'special areas' such as Barking Town Centre where specific design codes exist and should be applied. (See footnote below)

17

Category	Row	Images	Description	people (security)	vehicle	Sense of Division	Character / Impression	type	primary boundary use	Recommended / Images
Infrastructure	A. Roads		A1. > Trunk roads will be governed by TfL Streets requirements. > Motor vehicle carriage way and pavement. > Range from quiet residential streets to town centre high streets to major A roads.	A2. > Access needs to be controlled but not restricted	A3. > in the public realm roadside barriers are designed to deter vehicular access and restrict pedestrian movement.	A4. > the nature of roadways is that there should always be an intrusive division. > This sense of division will develop as the roadway intensifies	A5. > dictated by tfl streets but it suggests a standard railing for intersections and bollards where required. Kerbs are standard for entire network	A6. > waist height railing > bollards > kerb / hard landscaping	A7. > safety > area definition	
	B. Railways		B1. > This will be dictated by railtrack requirements in consultation with council > Tube and Main Line Railways > Safety considerations should be obvious but the main concerns are fast moving trains and electrified tracks > These safety concerns are paramount when considering the security of railway lines	B2. > must be the highest possible security be in line with tfl, Network Rail and highways policy	B3. > controlled maintenance access is necessary	B4. > the railway tracks themselves are an obvious division	B5. > high un-scalable > tfl & BR palisade > network rail have as part of their environment plan (sect 3.1) stated that they will work with stakeholders to improve the visual appearance of their facilities.	B6. > high un-scalable > tfl & BR palisade > network rail have as part of their safety and environment plan (sect 3.1) stated that they will work with stakeholders to improve the visual appearance of their facilities.	B7. > high level safety and security > area definition	
	C. Waterways		C1. > This will be dictated by the Environment agency > Brooks, streams, rivers, lakes, ponds	C2. > the desire here would be to keep people out of the water at all costs however to do this may strip all aesthetic qualities that the waterways brings.	C3. > strong physical protection for vehicles is necessary at all water crossings and other instances traffic and water courses meet.	C4. > very strong	C5. > varies dramatically and must be considered with reference to other relevant uses identified in this matrix	C6. > soft landscaping, mounds, verges > railings > dock edge > safety barriers	C7. > safety warning > ecological protection	
Parks and green spaces	D. Parks		D1. > Large open spaces of municipal significance > Defined opening and closing times	D2. > Parks need to have variable security; by day they need to be fully accessible to all members of the public. By night every effort has to be made to keep people out	D3. > vehicular access is only required for maintenance and special events	D4. > Ideally when a park is open the division from internal areas to the rest of the public realm will be close to seamless > after hours the park must be secure, traditionally the municipal parks will be bounded by a somewhat regal fencing system (??)	D5. > every effort should be made to keep park fencing as unobtrusive as possible > where parks abut busy roads boundary treatments should be used to block the traffic noise	D6. > vertical bar, learned with planting or hedging	D7. > After hours security	
	E. Green Spaces		E1. > Green Spaces are less defined open areas > No opening and closing	E2. > free movement	E3. > see D3	E4. > very little sense of division, they should melt into the public realm	E5. > boundary treatments for this type of land use should thoroughly challenge the necessity of each boundary type > obtrusive fences and hard edges should only be used where absolutely necessary	E6. > bollards > earth mounds > plantings > post and rail > low impact weld mesh border fencing where ball games and busy roads abut.	E7. > area definition	
Housing areas	F. Parking areas		F1. > large variety of type for housing parking areas. It ranges from individual parking areas right through to the parking areas provided for tower blocks.	F2. > level of security varies dramatically on a case by case basis , access by foot is obviously necessary.	F3. > car access may need to be controlled if the car park is private or paid	F4. > similar to roadways- see 4.	F5. > obtrusive fences and hard edges should only be used where absolutely necessary	F6. > planting, bollards, post and rail	F7. > low level security	
	G. Amenity greens		G1. > Small areas of green open space in housing areas, often acting as boundary treatments in them selves.	G2. NA	G3. NA	G4. See E4	G5. > low impact if at all	G6. > Planting or bollards	G7. > area definition	
Commercial properties / retail sites	H. Industrial estates		H1. > By the way industrial estates fit into the land use patterns of the British landscape they are usually "closed" to the general public > they are usually characterised by wide roads, large lorries and limited footpaths > after hours access is a major security concern	H2. > Security on Industrial estates is largely defined by vehicular movements as most of these measures will keep people out	H3. > Vehicular movement is the primary concern for securing an industrial site. The main issue is theft of expensive goods and machinery > Due to the nature of industrial sites they have very poor passive surveillance making more elaborate thefts such ram raiding very possible.	H4. > there is a very clear sense of division in industrial estates starting with a strong awareness upon entering the estate.	H5. > strong, secure	H6. > secure weld mesh fencing	H7. > very high level security	
	I. Other employment sites		I1. > such as offices, low impact industrial, warehousing > usually more integrated with other land uses than industrial areas > after hours passive surveillance is still limited	I2. > employment sites must be pedestrian friendly, it is the buildings which must be secure	I3. > see I2	I4. > any areas with a single or limited land use such as employment areas will have a relatively strong sense of division	I5. > where possible, boundary treatments in employment areas should not be obvious	I6. > large planter boxes, hedges > railings > buildings	I7. > Medium level security	
	J. Shops		J1. > usually situated in areas that are well connected to homes and public transport > this along with extended opening hours of general stores contributes to passive surveillance > these areas have a tendency to attract antisocial behavior	J2. > the area around shops is for pedestrians	J3. >see A3	J4. > see E4	J5. > low impact delineation	J6. > delineate with bollards, planters, and other hard landscaping	J7. > area definition	
	K. Retail warehouse outlets		K1. see I1	K2. > retail warehouse outlets need to have secure grounds after hours	K3. NA	K4. > see I4	K5. > closer to industrial than other employment	K6. > weld mesh > buildings	K7. > High level security	
Community facilities	L. Schools		L1. > schools have always been like a magnet for after hours anti-social behavior > similar security issues to parks (see D1) they must be secure by day and also after-hours.	L2. see I2	L3. > controlled access points	L4. > schools are very well defined places with strong boundaries. > there should always be a strong sense of division at the transition points for the pedestrian and motorist. > schools need to have strong and obvious entry and exit points	L5. > A similar look to that desired for parks	L6. > Secure post and rail fencing and hedging	L7. > High level security	
	M. Playgrounds		M1. see L1	M2. > playgrounds will either fit into a park or a green space or they will be the green space	M3. NA	M4. > playgrounds will be fenced by low picket type fences to prevent any ambiguity.	M5. > these areas need to appear to be and also need to be secure	M6. > bow top contour railing	M7. > Low level security > Area definition	
	N. Other buildings		N1. > such as surgeries and health facilities, sporting pavilions and facilities	N2. > the buildings and waste areas must be very secure but otherwise the grounds do not need excessive security	N3. > the concern here is for the car park, see E3.	N4. NA	N5. >	N6. > railings > buildings	N7. > Mid level security	
	O. Other residential		O1. > standard private residential developments	O2. > need to deter movement of people	O3. > needs to restrict cars	O4. > strong given that it is a private space	O5. > see E5	O6. > railings > buildings	O7. > Mid level security > Property delineation	

Colour is very important in boundary treatments. Fences and boundaries should blend in with the general landscape and not present a highly intrusive visual feature. For this reason fences and boundary treatments, with the exception of brick or similar clad walls and soft landscaping, should be of a receding colour.

RAL 6005 Grey green	
RAL 7016 Anthracite grey	
RAL 7030 Stone grey	
RAL 9005 Jet black	

Receding colours, are generally the darker colours of the spectrum. Black is perhaps the best colour for metal fencing, railings and similar boundary treatments, and provides for a consistency of treatment and appearance. Darker shades of blue, green or grey with similar tones, will enable variations in treatment that harmonise and blend well together. The exception to this rule is in areas such as the Town Centre, where the Barking Code advocates stainless steel to provide distinctiveness in the Town Centre.

19

Part 5: Procurement

All of the boundary treatments and variations expounded in the matrix, are available from a number of well known manufacturers. These are indicated in *Appendix C.*

For procurement of fencing and boundary treatments in Council owned or managed facilities, the Council's approved contractors should be used.

Green Procurement

Permanent fencing and boundary treatments should be designed, built and installed to last. Procurement should be from sustainable sources, where at all possible, and sustainable accreditation should be sought from suppliers.

Part 6: Implementation and maintenance

Implementation of fencing and boundary treatments must be to the highest standards. Standards for implementation and maintenance are attached as *Appendix D*.

It is recommended that colour on fencing and boundary treatments should be powder coated, to ensure that a long lasting, non-peeling and good colour coverage is maintained for as long as possible. This will reduce long term maintenance and ensure that the boundary treatments look good for longer.

20

Part 7: Associated issues for resolution

There are a number of issues that need to be tackled in conjunction with the implementation of the fencing and boundary treatment design guide, in order to maximise the effectiveness of the guide.

Good boundary treatments can be marred by poor maintenance regiemes, weed growth, windblown litter, fly tipping and dumping, poor location of facilities and illegal signage.

These aspects also impact on the visual chaos and on the overall image of the Borough.

Improved monitoring, maintenance and enforcement is required to ensure that the image improvements are achieved in relation to the public realm as a whole.

Tackling these issues and issues of procurement and sustainability may require a critical review of how systems operate to achieve optimum results. This may take some time, but is an essential component in improving the public realm.

21

Appendix A: Contents of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Public Realm Strategy and Streetscape Design Guide.

1 introduction

        purpose
        application
        looking forward
        accessibility

2 streets as living places

        through history
        character of streets
        the historic environment

3 designing for best practice

        design strategy
        the vision – Barking and Dagenham 2020 and beyond
        key design principles
        some examples of best practice

4 applying the design principles in the Barking and Dagenham

        applying the principles
        street types
        townscape character areas
        paving surfaces
        street furniture
        construction details
        quality controls on utility companies
        traffic management issues
        street type style palettes

5 potential projects

        regeneration area
        neighbourhood street
        transport interchange
        conservation area
        local shopping centre

22

6 design related issues
                public art
                existing public art
                lighting
                advertising
                streetscape design against crime
                local agenda 21

7 implementation and procurement mechanisms
                managing quality
                integrated management

8 Acknowledgements, Glossary and reference

23

Appendix B: Key Design Principles from the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Public Realm Strategy and Streetscape Design Guide.

KEY DESIGN PRINCIPLES

SIMPLE	ACCESSIBLE	SEAMLESS
Uncluttered Clutter is visually and physically confusing, crowded and untidy. Streets are untidy places, but this should emanate from the activities within them which can add to their character, not from the public infrastructure. **'Less is more'** Seek to combine functions in single elements, e.g. traffic signals and lamp columns, cycle stands and guard rails. **Material types** Form follows function - layouts should avoid pattern making with mixed colours and textures unless they demarcate important hierarchies of space and movement. **Material transitions** Avoid placing two similar textures alongside each other. This causes visual confusion eg. grid bonded square modular parking slabs next to stagger bonded rectangular slabs. **Colours** These should be receding. Mixed colours should only be used where their tones are complementary, and their hues similar.	**Unobstructed** Layouts of roads should zone necessary obstructions. Management procedures shall enforce a rigorous removal programme of unnecessary obstructions. **Convenient** Well-connected and direct routes for pedestrians without detours from desire lines. **Comfortable** Wide crossings and avoidance of steep gradients. Vehicular rights of way should be challenged where they discomfort the pedestrian. **Legible** Pedestrian routes and destinations should be understandable and immediately obvious by design, limiting the need for signage.	**Appropriate** Fitting the character of the area and surrounding buildings. **Matching** Tying in new design with existing patterns and materials to avoid visually or physically jarring results. Using scale and proportion in paving to reflect local buildings. **Appropriate** Street furniture should be colured to recede in view but not so as it is hidden from the visually impaired. The colour is to be black highlighted with gold where appropriate.

24

Appendix C: Suppliers of fencing and boundary treatments

Fencing Systems

JB Corrie & Co Ltd
Frenchmans Rd
Petersfield
Hants
GU32 3AP
tel: 01730 237100
fax: 01730 264915

SWE Contract Engineering
Waterham Business Park
Faversham
Kent
ME13 9EJ
tel: 01227 751813
fax: 01227 751183

Darfen
Unit B1, Eurolink Industrial Estate
Sittingbourne
ME10 3RL
tel: 01795 414180
fax: 01795 414190

Alpha Rail Limited
Alpha House
Urban Road
Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Nottingham
NG17 8AP
tel: 01623 750214
fax: 01623 756596

Havering Fencing Co
237 Chase Cross Road
Romford
RM5 3XS
Tel: 01708 747855
Fax: 01708 721010

Heras UK Fencing Systems
Herons Way
Carr Hill
Doncaster
South Yorkshire
DN4 8WA

25

IAE Fencing
Brookhurst Industrial Estate
Cheadle
Stoke-on-Trent
Staffordshire
ST10 1SR
tel: 01538 755888
fax: 01538 751300

Dirickx UK Limited
20 High Street
Southrepps
Norfolk
NR11 8AH
tel: 01263 834436
fax: 01263 834391

Street Furniture - Bollards, Railings etc

Woodhouse UK plc
Spa Park
Leamington Spa
CV31 3HL
tel: 01926 314313
fax: 01926 883778

Bunkert Street Furniture
Unit 1A Southern Cross Business Park
Bray
Co. Wicklow
Ireland
tel: 0800 169 1523 (uk free phone)

Treatments - Powder Coating, Galvanising etc

MGC Galvanising & Powder Coating
Castle Road
EuroLink Industrial Centre
Sittingbourne
Kent
ME10 3RN
tel: 01795 479489
fax: 01795 477598

G & G Powder Coatings LTD
Rippleside Commercial Estate
Barking
IG11 0RJ
tel: 020 8592 4555
fax: 020 8592 4777

26

Appendix D: Implementation and maintenance Standards

(To be inserted from existing maintenance guide)

27

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 39

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 11 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 43

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 12 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 55

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 65

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 87

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 99

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 11 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 125

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7, 8, 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Page 135

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank