

# London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

## Notice of Meeting

### THE EXECUTIVE

**Tuesday, 11 May 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

30.04.04

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](mailto:barry.ray@lbbd.gov.uk)

### AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2004 (circulated separately)**

#### **Business Items**

*Public Items 3 to 5 and Private Items 16 to 18 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. The Children Bill 2004 (Pages 1 - 5)**
- 4. Front Garden Parking (Pages 7 - 9)**
- 5. Revision to Libraries Fines and Charges (Pages 11 - 13)**

## Discussion Items

6. **Appointments to the Political Structure and Other Bodies 2004 / 2005 (Pages 15 - 40)**
7. **Draft Final Report of the Erkenwald Centre Development Scrutiny Panel (Pages 41 - 53)**
8. **Homeless: Achieving the Bed and Breakfast Target and Developing the Temporary Accommodation Service (Pages 55 - 59)**
9. **Transfer of Land (Pages 61 - 67)**
10. **Council Scorecard 2004 / 2005 (to follow)**
11. **Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent**
12. **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

13. **Provision of TV Reception to Flatted Accommodation (Pages 69 - 74)**  
*Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 8)*
14. **Internal Refurbishment Programme to Low Rise Dwellings (Kitchen/Rewire Works) - Appointment of Constructor Partners for Pre-Construction Phase (Pages 75 - 84)**  
*Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 7)*
15. **Procurement of Pilot Call Centre Technology (to follow)**  
*(Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 7 and 9))*

## **Business Items**

- 16. Restructure of the Housing Landlord Services Division: Detailed Proposals and the Deletion of a JNC Post in Housing Strategy (Pages 85 - 91)**

*Concerns a Staffing Matter (paragraph 1)*

- 17. Term Contract for Catering Equipment Servicing and Repairs (Pages 93 - 96)**

*Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraphs 8 and 10)*

- 18. Dorothy Barley Junior School - Replacement of Flat and Pitch Roof Covering (Pages 97 - 99)**

*Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraphs 7 and 9)*

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

This page is intentionally left blank

**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****JOINT REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND  
THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, ARTS AND LIBRARIES**

<b>THE CHILDREN BILL 2004</b>		<b>FOR DECISION</b>
<p>This report is being submitted to the Executive as a result of the publication of the Children Bill 2004.</p> <p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>On March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2004 the Government published the Children Bill 2004 which puts into effect the legislative changes required to implement the green paper <i>Every Child Matters</i>. The Children Bill was published jointly with an accompanying document titled <i>Every Child Matters: The Next Steps</i>. This report outlines the key proposals of the Bill and its accompanying document.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>The Executive is recommended to agree to the implementation of the Children Bill 2004 as set out in this report.</p> <p><b><u>Reason</u></b></p> <p>The Executive is asked to support the recommendations set out in this report to ensure the Council makes a prompt start in the implementation of the Children Bill 2004.</p>		
<b>Contact Officers:</b>		
Julia Ross	Director of Social Services	Tel: 020 8227 2300 E-mail: <a href="mailto:julia.ross@lbbd.gov.uk">julia.ross@lbbd.gov.uk</a>
Roger Luxton	Director of Education, Arts and Libraries	Tel: 020 8227 3000 E-mail: <a href="mailto:roger.luxton@lbbd.gov.uk">roger.luxton@lbbd.gov.uk</a>
Tolis Vouyioukas	Head of Children and Families	Tel: 020 8227 2233 E-mail: <a href="mailto:tolis.vouyioukas@lbbd.gov.uk">tolis.vouyioukas@lbbd.gov.uk</a>

**1. Background**

- 1.1 The green paper *Every Child Matters* takes an ambitious whole systems approach to supporting children and young people. It creates an overall framework for children and families services which includes child protection.
- 1.2 As a response to the Laming recommendations it also seeks to safeguard children and young people by improving accountability and partnership working. Locally, the Barking and Dagenham ACPC has conducted a multi- agency review of services to

safeguard children and a set of action plans has been signed off by partner agencies to improve safeguarding arrangements in the borough.

- 1.3 The Council will make a well planned and timely response to the Children Bill. A minimum disruption to the services it provides is a key priority. We want to move at a fast, but reasonable, pace and ensure that the desired service outcomes are secured in advance of the necessary structural changes. Continuing to evidence sustained improvement in performance across Children's Services is a key priority for the Council.
- 1.4 Integrating services for children and young people with our partners is central to our work and we want to evidence that the foundations are in place for the Children's Services Inspection in 2005.

## **2. Every Child Matters: The Next Steps**

- 2.1 This document is based on reaching the following outcomes for children and young people:
  - i. Being healthy
  - ii. Staying safe
  - iii. Enjoying and achieving
  - iv. Making a positive contribution
  - v. Economic well being
- 2.2 It covers family support, early intervention, a lead professional, and a common assessment framework to be produced by the Government by the end of 2004. It sets out expectations for key partners in children's services to work together in the delivery of services across organisational boundaries.
- 2.3 The Local Authority wants to continue to develop the integration of health and social care services to children and young people and is committed to greater engagement with the Health Authority.
- 2.4 *The Next Steps* document also deals with youth offending in terms of the links between sentencing and prevention and the Government's requirement that courts consider public protection, welfare, punishment and reparation, when deciding on sentences for young people who offend.
- 2.5 The document endorses the position set out in *Every Child Matters* for the need to develop a confident, competent and flexible children's workforce. The reforms will need to include all those who work with children and young people to set a common core of occupational standards.

## **3. Main Measures**

- 3.1 ***Children's Commissioner: The Children's Commissioner for England will be responsible for promoting awareness of the views and interests of children and young people. The Commissioner will be in post by April 2005.***

**Recommended Action:** To note.

- 3.2 **Duty to cooperate and to make partnership arrangements:** *Children's services authorities are expected to promote cooperation within the authority and with partner agencies to improve the well being of children and young people. The Next Steps document states that this duty provides the framework for integrated planning and commissioning through local partnerships. The Bill does not specify a name or title for these arrangements. Children's Trusts are not expected to be statutory organisations, although there is a recommendation that most areas will have a Children's Trust by 2006 and all areas by 2008.*

**Recommended Actions:**

- i. to meet the duty to co-operate and make partnership arrangements and ensure outcomes for children and young people continue to improve,
- ii. to formalise the accountability of the Children's Services Strategy Group and clarify its governance arrangements,
- iii. to establish links with and learn from Children's Trusts pilots,
- iv. to continue to develop the existing partnership arrangements across Social Services, Health, Education and other key partners,
- v. to establish a Children's Trust in Barking and Dagenham between 2006 and 2008.

- 3.3 **Safeguarding arrangements:** *Partner agencies are required to discharge their functions to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The Bill requires the establishment of a Local Safeguarding Children's Board to replace the current ACPC. It is expected that all Local Safeguarding Children's Boards are established by 2006. Unless a more independent chair is agreed locally it is expected that the Director of Children's Services chairs the Local Safeguarding Children's Board.*

**Recommended Actions:**

- i. to establish a Shadow Local Safeguarding Children's Board as soon as possible which will be chaired by the Director of Social Services,
- ii. to develop further the work of the Chief Officers' Group chaired by the Chief Executive of the Local Authority,
- iii. to agree financial contributions from key partner agencies,
- iv. to create a jointly funded development post to support the transition from the ACPC to the Local Safeguarding Children's Board,
- v. to have the full Board established by April 2005.

- 3.4 **Information databases:** *The Secretary of State will require local authorities to set up local databases of information about children and young people. The feedback from IRT pilots will be taken into account in the decision making process for information sharing. Authorities are advised not to rush into IT investment at this stage.*

**Recommended Action:** to learn from the IRT pilots nationally and formulate a clear strategy on the local implications.

- 3.5 **Director of Children's Services:** *Local Authorities with responsibility for children's services are expected to appoint a Director of Children's Services who will be accountable for local authority education and children's social services and any other services provided to children on behalf of the NHS under section 31 of the*

*Health Act 1999. It is expected that most areas will have this post in place by 2006 and all by 2008.*

**Recommended Actions:**

- i. that the Director of Social Services retains responsibility for personal social services to children and co-chairs the Children's Services Strategy Group with the Director of Education, Arts & Libraries,
- ii. that the Director of Education, Arts & Libraries retains responsibility for education services to children and co-chairs the Children's Services Strategy Group with the Director of Social Services,
- iii. that a Director of Children's Services is in post between 2006 and 2008.

3.6 ***Lead member for Children's Services:*** *It is expected that Children's Services in England designate a lead member by 2008 for the arrangements covered by the post of Director of Children's Services.*

**Recommended Action:** there is currently a designated member (Children's Champion) responsible for Children's Services across the Council. This portfolio will be re-viewed by the Leader of the Council.

3.7 ***Integration of Reviews and Inspection:*** *the Chief Inspector of Schools in consultation with the Commission for Social Care Inspection and the Commission Healthcare Audit and Inspection are expected to establish an integrated framework for the inspection of Children's Services in England.*

**Recommended Actions:**

- i. to make extended use of the Council's inspection team in support of children's social services in addition to its current responsibilities in relation to local education authority,
- ii. to note and contribute to the national consultation.

3.8 ***New powers of intervention in failing authorities:*** *Powers under the Education Act 1996 to secure good performance of LEAs will be extended to cover Children's Services. The Next Steps indicates that powers should be invoked 'only as absolutely necessary.'*

**Recommended Action:** to note.

3.9 ***The educational achievement of looked after children:*** *Section 22 of the Children Act 1989, which requires authorities to safeguard children, will be amended to include the educational achievement of looked after children. There has been some criticism that this should include a parallel duty placed on schools.*

**Recommended Actions:**

- i. to strengthen the work and accountability of the Looked After Children Health & Education Support Team with regular reports to the Children's Services Strategy Group,
- ii. to improve the educational achievement of looked after children in line with national and local targets.



- 3.10 **Private fostering:** *The Bill seeks to strengthen the Children Act 1989 private fostering notification scheme. Local authorities will be expected to raise awareness in their communities of the need to notify the local authority of private fostering arrangements and check these arrangements before the child is placed.*

**Recommended Action:** to strengthen the existing local authority arrangements and comply with the requirements of the Children Bill.

#### 4. **Conclusion**

The Children Bill 2004 provides the opportunity to transform how services to children and young people are delivered. It challenges us to work out how we configure personal and universal services in ways that make sense to those who use them. It is also a chance to rise above agency interests and focus on the needs of children and young people.

Although there is some room for flexibility in the local expression of the Children Bill, the Government expects that these measures are introduced within the prescribed timescales. It is important that Barking and Dagenham makes a prompt start and implements the recommendations as set out in this report.

#### **Background Papers**

- The Children Bill 2004
- Every Child Matters: The Next Steps
- LGA Briefing

This page is intentionally left blank

**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HOUSING AND HEALTH**

<b>FRONT GARDEN PARKING</b>	<b>FOR DECISION</b>	
<i>This report seeks a decision from Members regarding a change to existing policy in relation to front garden parking.</i>		
<b><u>Summary</u></b>		
<p>This report suggests a change to the current policy made by the Housing (Management) Sub-Committee on 17 November 1981 to allow 1 private motor vehicle to be parked in a front garden. The report also suggests that the policy made by the Housing (Estates and Management) Sub Committee on 8 May 1990 which gave similar permission to tenants of ground floor flats be changed.</p>		
<b><u>Recommendation</u></b>		
<p>The Executive is asked to agree:</p>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To amend the existing policy so that tenants and owner occupiers of houses and certain ground floor flats may with the prior permission of the Council park more than 1 private motor vehicle in their front garden. This is subject to the garden being of a size able to accommodate this.</li> <li>2. To amend the restrictive covenant in future Right To Buy sales to allow with the prior permission of the Council the parking of more than 1 private motor vehicle where the garden is of a size to accommodate this. The carriage crossing requirement will still apply; and</li> <li>3. To delegate decisions regarding front garden parking and appeals to the Director of Housing and Health in conjunction with the Director of Leisure and Environmental Services.</li> </ol>		
<b><u>Reason</u></b>		
<p>Many owner-occupiers and some tenants are already parking more than 1 vehicle in their front garden contrary to the existing policy. There is an on street parking problem in the Borough and amending the current policy would help to ease this and regularise what in many cases already happens.</p>		
<b>Contact:</b> Jim Ripley	Head of Landlord Services	Tel: 020 8227 3738 Fax: 020 8227 5705 Minicom: 020 8227 5755 E-mail: <a href="mailto:jim.ripley@lbbd.gov.uk">jim.ripley@lbbd.gov.uk</a>

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 On the 17 November 1981 the former Housing (Management) Sub-Committee agreed subject to the Councils prior written consent to allow the parking of 1 private motor vehicle in the front garden of a Council House. This policy has conditions attached regarding the provision of a hard standing in the garden and a footpath crossing. These requirements are laid out within the existing conditions of tenancy and have been reviewed and strengthened in the new draft conditions. Similarly on 8 May 1990 the Housing (Estates and Management) Sub Committee approved front garden parking for tenants of certain ground floor flats subject to conditions. These conditions related to consultation and agreement from other residents of the block involved.
- 1.2 Since this policy was agreed action has been taken against both tenants and owners of former Council owned properties who park more than 1 car in their garden. However where injunctions have been obtained this only serves to move vehicles back onto the estate roads causing additional congestion and problems both for pedestrians and motorists. There is an on street-parking problem in the Borough and most of the roads were constructed at a time when future family car ownership could not have been anticipated. Many families now have more than 1 vehicle and in some cases where adult sons and daughters are still at home it is not uncommon for households to have 3 or 4 cars.
- 1.3 The Director of Environmental and Leisure Services has a strategy to manage on street parking and together with action being taken by this Department to introduce wheel clamping in some areas and encouraging the take up of empty garages, it seems that the time is right to review this policy as part of an overall approach to reduce on street parking. Members should be aware that it is the policy of DLES for residents to provide a carriage crossing for each off road parking space. The provision of a second carriage crossing would mean the loss of a kerbside parking space and any nett loss of parking would need to be a deciding factor when Officers consider individual applications.

## **2. Conclusions**

- 2.1 Many of the front gardens on the estates are large enough to accommodate 2 vehicles and in many cases already do. Recent action taken as part of a drive to enforce the present policy has resulted in complaints to Ward Members that the policy is outdated and does not take account of present car ownership levels. The 6 Community Housing Partnership Boards have been consulted on this issue and are generally in favour of the proposals. Comments of each Board have been considered and where appropriate incorporated into this report.
- 2.2 If Members agree to the recommendations in this report to change the current policy then Officers will prepare the relevant procedure note for staff to follow. It is anticipated that the procedure will cover issues such as charging owner/occupiers and leaseholders a fee for investigating an application and procedures for dealing with appeals. It therefore seems that the time is right for the policy to be reviewed in conjunction with the other measures being taken to deal with on street parking problems.

### 3. **Consultation**

The following have been consulted and views expressed have been incorporated into this report:

All 6 CHP Boards  
DLES - Highways  
DLES - Property Services

### **Background Papers**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, ARTS AND LIBRARIES**

<b>REVISION TO LIBRARIES FINES AND CHARGES</b>	<b>FOR DECISION</b>	
<p><i>The Library Service is proposing to increase certain elements of their fines and charges to meet revised income targets.</i></p> <p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>This report contains the proposed scale of fines and charges commencing 1 June 2004 which will allow the service to provide a cost efficient service in line with the Council's projected expenditure.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>The Executive is asked to agree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scale of fines and charges as set out in section 2 of this report;</li> <li>2. That the new scale of fines and charges commence from 1 June 2004; and</li> <li>3. That the head of Libraries carries out further research in to new charges.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Reasons</u></b></p> <p>To reduce the net cost for the provision of the Library Service in line with agreed targets as part of the overall reduction in service costs for Education, Arts and Libraries.</p>		
<p><b>Contact Officer:</b> Trevor Brown</p>	<p>Head of Library Services</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 3601 Fax: 020 8227 3699 E-mail: <a href="mailto:trevor.brown@lbbd.gov.uk">trevor.brown@lbbd.gov.uk</a></p>

**1. Background**

- 1.1 There has not been a significant change in the basic charging structure since 2001 as part of Libraries' commitment to Social Inclusion as set out within previous Annual Library plans.
- 1.2 The current financial outlook requires libraries to generate more income in order to maintain the level of service. The scale of fines and charges have been reviewed with a view to increasing income but implementing charges which are comparable to neighbouring boroughs.

**2. Main Body of the Report**

- 2.1 The proposed changes are as follows:

Current	Amount	Projected Income 2003/4 *	2004/5 (Proposed)	Projected Income 2004/5
<b>Fines - Adults only</b>				
Books, spoken word, music	10p per item per working day	£34,500	13p per item per working day – Adults only	£45,000
DVD/Video	25p & 50p per day		No change	
	Maximum £10 (100 days)		Maximum £5 (39 days)	
<b>Reservations</b>				
All in stock items	Free	£2,607	No change	£3,500
All items not in stock	60p		£1	
<b>DVD/Video</b>				
Children/Factual	£1 pw	£14,671	No change	£15,000
Feature	£2 pw		No change	
<b>Audio</b>				
Language courses	80p	£6,928	£1	£9,000
CD/cassette - singles	70p		£1	
CD/cassette - sets	£1.20		£1.50	
Spoken Word	Nil	Nil	Adults only £1 per box set	£15,000
Subscription 3 months	£6	£6,228	£10	£10,000
Subscription 6 months	£10		£15	
Subscription 12 months	£18		£30	
<b>Lettings</b>				
Branches	£10/£15 per hour	£18,647	Under review	£18,647
Lecture Hall	£20/£30 per hour			
Conference Rooms	£10/£15 per hour			
<b>Photocopying</b>				
All sites	10p/£1	£6,505	No change	£6,500
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>£90,086</b>		<b>£122,647</b>

This provides a projected increase of just over £32,000 which will contribute significantly to the £45,000 budget saving that is required from increased fees, charges, lettings income.

## 2.2 Areas for further investigation:

In order to further increase income the Head of Libraries is pursuing the following areas:



- Service Level Agreements with partners e.g. UK-Online, SureStart, Customer First
- Administrative charge for overdue and lost/damaged items
- Commercial letting of space in new developments e.g. Central Library,
- Increasing external funding and grants

### **3. Consultations/financial and other implications**

3.1 Research using the current edition of 'Fines and Charges in Public Libraries in England and Wales 2003' (produced by 'The Sheffield Information Organisation') indicates that our proposed charges are not extreme. The following table briefly summarises the current charges operated by our near neighbours:

	B & D (proposed)	B & D	Havering	Newham	Redbridge
Fines	13p per working day - £5 max.	10p per working day - £10 max	10p per day first week – then 11p	12p per day - £5 max	14p per day
Reservations	Free in stock - £1 not in stock	Free in stock – 60p not in stock	75p	Free in stock - £1.20 not in stock	£1
Video/DVD	£1 -£2	£1 - £2	£1.20 - £3	£1.80	£2.60
CDs	£1 single £1.50 box	70p £1.20	60p single £1.60 box	90p	£1 single £2 box
Spoken Word	£1 box	Free	Free	Free	£1 single £2 box
Photocopying A4	10p/£1(col)	10p/£1(col)	10p/£1(col)	10p/£1(col)	10p/£1(col)

3.2 A charge for the loan of spoken word is a new direction for this authority but our research shows that 76% of UK library authorities now make such a charge. There is a wide variance up to a maximum of £3, however this is tempered by a range of concessions. The proposed charge of £1 is at the lower end. We are currently actively identifying potential concession groups based around disability and need. In line with current professional practice, exemptions will be self-certified. This work has a deadline of 28 May 2004 to facilitate the 1 June commencement date. It is recognised that for a maximum return of income, this new charge must be marketed positively and effectively.

### **4. Conclusion**

4.1 Changes to the current charges need to be agreed as soon as possible to allow due notice to be given to our users and to meet the 01 June start date. It is also requested that due time is allowed for investigation and implementation for new areas of charging e.g. spoken word.

### **Public background papers (used in preparation of the report)**

1. 'Fines and Charges in Public Libraries in England and Wales 16<sup>th</sup> edition'
2. Libraries' DMT minutes 25.02.04

This page is intentionally left blank

**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE STRATEGY**

<b>APPOINTMENTS TO THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND OTHER BODIES 2004 / 2005</b>	<b>FOR DECISION</b>
<p><i>This report deals with the appointment of Members to the meetings that make up the Council's political structure and the appointment of Council representatives to serve on various internal and outside bodies for the 2004 / 2005 council year. It is presented under paragraph 9.2 of Article 2 of the Constitution.</i></p>	
<p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p>	
<p>Each May, the Executive considers the above appointments and makes recommendations to the Annual Assembly. The Ceremonial Council on 28 May will deal with the appointment of the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Chaplain.</p>	
<p><b><u>Recommendation</u></b></p>	
<p>The Executive is asked to make recommendations to the Assembly on the following areas:</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council meetings: (Appendix A sets out further information and current membership) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive</li> <li>• Scrutiny Management Board</li> <li>• Development Control Board</li> <li>• Regulatory and General Matters Board</li> <li>• Personnel Board</li> <li>• Standards Committee</li> <li>• Community Forums (including a recommendation that the term of office of Community Forum Deputy Chairs be increased from one to two years)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Chairs and Deputy Chairs (Appendix B)</li> <li>3. Co-opted Members (Appendix C)</li> <li>4. Best Value Review Groups (Appendix D)</li> <li>5. Representatives on Various Bodies (Appendix E)</li> <li>6. Trustees of Local Charities (Appendix F)</li> <li>7. Member Representation on School Governing Bodies (Appendix G)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Contact:</b> Steve Foster</p>	<p>Democratic, Electoral &amp; Members Services</p> <p>Tel: 020 8227 2113  Fax: 020 8227 2171  Textlink: 020 8227 2594  E-mail: <a href="mailto:steve.foster@lbbd.gov.uk">steve.foster@lbbd.gov.uk</a></p>

**Background papers used in the preparation of this report: None**

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL BODIES

Political Balance

1.1 Most of the meetings that make up the political structure have been set up as “committees” under existing legislation (the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Government and Housing Act 1989). As such, political balance requirements must be met. These require the Council, so far as is reasonably practicable, to adhere to the following principles:

- That not all seats on “committees” be allocated to the same political group
- That the majority of seats be allocated to the political group whose members are in the majority on the Council
- That the number of seats on each committee and in total allocated to political groups be in the same proportion as their membership bears to the total membership of the Council

1.2 The Council can, however, make appointments that do not comply with these principles provided the procedure is followed and no Member of the Council votes against. If the relevant numbers of places are offered to the Minority Groups and they choose not to take them, the Council has fulfilled its legal obligations.

1.3 In making appointments to fill seats allocated to political groups, the wishes of those groups as to which of their members should be appointed must be followed.

1.4 In Barking and Dagenham, there are three minority groups. The current political balance and groupings are as follows:

Labour	41 (Majority Group)
Chadwell Heath Residents Association	4 (1/12.75th of membership)
Conservative	3 (1/17th of membership)
Liberal Democrat	3 (1/17th of membership)

1.5 The meetings, the number of Members to be appointed to each and the number of places to be offered to the Minority Groups are shown in the attached table.

Meeting	Membership	Minimum number of places to be offered to the Minority Groups	Comments
Executive	10	Established under Section 11 of the Local Government Act 2000. The political balance requirements of Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 do not apply when determining membership.	The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council automatically take 2 places.  The Chair and Deputy Chair of the Assembly are excluded.
Scrutiny Management Board	7 Councillor Members  4 Statutory Co-opted Members (for education matters)	Residents' Association: 1	Members of the Executive and the Chair of the Assembly are excluded.  <b>It is proposed that the membership of the SMB be extended to 9 Members and that the appropriate amendment be made to the Constitution.</b>
Development Control Board	24 (forming two Panels of 14, with the same Chair and Deputy Chair and the Leader and the Lead Member for Regeneration on both Panels)	Residents' Association: 2  Conservative: 1  Liberal Democrat: 1	

Regulatory & General Matters Board	Current membership: 17 (from which a panel of 5 is selected by rota as far as possible for each meeting). <b>NB: Please see comments column</b>	Residents' Association: 1 Conservative: 1 Liberal Democrat: 1	A separate report on this agenda proposes that the Board should become the Council's licensing committee for the purposes of the Licensing Act 2003. The licensing committee must consist of between 10 and 15 members and sub-committees of 3 members can also be established to carry out particular functions (the proposal is that this would continue to be on a rota basis). The number of seats to be allocated to the minority parties would be the same as at present with a membership of 10-15 members.
Personnel Board	17 (from which a panel of 3 will be selected by rota as far as possible for each meeting)	Residents' Association: 1 Conservative: 1 Liberal Democrat: 1	
Standards Committee	3 Councillor Members and 2 independent members	Established under Section 11 of the Local Government Act 2000. The political balance requirements of Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 do not apply when determining membership.	The Leader is excluded.
Community Forums	All ward members in Forum area	Membership reflects wards	

This page is intentionally left blank



**MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL BODIES 2003/04**

**THE EXECUTIVE**

Councillors Alexander, Bramley, Fairbrass, Geddes, Kallar, McKenzie, Osborn, Porter, Smith and Wade

**SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**

Councillors Barns, H. Collins, L. Collins, Mrs. Conyard, Denyer, Mrs Twomey and Mrs West

Co-opted Members (for education matters):

Church representatives : Reverend R Gayler - representing the Church of England  
Mrs G Spencer - representing the Roman Catholic Church

Parent Governor representatives - Mr P Carter - Primary Schools  
Mr B Philips - Secondary Schools

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD**

The Board is split into two panels. The Chair and Deputy Chair are members of both panels, as are the Leader and the Lead Member for Regeneration. The other members are listed below:

**Panel A (Wednesdays):** Cook, Mrs Cooper, Mrs Cridland, Dale, Mrs Flint, Gibbs, Jones, Miles, Mrs Rawlinson and Wainwright

**Panel B (Tuesdays):** Barns, Mrs Blake, Cooper, Denyer, Fani, Justice, Mrs Rush, Mrs Twomey, Waker and Mrs West

**REGULATORY AND GENERAL MATTERS BOARD**

Best, H. Collins, Cook, Mrs Cooper, Mrs Cridland, Fani, Mrs Hunt, O'Brien, Mrs Osborn, Parkin, Mrs Twomey, Waker and Mrs West (plus four vacancies on current membership of 17 or up to two vacancies on proposed membership of up to 15)

**PERSONNEL BOARD**

Barns, H. Collins, Mrs Conyard, Mrs Cridland, Curtis, Davis, Fairbrass, Fani, Geddes, Mrs Hunt, Justice, Kallar, Miles, Mrs Osborn, Porter, Mrs Rush, Mrs Twomey, Waker

**STANDARDS COMMITTEE, including Independent Members**

Councillors Curtis, H. Collins and Little

**Independent Members:** Fiona Fairweather and Reverend Stephen Poole

## **COMMUNITY FORUMS 2003/04**

### **ABBAY, GASCOIGNE AND THAMES**

Councillors Alexander, Barns, Bramley, Fani, Mrs Flint, Miles, McKenzie, Mrs Rawlinson and Mrs Rush.

### **EASTBROOK, HEATH AND ALIBON**

Councillors L Collins, Davis, Fairbrass, Kallar, Little, McCarthy, Osborn, Parkin and Wade

### **EASTBURY, MAYESBROOK AND LONGBRIDGE**

Ms Baker, Mrs Blake, Mrs Challis, Clark, Mrs Conyard, Cook, Cooper, Mrs Cooper and Mrs Hunt

### **PARSLOES, BECONTREE AND VALENCE**

Councillors Mrs Bradley, Mrs Bruce, H Collins, Mrs Cridland, Geddes, Jones, O'Brien, Mrs Osborn and Wainwright

### **RIVER, VILLAGE AND GORESBROOK**

Councillors Best, Dale, Huggins, Jamu, Porter, Smith, Thomas, Mrs Twomey and Waker

### **WELLGATE**

Councillors Curtis, Denyer, Gibbs, Justice and Mrs West

**CHAIRS AND DEPUTY CHAIRS 2003/04**

	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Deputy Chair</u>
* Assembly	Councillor Davis	Councillor Best
Scrutiny Management Board	Councillor Mrs Twomey	Councillor H Collins
Development Control Board	Councillor Mrs Bruce	Councillor Jamu
Standards Committee	Councillor Curtis	Reverend Stephen Poole
Abbey, Gascoigne and Thames Community Forum	Councillor Mrs Rush	# Mr Colin Ramage
Eastbrook, Heath and Alibon Community Forum	Councillor Kallar	# Mrs Edna Fergus
Eastbury, Mayesbrook and Longbridge Community Forum	Councillor Mrs Hunt	# Mr Ahmed Choudhury
Parsloes, Becontree and Valence Community Forum	Councillor Wainwright	# Mr James Campe
River, Village and Goresbrook Community Forum	Councillor Thomas	# Mr Brian Beasley
Wellgate Community Forum	Councillor Denyer	# Vacant

\* The Chair of the Assembly needs to play an independent role and, therefore, cannot be a member of either the Executive or the Scrutiny Management Board. The Deputy Chair cannot be a member of the Executive.

# Deputy Chairs are appointed from the community via the Community Forums. It is proposed that the tenure of Deputy Chairs be increased from one to two years and that an appropriate amendment be made to the Constitution:

At some Forums, it has proved quite a task to encourage the community to come forward to stand, particularly as the Council expects them to attend quite a few meetings, despite the recent provision of a small expense allowance.

The process of seeking nominations and conducting ballots is both time consuming and relatively expensive in terms of postage and so on. There is also a growing need to support Deputy Chairs through offering training and general help and advice to develop their role as community representatives.

It is felt that the existing one year period as Deputy Chair, which amounts to attending six Community Forums, provides little opportunity to develop the individual and give them an insight into Council workings. It is felt that a two year tenure would be far more beneficial both to the individual and the Council in terms of gaining experience and confidence in being able to give real support to the Chairs. That support will be tested in the coming year with the decision taken by the Chairs and Deputy Chairs meeting to encourage Deputy Chairs to run on a trial basis the question and answer sessions at Forums.

If the Council is mindful to move to a two year appointment, it would not preclude an individual from stepping down from the position, if for any reason they were unable to continue, as was recently exemplified at Wellgate, where the Deputy Chair had to resign due to moving out of the Borough.

Note:

Ceremonial Council

The Mayor is automatically appointed as the Chair of the Council.

The Deputy Mayor is automatically appointed as the Deputy Chair of the Council.

Executive

The Leader of the Council is automatically appointed as the Chair of the Executive.

The Deputy Leader of the Council is automatically appointed as the Deputy Chair of the Executive.

**CO-OPTED MEMBERS**

Education co-opted members have a statutory right to be involved in the Council's decision making processes. However, under the legislation this only applies to Overview and Scrutiny Committees where their functions relate wholly or partly to educational matters which are the responsibility of the Authority's Executive.

The Regulations state that a Local Education Authority shall appoint at least two but not more than five Parent Governor representatives to Scrutiny and Overview and, on the assumption that the Council still maintains Roman Catholic schools, the total number of Church representatives to be appointed shall be one (Church of England) and one (Roman Catholic). Both Parent Governor and Church representatives have the right to vote where education matters are being considered and the right to Call-In Executive decisions as any other non-Executive Member.

The current Church representatives are:-

Church of England - Reverend R Gayler  
Roman Catholic Church - Mrs G Spencer

The Parent Governor representatives are elected for a four year period - one representing primary schools, the other representing secondary schools. The current holders of these positions are:-

Primary Schools - Mr P Carter  
Secondary Schools - Mr B Phillips

The co-opted Members have been added to the membership of the Scrutiny Management Board for education matters only.

This page is intentionally left blank

**BEST VALUE REVIEWS**

The Council carried out two cross-cutting best value reviews in 2003/04, on Procurement and Regenerating the Local Economy, in response to issues raised in its Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA).

This year, the Council is carrying out a service-based review of landlord services. Further reviews will take on board CPA recommendations and a report seeking Member appointments will be submitted at the appropriate time.

Future reviews will take on board CPA requirements and are yet to be determined.

This page is intentionally left blank



## COUNCIL REPRESENTATION ON VARIOUS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL BODIES

Organisation	Representation required 2004/05	Representation 2003/04	Lead Department & Contact
Age Concern	2 Councillors	Mrs Bruce and Davis	Social Services (SS) Celia Pike-Lees – Ext. 2786
Association of London Government			
Leader's Committee	1 Councillor, plus up to 2 named deputies	Lead Member (Geddes) Named Deputies Alexander and McKenzie	Corporate Strategy (CS) Sally Penessa - Ext. 2219
Health & Social Care Forum	1 Councillor, plus 1 named deputy	Lead Member (Osborn) Named Deputy Geddes	SS: Celia Pike-Lees - Ext. 2786
Housing Forum	1 Councillor, plus 1 named deputy	Lead Member (Osborn) Named Deputy Geddes	Housing & Health (HH): Ken Jones - Ext. 5703
Education Forum	1 Councillor, plus 1 named deputy	Lead Member (Alexander) Named Deputy Best	Education, Arts & Libraries (EAL) Roger Luxton - Ext. 3000
Culture & Tourism Forum	1 Councillor, plus 1 named deputy	Lead Member (Porter) Named Deputy Miles	EAL: Jane Hargreaves - Ext. 4818
Crime and Public Protection Forum	1 Councillor, plus 1 named deputy	Lead Member (McKenzie) Named Deputy Mrs Rush	CS: Jeff Elsom - Ext. 2133
Economic Development Forum	1 Councillor, plus 1 named deputy	Lead Member (Kallar) Named Deputies Miles and McCarthy	Regeneration & Environment (R&E) Jeremy Grint - Ext. 2443
Lead Member for Equalities	1 Councillor nominee (the Leader's Committee then elects from the nominees a lead member for equalities in London)	Lead Member (Wade) Named Deputy Davis	EAL : Roger Luxton - Ext. 3000

Organisation	Representation required 2004/05	Representation 2003/04	Lead Department & Contact
<p>Grants Committee</p> <p>Transport and Environment Committee</p> <p>Greater London Provincial Council</p>	<p>1 Councillor, plus up to 4 named deputies</p> <p>1 Councillor, plus up to 4 named deputies</p> <p>In 2004/05, the Leader's Committee will constitute the GLPC Employer's Side. However, day-to-day matters will normally be dealt with by a meeting of deputy representatives and boroughs are asked to nominate 2 named deputies for this purpose.</p>	<p>Lead Member (Wade) Named Deputy Davis</p> <p>Lead Member (Kallar) Named Deputies Miles and McCarthy</p> <p>Mrs Twomey and one vacancy</p>	<p>CS: Mick Beackon - Ext. 2030</p> <p>R&amp;E: Niall Bolger - Ext. 3200</p> <p>CS: Keith Warrior - Ext. 2354</p>
<p>ALG Limited</p>	<p>1 Councillor (usually the Leader's Committee representative)</p>	<p>Lead Member (Geddes) named Deputies Alexander and McKenzie</p>	<p>CS: Naomi Goldberg from May 2004 Ext. 2248</p>
<p>Barking &amp; Dagenham Citizens Advice Bureau</p>	<p>1 Councillor</p>	<p>Cook</p>	<p>CS: Naomi Goldberg from May 2004 Ext. 2248 (TBC)</p>
<p>Barking &amp; Dagenham Council for Voluntary Services</p>	<p>2 Councillors</p>	<p>Fani and Mrs Rush</p>	<p>CS: Mick Beackon - Ext. 2030</p>
<p>Barking &amp; Dagenham Gospel Oak Line Committee</p>	<p>1 Councillor</p>	<p>Jones</p>	<p>R&amp;E: Gordon Glenday - Ext. 3929</p>
<p>Barking &amp; Dagenham Partnership</p>	<p>4 Councillors</p>	<p>Leader and 3 Executive Members (Alexander, Kallar and Osborn)</p>	<p>CS: Sally Penessa - Ext. 2219</p>
<p>Barking &amp; Dagenham Racial Equality Council</p>	<p>2 Councillors</p>	<p>Fani and H Collins</p>	<p>CS: Bill Coomber - Ext. 2105</p>
<p>Barking &amp; Dagenham Sports Council</p>	<p>10 Councillors</p>	<p>Barns, Mrs Cridland, Mrs Flint, McKenzie, Miles, O'Brien and Mrs</p>	<p>R&amp;E: Teresa Parish - Ext. 3313</p>

Organisation	Representation required 2004/05	Representation 2003/04	Lead Department & Contact
Barking College Corporation	2 Councillors	Twomey Co-opted member - Roy Patient	EAL: Justin Donovan - Ext. 3364
Barking College Corporation Search Committee	1 Councillor	Osborn	EAL: Justin Donovan - Ext. 3364
Barking Reach Development Company Limited and Enabling Board	2 Councillors	Leader and Lead Member (Kallar)	R&E: Jeremy Grint - Ext. 2443
Barking Town Centre Partnership	6 Councillors (4 Ward Members and the Lead Members for Regeneration and Improving Health, Housing and Social Care)	Alexander, Bramley, Mrs Bruce, Kallar, Osborn and Mrs Rush	R&E: Jeremy Grint - Ext. 2443
Community Housing Partnerships  Abbey, Gascoigne & Thames  Eastbrook, Heath and Alibon  Eastbury, Mayesbrook and Longbridge  Parsloes, Becontree and Valence  River, Village and Goresbrook	For each CHP – 2 Councillors from each Ward	Barns, Bramley, Fani, Mrs Flint, Mrs Rawlinson and Mrs Rush  L Collins, Davis, Kallar, McCarthy and Osborn (one vacancy)  Ms Baker, Mrs Blake, Mrs Challis, Cook, Cooper and Mrs Hunt  Mrs Bradley, H Collins, Mrs Cridland, Geddes, O'Brien and Mrs Osborn  Best, Dale, Huggins, Smith and Thomas (one vacancy)	H&H: Jim Ripley - Ext. 3738

Organisation	Representation required 2004/05	Representation 2003/04	Lead Department & Contact
Wellgate		Denyer, Justice and Mrs West (1 vacancy)	
Community Legal Services	1 Councillor	Lead Member (Fairbrass)	CS: Muhammad Saleem - Ext. 3108
Community Safety Strategic Partnership	1 Councillor	Lead Member (McKenzie)	CS: Jeff Elsom - Ext. 2133
Community/Police Consultative Group	Lead Member plus 3 other Councillors including one representative of the minority groups	Lead Member (McKenzie)	CS: Jeff Elsom - Ext. 2133
Dagenham Village Partnership	3 Ward Councillors	Best, Dale and Waker	R&E: Bernadette McGuigan - Ext. 3881
Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership	1 Councillor	Lead Member (Alexander)	EAL: Christine Pryor - Ext. 5552
East London Waste Authority	2 Councillors	Lead Member (McKenzie) named Deputy Mrs Twomey	R&E: Mike Mitchell - Ext. 2677
ELWA Integrated Waste Management Service Contract Liaison Committee	1 Councillor	Mrs Twomey	R&E: Mike Mitchell - Ext. 2677
Employee Joint Consultative Committee	9 Councillors	Davis, Fairbrass, Geddes, Hunt, McCarthy, McKenzie, Thomas, Mrs Twomey and Waker	CS: Jan Southwell - Ext. 2145
Excellence in Cities Partnership Board	1 Councillor	Lead Member (Alexander)	EAL: Jenny Crossley - Ext. 3507

Greater London Employers Association Limited	1 Councillor	Mrs Twomey	CS: Keith Warrior - Ext. 2354
Greater London Enterprise	1 Councillor	Lead Member (Kallar)	R&E: Jo Sinclair – 07968 511861
London Riverside (Heart of Thames Gateway) Board	2 Councillors	Leader and Lead Member (Kallar)	R&E Jeremy Grint - Ext. 2443
Independent Custody Visiting Panel	1 Councillor	Lead Member (McKenzie)	CS: Teresa Munro - Ext. 2861
Joint Safety Committee	7 Councillors	L Collins, Curtis, Davis, Jamu, Kallar, McCarthy and Mrs Twomey	CS: Stephanie May - Ext. 2201
Kingsley Hall Settlement	1 Councillor	Jones	
Local Government Association General Assembly	4 Councillors	L Collins, Geddes (Named Deputies Alexander and McKenzie) and Mrs Rush (one vacancy)	CS: Naomi Goldberg Ext. 2248
Urban Commission	2 Councillors	Kallar (Named Deputies Miles and McCarthy) and Geddes (Named Deputies Alexander and McKenzie)	R&E: Jeremy Grint - Ext. 2443
Local Housing Company Board	4 Councillors	Mrs Hunt, Miles, Osborn and Mrs West	H&H: Ken Jones - Ext. 3738
London Housing Unit Committee and Executive Sub-Committee	2 Councillors for each	Osborn and Geddes (Deputy)	H&H: Ken Jones - Ext. 3738
London Accident Prevention Council	1 Councillor	Mrs Bruce	R&E: Mike Mitchell - Ext. 3110

London Arts Forum	1 Councillor	Mrs Twomey	EAL: Tracey McNulty – Ext. 4846
London (North East) Valuation Panel	2 Councillor nominations 6 non-Councillor nominations	Nominations: Mrs Keller, Mr Ramage and Mr Ramsay	N/A
Neighbourhood Renewal Steering Group	4 Councillors	Lead Member (Kallar) H Collins, McKenzie and Mrs Rush	CS: Sally Penessa - Ext. 2219
Non Domestic Rate Consultation Meeting	3 Councillors	Leader, Deputy Leader and one vacancy	Finance Department (DF): Joe Chesterton - Ext. 2932
Public Transport Liaison Group	2 Councillors	Lead Member (Kallar) and Jones	R&E: Mike Mitchell - Ext. 3110
Registered Social Landlord Forum	1 Councillor	Barns	H&H: Ken Jones – Ext 3738 (TBC)
Reserve Forces and Cadets Association for Greater London	1 Councillor	Smith	None.
School Organisation Committee including Admissions Forum	4 Councillors	Lead Member (Alexander) Bramley, Jones and Curtis	EAL: Jenny Crossley – Ext. 3507
Sector Police Working Parties	For each sector, 1 Councillor from each Ward	Alexander, Ms Baker, Barns, Mrs Cooper, Mrs Hunt, Mrs Rush	None.
KB Sector (Barking)		H Collins, Mrs Cridland, Davis, Jamu, Justice, Kallar, Little, Thomas, Waker, Wainwright, Mrs West	
KG Sector (Dagenham) and KK Sector (Marks Gate)			

Social Services Children & Families Permanence Panel	2 Councillors	Mrs Bradley	SS: Tolis Vouyioukas - Ext. 2233
Social Services Task Centred Fostering Panel	2 Councillors	Cook and Mrs Hunt	SS: Tolis Vouyioukas - Ext. 2233
Barking & Dagenham User/Carer Forum	1 Councillor	Lead Member (Osborn)	Primary Care Trust: Steve Wedgwood - Tel. 020 8532 6320
London Museums Agency	1 Councillor	Mrs Blake	EAL: Kirstie Briody - Ext. 6769
Stort Valley Housing Association	2 Councillors	Leader and Lead Member (Osborn)	H&H: Ken Jones - Ext. 5703
Superannuation Fund Investment Panel	2 Councillors	Bramley and Thomas Two further nominees to be put forward by Lead Member as necessary	DF: Joe Chesterton - Ext. 2932
Sure Start: Gascoigne Management Board	1 Councillor	Mrs Rush	SS: Tolis Vouyioukas – Ext 2233 (TBC)
Thames Chase Joint Committee	3 Councillors (either Ward or Executive Members or a mixture of both)	Parkin (Eastbrook), Waker (Village) Jamu (River)	R&E: Allan Aubrey - Ext. 3576

<p>Thames Gateway London Partnership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Executive</li> <li>- Community Safety Strategic Board</li> <li>- Gateway to London Board</li> <li>- Outer Thames Gateway Area Partnership</li> </ul>	<p>1 Councillor</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p>	<p>Lead Member (Kallar)</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p>	<p>R&amp;E:</p> <p>Jeremy Grint - Ext. 2443</p> <p>“</p> <p>Jo Sinclair – 07968 511861</p> <p>Claire Adams - Ext. 2161</p>
<p>Heathway Town Centre Forum</p>	<p>5 Councillors</p>	<p>Ward Members from River, Village and Alibon</p>	<p>R&amp;E:</p> <p>Ralph Cook - Ext. 6015</p>
<p>Unitary Development Plan Group</p>	<p>3 Executive Members (voting members)</p> <p>2 Development Control Board Members (by invitation only)</p>	<p>Executive Members (voting Members) - Alexander, Fairbrass and Osborn</p> <p>Development Control Board Members (by invitation only) - Mrs Bruce and Kallar</p>	<p>R&amp;E:</p> <p>Gordon Glenday - Ext. 3929</p>



**TRUSTEES OF LOCAL CHARITIES**

The Council appoints trustees to a number of local charities. Details of the charities and trustees are shown below, together with any other relevant comments.

- **Dagenham United Charity** was created on 24 November 1997 and effectively amalgamates the previous Dagenham United Charities, William Ford Charity and the Dagenham War Memorial Trust Fund. It gives financial assistance to those in need at Christmas time and the area of benefit is the former Borough of Dagenham as at 1921-1924.

There are five trustees, four of which are appointed by the Council as follows and may be, but do not need to be elected Members of the Council.

Councillor Davis - 24 May 2001 - 24 May 2005 - four year term of office

Councillor Wainwright 24 May 2003 - 24 May 2004

Councillor Justice (2003/04 municipal year)

One vacancy

- **Barking General Charities** consists of a number of ancient charities which are now administered as far as Barking is concerned under a scheme made by the Charity Commissioners on the 27 May 1898. Keith Glenny of Hatten, Asplin and Glenny Solicitors acts as Clerk. The area of benefit is Barking.

There are seven trustees, two of which are appointed by the Council as follows:-

Councillor Mrs Bruce - for the municipal year 2003/04

Councillor Porter - for the municipal year 2003/04

There is no specific term of office.

- **Barking and Ilford Charities** is an amalgamation of the Barking General Charities and Ilford General Charities and its function is to administer the almshouses in Barking. It is also administered by Keith Glenny.

There are seven trustees, two of which are appointed by the Council as follows:-

Councillor Mrs Bradley - for the municipal year 2003/04

Councillor Mrs Flint - for the municipal year 2003/04

There is no specific term of office.

- **King George V Silver Jubilee Trust Fund** applies the net income from investments for the purpose of relieving cases of need, hardship or distress of children resident in the area.

The trustees are the Mayor and the Director of Social Services and there is no specific term of office. Last year, it was agreed that they continue to administer this Fund.

- **The Eva Tyne Trust Fund** was established by the former Education Committee in 1992 following the Mayoral Appeal of 1990/91. The purpose of the fund is to support, through grants, all young persons aged between 12 and 25 who are resident in the Borough in order to assist them to develop themselves and contribute to the local community as a whole. The Constitution allows the waiver of the upper age limit if an applicant has a disability.

There are eight trustees, the Council representatives are:

Councillor Mrs Bruce  
Councillor Davis  
Councillor Mrs Twomey  
Councillor Jones (ex-officio; no voting powers)

- **The Brocklebank Lodge Trust Fund** was established some years ago following a bequest to Brocklebank Lodge. The Trust usually only meets once a year to approve the minutes, accounts and expenditure for the following year. The trustees are the Director of Finance, Director of Social Services and two Member representatives, who are:

Councillor H Collins  
Councillor Jones

The fund provides extra amenity for Brocklebank Lodge, over and above that which is provided by the Council.

## **Conclusions**

Whilst it appears that some charities have no specific terms of office, I understand from the Honorary Clerks/Secretaries that appointees tend to continue through both goodwill and their long-term association with the charity concerned. It is, however, essential that trustees are appointed to the following Charities in view of the beneficial nature of these Charities and the level of funds involved:-

Dagenham United Charity  
Barking General Charities  
Barking and Ilford Charities  
The Eva Tyne Trust Fund  
Brocklebank Lodge Trust Fund

**MEMBER REPRESENTATION ON  
SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL</b>
Councillor Ms Baker	Eastbury Infants' School Eastbury Comprehensive School
Councillor Barns	Barking Abbey Comprehensive School
Councillor Mrs Bradley	Adult College
Councillor Bramley	Jo Richardson Community School Tuition Service
Councillor Mrs Bruce	Barking Abbey Comprehensive School Eastbury Comprehensive School
Councillor Mrs Conyard	Jo Richardson Community School Monteagle Primary School
Councillor Cook	Barking Abbey Comprehensive School
Councillor Cooper	Ripple Infants' School
Councillor Mrs Cridland	Grafton Junior School Valence Infants' School
Councillor Curtis	Warren Junior School Furze Infants' School
Councillor Dale	William Ford Church of England Junior School
Councillor Davis	Becontree Primary School Hunters Hall Primary School
Councillor Denyer	Furze Infants' School Warren Junior School
Councillor Fairbrass	William Ford Church of England Junior School
Councillor Fani	Eastbury Infants' School
Councillor Mrs Flint	Thames View Infants' School Gascoigne Primary School
Councillor Geddes	Becontree Primary School Robert Clack Comprehensive School
Councillor Gibbs	Marks Gate Infants' School Warren Comprehensive School
Councillor Huggins	Cambell Infants' School Cambell Junior School
Councillor Mrs Hunt	Monteagle Primary School
Councillor Jamu	Dagenham Priory Comprehensive School
Councillor Jones	Adult College Sydney Russell Comprehensive School Parsloes Primary School
Councillor Kallar	Adult College Robert Clack Comprehensive School Jo Richardson Community School
Councillor Little	Valence Junior School
Councillor McCarthy	Richard Alibon Primary School
Councillor Miles	Dagenham Priory Comprehensive School Thames View Infants' School
Councillor Mrs Osborn	Five Elms Primary School Valence Junior School

<b>NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL</b>
Councillor Parkin	Rush Green Junior School Parsloes Primary School
Councillor Porter	Cambell Infants' School Sydney Russell Comprehensive School
Councillor Mrs Rawlinson	Jo Richardson Community School
Councillor Mrs Rush	Tuition Service Monteagle Primary School
Councillor Smith	Dagenham Priory Comprehensive School
Councillor Thomas	Thomas Arnold Primary School
Councillor Wade	Richard Alibon Primary School Eastbrook Comprehensive School
Councillor Wainwright	The Leys Primary School Dagenham Priory Comprehensive School
Councillor Waker	The Leys Primary School John Perry Primary School
Councillor Mrs West	Henry Green Primary School

**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****ERKENWALD CENTRE DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY PANEL**

<b>DRAFT FINAL REPORT OF THE ERKENWALD CENTRE DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY PANEL</b>	<b>FOR DECISION</b>
<p><i>Final reports of Scrutiny Panels are submitted to the Scrutiny Management Board (SMB), the Executive and the Assembly, as required by Paragraph 11 of Article 5b of the Council's Constitution.</i></p>	
<p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p>	
<p><b><u>Background and current position:</u></b></p>	
<p>This report sets out the final report and recommendations of the above Scrutiny Panel, which was established in June 2001 to monitor the development of the former Erkenwald Youth Centre as a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) for primary children who are excluded from school and a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) centre. This was a joint project between the Council and the North East London Mental Health Trust (NELMHT).</p>	
<p>The SMB set up the Panel after being made aware of the local community's concerns about the loss of the site as a youth facility. The Panel had its first meeting on 4 September 2001.</p>	
<p>After significant delays, the building is now complete and the PRU commenced operation in March 2004. The CAMHS part of the development was unable to proceed, as it was not possible to secure all the necessary funding for this.</p>	
<p><b><u>Project delays:</u></b></p>	
<p>The joint project was originally due to have opened in Autumn 2002. The key factors in the delay were:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A major project redesign in October 2001 to meet CAMHS' requirements</li> <li>▪ The withdrawal of the CAMHS element in February 2002, which necessitated another major redesign</li> <li>▪ A delay of one month in the contractor starting on site</li> <li>▪ An extension of five weeks to the building programme to accommodate post-contract design changes</li> <li>▪ Delays in furnishing the Centre at the completion of the building programme due to a project overspend and delays on the part of the furniture supplier</li> <li>▪ Break-ins at the centre in January 2004, resulting in the theft of IT equipment</li> <li>▪ Delays in resolving various issues necessary to open the Centre, principally relating to security, Information Technology and kitchen works</li> </ul>	

## **The Panel's key messages**

The overall message is positive:

- The Erkenwald PRU is a groundbreaking, first class facility that will provide dedicated support and guidance to some of the Borough's most vulnerable young children and enable them to return to school as quickly as possible.
- The building's design is excellent and it will enhance the local area.
- The centre's hard area, used as a sports facility by young people for many years, will remain available for use by the local community.

However, a number of problems were encountered during the development and, in some cases, lessons can be learned from these. The difficulties were as follows:

- The delays referred to above (see Section 5 for a detailed chronology)
- The Panel felt that there were occasions when the relevant departments should have communicated and worked with each other more effectively to progress the project:
  - As mentioned above, the building contract was extended to accommodate post-contract design changes (see paragraph 5.27), some of which were quite significant. It is arguable that at least some of these should have been identified at the design stage and this delay avoided.
  - When the Panel met in January 2004, it felt that insufficient progress was being made in resolving the outstanding issues necessary to open the centre. As a result, a manager was tasked to co-ordinate the efforts of the relevant departments and drive the project forward (see paragraph 5.35).
- As detailed in Section 5, there were a number of changes in the nature/leadership of the project and the Panel felt that these detracted from the continuity of the development, as demonstrated by the need to appoint a manager to resolve the outstanding issues in January of this year.
- Arrangements for keeping the community informed and involved were not always satisfactory. As shown in Section 5, the Panel had to intervene to ensure this was rectified on more than one occasion. More positively, the Panel was pleased to note that the PRU is planning to engage and involve the community on an ongoing basis (see Section 1).
- The withdrawal of the CAMHS unit meant that the community was not able to benefit from the out-patient service it would have provided and contributed significantly to the delays in progressing the PRU. Although it is perhaps easy to say this now with the benefit of hindsight, it is arguable that the funding position should have been resolved more satisfactorily before the project was progressed.

## **Recommendations / Reasons**

1. That the Council widely publicises the opening of the PRU to ensure that this excellent service, which befits the authority's Beacon Status, is recognised both locally and nationally; and
2. That the Council examines the lessons from this project in terms of joint working and communication between departments, including the issue of continuity in project leadership, and puts any necessary improvements in place (The Management Team should take the lead on this).

3. That a local consultation strategy be drawn up as an integral part of every Council/joint building development and that the implementation of these be rigorously monitored, to ensure the local community is fully informed and consulted on all such developments.
4. That, when engaging in joint projects, the Council needs to ensure that, at every stage of the development process, it is satisfied with the funding position of its partners before proceeding further, to ensure that the problems encountered with this development are not repeated.
5. That the PRU implements its plans to engage the local community and that the Council monitors these by consulting the community on an annual basis, to ensure good relations are being maintained between the PRU and its neighbours.
6. That, given the history of security problems at the site, the Executive identifies funding to provide Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras at the Centre, linked into the Council's central monitoring station through a microwave link, subject to further work being carried out to confirm the capital and revenue costs of this and the alternative options (The Panel has been advised that the estimated cost is £55k, but this needs to be confirmed, together with the annual costs of linking into the monitoring station. The alternatives being looked at are (i) linking into the monitoring station via a BT line and (ii) cameras linked to on-site recording equipment. As outlined in paragraph 5.40, if the Executive is minded to support this proposal the Education, Arts and Libraries Department would look to fund it either through Department for Education and Skills (DfES) Standards Funding (Capital or Seed Challenge) or the Repairs Programme).

Councillor Mrs Kay Flint	Chair, Erkenwald Centre Development Scrutiny Panel	Tel: 020 8594 0443 E-mail: <a href="mailto:kay.flint@lbbd.gov.uk">kay.flint@lbbd.gov.uk</a>
Allan Aubrey	Independent Scrutiny Support Officer to the Panel	Tel: 020 8227 3576 E-mail: <a href="mailto:allan.aubrey@lbbd.gov.uk">allan.aubrey@lbbd.gov.uk</a>
Steve Foster	Democratic Support Officer	Tel: 020 8227 2113 Fax: 020 8227 2171 Textlink: 020 8227 2594 E-mail: <a href="mailto:steve.foster@lbbd.gov.uk">steve.foster@lbbd.gov.uk</a>

## 1. Introduction

### Panel background and terms of reference

- 1.1 On 16 May 2001, the Executive agreed that the former Erkenwald Youth Centre in Marlborough Road be developed as a Pupil Referral Unit and Community Health Centre. The Centre was to be developed jointly by the Council and NELMHT. The Pupil Referral Unit, operated by the Council, would use the Centre to teach primary aged children excluded from school, and the Child & Adolescent Mental Health

Service (CAMHS), led by NELMHT, would provide an out-patient service. The two would work together to provide a comprehensive support service to young children with complex difficulties and their families. The initial outline plans involved the conversion and extension of the single-storey building, at an estimated capital cost of £520,000, subject to exclusions such as professional fees, 60% to be met by NELMHT and 40% by the Council.

- 1.2 On 20 June, the SMB was made aware of the local community's concerns that the site was being lost as a youth facility and complaints that it had not been adequately consulted about the Centre's future. It set up the Erkenwald Centre Development Scrutiny Panel with the following terms of reference:

"To monitor progress with the implementation of the Erkenwald Centre Development as a Pupil Referral Unit and a Community Health Centre."

- 1.3 Section 5 of the report provides a detailed chronology of the Panel's work and the development of the Centre.

#### The Erkenwald PRU

- 1.4 The PRU is part of the Borough's Tuition Service, which supports pupils who are excluded from school due to emotional or behavioural problems or unable to attend for medical, personal and other reasons. The PRU is not a permanent solution for each child, but an intervention to enable them to progress and return to school as quickly as possible. A PRU for secondary school age students is already operating at a site next to Cambell Junior School. The PRU at Erkenwald provides a dedicated facility for primary children, who, until the centre opened, were being educated under interim arrangements at the Cambell site. These children represent some of the borough's most vulnerable young people; the support they get from the PRU will not only help them make the most of their education and get the best possible start to life but should reduce the need for this kind of support for older students.
- 1.5 The PRU will provide tuition for a maximum of 12 pupils at a time. This means that there will be little or no disruption to those living around the centre. It will open for normal school hours and term times. There is adequate staff parking at the site, so this should mean parking availability on local streets is not adversely affected.
- 1.6 The PRU has made a commitment to be a good neighbour: "We will always listen to local people to see if there are any ways in which we can improve on how we can become a part of the community." As a practical demonstration of this, the Centre's hard standing, which has been used as a sports area by local young people for many years, will remain available for use by the community. The PRU is also planning to hold open events on an ongoing basis where the community will be invited to look around the Centre and meet the children.

## **2. Membership**

- 2.1 The Members appointed to the Panel were Councillors Mrs Kay Flint (Lead Member), Fred Jones and Kate Golden. Councillor Mrs Dee Hunt replaced Councillor Golden after the latter did not stand in the 2002 Local Election.



- 2.2 Former Councillor Mrs Rita Rogers also attended regularly up to the 2002 Local Election, in which she did not stand for re-election.
- 2.3 The Panel's Independent Scrutiny Support Officer was Allan Aubrey (Head of Leisure) and its Democratic Support Officer was Steve Foster.
- 2.4 The Panel's original Lead Service Officers (LSO's) were Christine Grice (Head of Children's Support and the development's project manager) and Justin Donovan (Head of Lifelong Learning) from the Education, Arts & Libraries Department (EALD). Christine Grice left the authority in Spring 2002 and was replaced, on a temporary basis, as LSO, by Steve Rowe (Principal Inspector, Community Inspection & Advisory Service). The current LSO is Justin Donovan.
- 2.5 The other officers who have attended the Panel have included:
- Brian Bye (Construction Services Manager, Leisure & Environmental Services Department (LESD): the project architect)
  - Andy Carr (Assets Manager, EALD)
  - Melissa Hoskins (Press & PR Manager, Corporate Communications): one meeting at request of Panel to advise on publicity issues
  - Keith Ellis (Principal Architect, LESD)
  - Sandy Waugh (Headteacher, Tuition Service)
  - Jill Doyle (Deputy Headteacher, Tuition Service)
  - David Wright (Teacher in Charge of Erkenwald)
  - Derek Marney (Senior Projects Manager, EALD)
- 2.6 Martin Yates (Area Manager, Child and Adolescent, NELMHT) attended one of the Panel's initial meetings to discuss NELMHT's part of the project.
- 2.7 Phil Bass, a consultant Quantity Surveyor employed by the Council, also attended one of the initial meetings.

### **3. Consultation**

- 3.1 The Panel's first meeting was attended by members of the Erkenwald Tenants & Residents Association (ETRA), led by Roy and Sheila Reeves, respectively the Chair and Secretary of the Association. The residents expressed their opposition to the Council's plans; they had prepared a bid to operate the building as a youth and community centre. The Panel advised that this matter was outside its terms of reference but asked them to assist with its task. Since then, Roy Reeves has attended the Panel whenever he could and Members are extremely grateful for his contribution; his advice on how best to consult residents on progress has been particularly invaluable.
- 3.2 Details of the consultation carried out during the development are included in Section 5 of the report.
- 3.3 This report has been prepared in consultation with relevant officers from EALD, DLES and NELMHT.

### **4. Equalities & Diversity and Health Issues**

- 4.1 The key equalities and diversity issue has been physical access to the Centre. The building has good access for disabled people.
- 4.2 The CAMHS unit would have provided significant health benefits had it been built and it is a matter of considerable regret that this did not prove possible.

## **5. Chronology of Events**

### September 2001

- 5.1 The Panel first met on 4 September 2001, receiving a background/progress report and agreeing how it would approach its task. The key developments were that the NELMHT Board had approved the scheme (July 2001) and that two joint Council/NELMHT officer groups had been established, one to look at the model of care and the other to oversee the building's development. The Panel also held the discussions with ETRA referred to above.

### October 2001

- 5.2 The Panel met again on 2 October. It was advised that, having considered a petition from ETRA, the Assembly had agreed that the development should go ahead as planned. EALD had also held two meetings with ETRA to discuss alternative arrangements for providing community facilities in the area.
- 5.3 The Panel considered a further progress report, together with sketch plans, a feasibility estimate and an indicative project programme. The plans were based on the original single storey conversion and extension concept; the joint officer group had made some revisions, but the overall estimate was unchanged. A planning application was due to be made by January 2002, tenders would go out in mid-January, work would start in April and be completed by 4 October 2002.
- 5.4 The Panel made the following key recommendations to officers at this point:
- That, in addition to the ongoing discussions with ETRA, regular press releases be issued to keep the community informed
  - That security measures at the site be reviewed and that the possibility of installing Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) be investigated.

The Panel also discussed the possibility of the Centre being used for community activities in the evening, but, at this stage, concluded that this would be impractical as it was advised that the building was likely to be fully utilised throughout the day and during some (and possibly all) evenings and also that the design was not ideal for such activities.

- 5.5 The Chair and officers visited the site on 23 October 2001. Vandals had broken into the building shortly before the visit and ruptured the water tank, causing flooding and associated damage.

### November 2001

- 5.6 Following the October meeting, the development faced its first significant challenge. NELMHT requested additional accommodation to meet service needs. This led to a

revised design, including the addition of a second storey above the ground floor extension. The new design was submitted to the Panel's meeting on 26 November, together with a new estimate of £770,000, exclusive of fees. The Panel was advised that the Council and NELMHT were negotiating how these additional costs would be met and that there was likely to be some slippage, although it was difficult to assess the extent of this. The Panel agreed to meet again in March, when the situation would be clearer.

5.7 The Panel made the following recommendations at this meeting:

- Consultation: that a public meeting be held so that residents could discuss any concerns about the development and that further steps be taken to continue to engage residents after this.
- Security: to examine the installation of electrically operated door and window shutters. Although there was no budgetary provision for this, it was felt that it would be more cost effective to include these in the design rather than adding them further down the line when the Council might also have to pay for repairs that the shutters might prevent. In the event, it was not possible to install these shutters due to the design of the doors and windows.

5.8 The Panel submitted an interim report to the SMB advising of the above and asking that it be allowed to complete its task by meeting at one or two key points during the remainder of the development process; this was agreed.

#### March and April 2002

5.9 The most serious setback occurred in Spring 2002. Planning permission having been granted, the Panel met on 4 March to be advised that the CAMHS element of the project could not be funded. The Panel expressed profound disappointment about this: NELMHT had advised in the previous July that it had approved the scheme and, until then, had not informed the Council of any problems; it asked that this message be conveyed to them. At the time, the Panel had understood that there was a shortfall in capital funding. However, in commenting on this report, NELMHT advised that, while it had had no desire to cause any delay or inconvenience to the partners associated in the project, it had not been in a position to go ahead because it had not been able to secure revenue funding.

5.10 The officers advised that working with NELMHT remained the preferred long-term option but that the Council had to ensure the provision of a PRU as soon as possible after the start of the next academic year. The Panel supported the officer's recommendation, which the Executive subsequently agreed, that the Council proceed on schedule to convert the Centre into a PRU and enable the CAMHS element to be added at a later date if the funding position changed.

5.11 The Panel asked that local residents be informed, in writing, of the Executive's decision and kept updated/consulted as the project continued.

5.12 Christine Grice had recently left the authority and line management responsibility for the PRU passed to Steve Rowe on a temporary basis pending a management reorganisation in EALD. Panel Members had not been informed of this and expressed their concern to the Director.

- 5.13 The Panel met again on 25 March. It was confirmed that the Council had sufficient funding within the Capital Programme to provide the PRU: £611,000 had originally been allocated and the revised estimate was £465,000 inclusive of fees and exclusive of fittings, furnishings and the construction of the pitched roof referred to in paragraph 5.15.
- 5.14 The scheme approved by the Development Control Board had included a pitched roof costing £60,000. The Panel made it clear that this had to be included in the revised scheme, principally for reasons of security. It was confirmed this could be met within the overall budget.
- 5.15 The Panel reminded officers to advise residents of the Executive's decision (to be taken the following day) and re-emphasised the general need to continue keeping residents informed.
- 5.16 On 30 April, the Panel was advised that EALD had circulated an information leaflet on the Centre to local residents. Unfortunately, they were not delivered to all the relevant households and the Panel gave instructions that this be rectified. The leaflet confirmed that the Centre's hard area, used as a sports area by young people, would remain available for community use as ETRA had requested. The Council had also given a presentation on the scheme at a public meeting organised by ETRA on 19 April and answered residents' questions. Mr Reeves supplied the Panel with a copy of ETRA's written comments on the PRU, in which ETRA welcomed the chance to have its say, stated that residents seemed to accept that the PRU would be built and emphasised that this must take place with minimal disturbance to residents.
- 5.17 The Panel was advised of the revised timetable for the project. Tenders were to be sought in July, the contract awarded in September, works to commence at the end of that month and to complete by January 2002. The Panel asked EALD to send a letter to local residents setting out the project timetable and other relevant information and answering ETRA's written comments on the PRU and any other relevant concerns.
- 5.18 The Panel also looked again at whether the Centre might be used for community activities when not in use as the PRU. It seemed unlikely that the Centre would be suitable for large-scale activities but that it might be possible to use it for smaller meetings, such as ward surgeries and Residents Association committee meetings. It was agreed, however, that it would be necessary to look at the final layout of the building in more detail and examine factors such as security and the confidentiality of PRU clients before this could be confirmed. The Panel agreed to return to this topic in due course.

#### June 2002

- 5.19 The Panel met again on 10 June to check progress and examine the building plans. There had been slight slippage in that work was now due to begin in the first week of October and finish by the end of January 2003.

- 5.20 There had also been an unacceptable delay in distributing the leaflets and letter referred to at the April meeting. The Panel received assurances that the leaflets would be delivered by 16 June and that the letter would also be delivered without delay; these requirements were met.

#### October 2002

- 5.21 The Panel met on 28 October. Tenders had been invited on 16 August and returned on 17 September. The Panel received a report analysing the tenders, which was to be submitted to the Executive in mid-November, and supported the officer's recommendation on the company to be appointed. Works were to start before Christmas and finish by March 2003.
- 5.22 It was confirmed that the tender price was well within the budget agreed for the project, that the 17 week programme included snagging, inspection and commissioning and that, on this basis, the Centre would be a finished product ready for occupation at the beginning of April 2003.
- 5.23 The plan was to open the Centre at the beginning of the summer term. In the interim, work needed to be done to develop the Centre's curriculum and policies, ensure staff were in place and make the other necessary preparations. The Council was having difficulties in recruiting a head teacher and was examining various options to resolve this.
- 5.24 The Panel agreed to meet again if necessary and to agree its final report once its work was completed. The Lead Member was kept regularly updated on progress during the ensuing months.

#### November and December 2002

- 5.25 The Executive appointed the recommended contractor on 26 November and the order, to the value of £494,402, was placed at the end of the Call-In period on 4 December.
- 5.26 The contractor was due to start work in January 2003 but there was a delay of one month in them starting on site. The Education, Arts & Libraries Department held a meeting with the contractor, on 19 December 2002. Despite their written confirmation that they would commence work in January 2003, the contractor informed the officers that they could not start work until 5 February. The officers protested about this but the contractor's position remained unaltered. EALD decided to press ahead with the contract, as the alternative would have been to seek the Executive's approval to cancel and re-award the contract, which would have delayed progress even further. EALD was confident that the contractor would deliver the project on time and according to the requirements of the contract. However, the contractor's actions had been carefully recorded. The Panel Members were informed of the situation after the Christmas break. The contract completion date was now 2 June 2003.

### February-September 2003

5.27 Work started on site on 3 February 2003 and final handover took place on 18 July 2003, 7 weeks late. The Council agreed a 5 week contract extension because of post contract design changes and there was a further delay of 2 weeks in completing these. There would only have been one week's extra slippage, but there was vandalism again at the site even though a security guard was employed there 24 hours a day, and this meant another week's delay. The main areas of post-contract design changes were:

- Increased Information Technology provision including dado trunking – End User Change Post Contract
- Changes to layout of reception – End User Change Post Contract
- Changes to kitchen layout and materials used – End User Change Post Contract
- Boundary fencing works – End User Change Post Contract
- Additional roof light and associated works – Design Change by Architects Post Contract
- Video Door Entry System – Design Change Post Contract
- Gutter outlets – Design Change by Architects Post Contract
- Firebreak to roof space – Design Change by Architects Post Contract
- Washing machine and cleaners sink – End User Change Post Contract
- Water tank in roof space to comply with water by laws – Design Change by Architects Post Contract

The end user also required that the building be connected to the Borough's IT network; this cost an additional £15,000. In addition, they required that the site's boundary fence be replaced for security reasons – it was not originally intended to re-fence the property – and this cost £16,500.

5.28 These changes, together with the extension of the building programme, put the contract and overall project over budget. On 30 September, the position was as follows:

The contract value was £494, 402 – but additions had put this up to £513,701.

The original capital budget was £611,000 but the predicted spend was now £619, 418.

5.29 Following handover, the main tasks that needed to be completed were replacing the boundary fence (this was finished by 8 September 2003) and furnishing the property. Unfortunately, there was no money left in the budget for furniture so this has had to be found from elsewhere. The furniture was ordered on 24 September 2003 and should have been delivered by 24 October 2003. The supplier failed to meet this delivery date and continued to delay despite being chased by the Council on several occasions.

### October and November 2003

5.30 The Lead Member asked that a site visit be arranged and, after some delay in finding a convenient date, this took place on 4 November. The furniture had still not been delivered and the Council was continuing to chase the supplier.

- 5.31 Overall, the Panel was delighted with the Centre. The building is very pleasing from the outside and fits in well with the surrounding environment. Inside, the rooms are well laid out and attractive and will make an ideal environment for the teachers and young children.
- 5.32 The Panel was concerned about the potential vulnerability of the Centre's glass windows and doors, this point being illustrated by the fact that, as a temporary measure until the Centre opens, they were being protected by wooden boards. The Panel asked that the glass be protected by installing shutters (as it had originally recommended) or be replaced with security glass. The officers advised that there were no funds for this, but agreed to try to secure these from other budgets.

#### December 2003

5.33 At 1 December 2003:

- Officers had confirmed that the design of the windows did not lend themselves to roller shutters. They were looking at grilles and/or toughened glass options. Funding had been found from outside the Capital Programme to complete this work (from the insurance settlement from the Thames View Youth Club).
- The furniture was due to be in place by the end of the Autumn Term. The Information Technology equipment had begun to arrive.
- All staff were in place
- The Centre was due to open on the first day of the Spring Term (5 January 2003)

#### January 2004

5.34 The Panel met on 27 January and was advised of the latest position:

- The Centre was still not open as several significant items/issues required completion/resolution (these related principally to security, Information Technology and kitchen works), some of which had to be completed before pupils could be admitted safely.
- There had been a security guard on site 24 hours a day since July 2003. Despite this, there had been a couple of break-ins in recent weeks. In one incident, which took place in daylight, IT equipment was stolen worth £6,000. In response, the officers were looking at protecting the windows/doors with grilles and enhanced CCTV provision. The guard who had been on duty at the time of the break-in had been replaced.
- Funding was available to take forward some of this work.

5.35 The Panel expressed great concern about the continuing delays and also the break-ins, particularly as security had been repeatedly highlighted as a key issue since the project began. It agreed:

- that Derek Marney (Senior Project Manager, Education Arts & Libraries) be tasked to take the project forward
- that he work with the other officers involved in the project to determine which of the outstanding work had to be completed before the centre opened
- that he prepared a timetable for the completion of this work and presented this to the Panel's next meeting, together with a progress update

5.36 There was also some discussion about the use of the centre for community activities; Mr Reeves asked particularly about the centre's hard sports area. The officers indicated that they would like a representative of the Residents' Association to sit on the centre's management committee and discuss this issue. The Panel noted that, in the information leaflet that it distributed to local residents in June 2002, the Council stated that the hard area should remain available for use by the community.

#### February 2004

5.37 The Panel met for the last time on 23 February 2004. Mr Marney provided an update, the key points being:

- The centre was on target to open by mid-March.
- Kitchen redesign. The teacher-in-charge had requested a change of layout to allow the kitchen to be used for training as well as meals and thereby improve the service. The design had been finalised, the contractors were on site and the works were due to be completed within 2 weeks.
- Security:
  - Since the last meeting, there had been further security incidents: youths had climbed on the roof on one occasion and stones had also been thrown at the building.
  - An order had been placed to install security window shields for all external windows and skylights; the external doors would have roller shutters. These works were due to be completed by mid-March 2004.
  - It is estimated that it would cost £55k to provide CCTV cameras linked into the Council's central monitoring station and there was insufficient funding for this (the revenue costs were not identified). Officers were looking at alternative options, including cameras linked to recording equipment on site (the costs of this were not identified). Once the centre opened and until this was resolved, a security guard would still be required during locked hours.
  - The whole building was alarmed and a panic alarm had been ordered for reception.



- IT: The stolen equipment had been replaced and would be installed on site once the Council was satisfied that the building was fully secure (estimated date for installation of IT and telephones: mid-March 2004)
- When the above works were near completion, there would be an on site meeting to ensure that the centre was ready for opening.
- There might still be some works outstanding after mid March 2004 such as landscaping, but these should not interfere with the opening or running of the centre.
- Arrangements would be made shortly for an official opening.

5.38 The Panel was very pleased with the progress that had been made since the last meeting. It thanked Mr Marney for the outstanding work he had done in progressing the project in the short time since he had been appointed.

5.39 Mr Reeves was in attendance and the Panel discussed with him the issue of community involvement. Mr Marney emphasised that the community would be able to use the hard area once the centre was open and that he would be consulting the community on how this activity would be supervised. Mr Reeves suggested that a community meeting be held and the Panel asked Mr Marney to take this forward.

5.40 The Panel agreed:

- to recommend that additional funding be provided to install CCTV cameras linked into the central monitoring station, given the history of security problems at the site. It feared that, if CCTV is not installed, there will be heavy ongoing repairs and maintenance costs from vandalism. There is also the need to prevent young people gaining access to the roof. (The Education, Arts and Libraries Department has indicated that, if the Executive approves this recommendation it would seek competitive quotes and work with the Centre in respect of funding and installing a system either through Department for Education and Skills (DfES) Standards Funding (Capital or Seed Challenge) or the Repairs Programme)
- to undertake a site visit shortly before the centre opened

#### March 2004

5.41 The Members' site visit took place on 16 March 2004. The kitchen, security and IT works listed above had been largely completed and the building was nearly ready for occupation.

5.42 The PRU commenced operation on 7 April and the official opening is on 14 May.

#### **Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:**

Executive, Scrutiny Management Board and Erkenwald Centre Development Scrutiny Panel papers.

This page is intentionally left blank

**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HOUSING AND HEALTH**

<b>HOMELESSNESS: ACHIEVING THE BED AND BREAKFAST TARGET AND DEVELOPING THE TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION SERVICE</b>	<b>FOR DECISION</b>	
<p><i>This report shows progress made in the delivery of the Council's statutory responsibilities to homeless people for temporary accommodation</i></p> <p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>This report advises the Executive of the achievement of the Government's target for bed and breakfast placements for homeless families and refers to the letter received from Lord Rooker congratulating the Council on meeting the target ahead of schedule.</p> <p>The report updates the Executive on the take up of Private Sector Leased (PSL) properties and the contribution made by this provision to improving the quality of temporary accommodation options for people for whom the Council has a statutory obligation. This measure has helped ensure that the achievement of the B and B target is sustained and that the costs of temporary accommodation to the Council can be minimised. Details are also given of the improvement in the financial position on temporary accommodation costs.</p> <p>The progress made on managing the housing related issues of the Government decision to grant Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) to a number of asylum seeker families living in the UK for more than 3 years, is reported.</p> <p>It is intended to bring a further report to the Executive on the continued development of the PSL source of accommodation to meet a wider range of housing needs.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>The Executive is asked to agree to commit to reduce the usage of bed and breakfast placements for single persons, noting current take up of Private Sector Leased properties as well as the potential for further development of this provision.</p> <p><b><u>Reason</u></b></p> <p>Whilst the BandB statutory target has been achieved, reducing such placements for single persons will be beneficial for those people, the Council and Council Tax payers.</p>		
<b>Contact:</b> Ken Jones	Head of Housing Strategic Development	Tel: 020 8227 5703 Fax: 020 8227 5595 Minicom : 020 8227 5755 E-mail: <a href="mailto:ken.jones@lbbd.gov.uk">ken.jones@lbbd.gov.uk</a>

## 1. **Background**

- 1.1 The Homelessness (Suitability of Accommodation) (England) Order 2003 issued by the Secretary of State requires that there be no further use of bed and breakfast (BandB) accommodation for families with children, or where a member of the household is pregnant, for any period in excess of 6 weeks. This Order was effective from 1 April 2004.

Lord Rooker, Minister of State at the ODPM, has written to the Chief Executive to congratulate the Council on reaching the BandB target ahead of schedule (Appendix A).

- 1.2 The Executive agreed on 12 August 2003 to raise the number of PSL properties to be procured by 150 to a total of 250. Delegated authority was also given to the Director of Housing and Health to procure additional accommodation above 250 with regular update reports to the Executive. At present the number in use is 210 and this has meant that the Council has been able to achieve the BandB target. Important outcomes from this are:

- greater stability for families because they remain for much longer periods in the same property
- better quality of temporary accommodation for families who become homeless
- due to Housing Benefit rules, all costs related to PSLs are recoverable (dependent upon the individual circumstances) so that the costs to the Council are eliminated.

- 1.3 The Council in partnership with Look Ahead Housing and Care has 2 schemes in development for homeless people at Bevan Avenue and Ravensfield Close which will provide 71 units.

- 1.4 The Government granted a national moratorium to a number of asylum seeker families with children resident in the UK from before October 2000. On granting Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) the responsibility for any homelessness approaches and housing costs falls to the local Housing Authority. The Council has made representations to ALG and the Home Office has been lobbied on this matter.

The ALG has produced a protocol which unequivocally puts responsibility for all housing issues with the authority that placed the family – even where this is within another borough / district. This is particularly welcome for Barking and Dagenham. It should be noted, however, that this protocol cannot supercede statutory rights of individuals in terms of homelessness responsibilities.

There are 310 families for whom the Council may have responsibility in the event that their landlords terminate their tenancies – these are people who have lived in Barking and Dagenham for more than 3 years. There are a further 90 families who were placed outside the borough.

## **2. Achievement of the BandB target**

2.1 The Council achieved the target as indicated in 1.1 in February 2004. There is continued use made of BandB for single persons, though this is a last resort temporary accommodation solution.

2.2 The following shows the placements for homeless people for whom the Council has a statutory responsibility as at 1 March 2004:-

Hostel (Boundary Rd)	- 30
Private Sector Leased (PSL) properties	- 210
Bed and breakfast (BandB) – (single people)	- 52
Non secure Council tenancies	- 448

2.3 In Lord Rooker's letter he looks forward to Barking and Dagenham developing its Homelessness Strategy in the areas of prevention, tackling repeat homelessness and extending housing options. These are all issues prominent in Barking and Dagenham's Homelessness Strategy and are being addressed in terms of delivery.

## **3. Progress report and financial position on temporary accommodation**

3.1 It can be seen from the table below that the service has experienced high growth throughout the past 3 years. A further consequence of reducing the level of BandB placements and exercising tighter management control of temporary accommodation has been that the financial position of this responsive service has improved. Attention has been focused on recovering costs through the Housing Benefit (HB) system and collection of charges not eligible for HB. The substantial improvement has been brought about by strong monitoring and management arrangements put in place during the second half of 2003/04 by the Accommodation Resettlement and Finance teams in Housing and Health and Revenue Services.

The figures shown for 2003/04 are based on forecasts and can be contained within the Housing General Fund budget, although there is no budget for temporary accommodation costs. It is anticipated that these measures and change from BandB should result in further improvement in 2004/05

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>
Bed and Breakfast	117,255	664,076	888,107
Private Sector Leasing		38,846	1,908,899
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>117,255</b>	<b>702,922</b>	<b>2,797,006</b>
Less Income (BandB)		(252,985)	432,359
Income (PSL)		(85,497)	2,263,744
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>117,255</b>	<b>364,440</b>	<b>100,903</b>

3.2 In relation to the potentially up to 400 families who may be granted ILR, close working relations have been developed between the Private Sector Housing team, Accommodation Resettlement (both within Housing Strategy) and the Accommodation Team of the Asylum Seeker Unit (ASU). This has proved to be effective in securing the objective of maintaining families in their private sector rented properties and to minimise / eliminate any financial obligation on the Council. This is being secured by negotiations with the landlords to:-

- accept Housing Benefit rent levels or, failing this
- convert the letting to a PSL arrangement

From the ILR determinations that have come through to date the indications are that the approach set out is proving to be very effective.

#### **4. Proposal and justification**

4.1 The procurement of PSL properties to the present level has been successful in responding to the increase in demand from families to date – 56% rise in 2002/03. It is likely that the trend will continue, though at a lower rate of increase, therefore, the need to expand this provision remains. In addition, as can be seen from the figures in para 2.2 there are over 50 single persons in BandB. This is generally an inferior option and is more expensive for the Council. To address this it is proposed to seek to access private sector properties that can be satisfactorily used as Homes in Multiple Occupation. In such cases inspections by Council staff are carried out to ensure standards are complied with.

4.2 It is intended to bring a further report to the Executive within 3 months to address the development of PSL to encompass the housing needs of

- homeless single people and families – to include the permanent discharge of homelessness responsibilities
- keyworkers
- the residual number of asylum seekers (other than unaccompanied children) who are the responsibility of the Council.

This report will also deal with management and procurement of the PSL properties, which is likely to involve one of the Council's RSL partners.

#### **Background papers used in the preparation of this report:**

- Executive report 12 August 2003 – Homelessness Strategy (Minute 74)
- Executive report 26 November 2002 - Private Sector Leasing Scheme - Homelessness Accommodation (Minute 231)
- Letter from Lord Rooker to Chief Executive 25 February 2004.



Office of the  
Deputy Prime Minister

Creating sustainable communities

**Jeff Rooker**  
**Minister for Regeneration and**  
**Regional Development**

Mr G Farrant  
Chief Executive  
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham

OFFICE OF THE  
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER

26 Whitehall  
London SW1A 2WH

Tel: 020 7944 3012  
Fax: 020 7944 4489  
E-Mail: [jeff.rooker@odpm.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:jeff.rooker@odpm.gsi.gov.uk)

Web site: [www.odpm.gov.uk](http://www.odpm.gov.uk)

25 February 2004

#### **Homelessness - B&B reduction target**

In March 2002, the Government set a challenging target for all local housing authorities to end the use of B&B hotels for longer than six weeks for homeless families with children by March 2004. The target was set in recognition of the damaging impact on children forced to spend long periods in B&B hotels, and was widely welcomed and supported. It was backed up by: improvements to Housing Benefit subsidies; specific funding from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister to support homelessness prevention and B&B reduction action plans; and a structured series of seminars and master-classes organised by the ODPM Homelessness & Housing Support Directorate, Beacon Authorities and our team of specialist practitioners.

Your authority is one of many reporting the end of long-term use of B&B for families with children well ahead of the target date. I wish to commend you for both your work and evident achievement in reducing the use of this least acceptable (and most expensive) form of temporary accommodation. I congratulate you on your successful use of both central and local funding for such a positive outcome and importantly encourage you to secure the ongoing sustainment of this achievement.

I wrote to all housing authorities in November about the Government's intention to make an Order (under s.210 of the 1996 Housing Act) to give the target a firm statutory basis. Following consultation, that Order was laid in December and copies were sent to all housing authorities together with associated statutory guidance to which they must have regard in law. The Order will come into force on 1 April 2004.

It will underpin the excellent achievements of most housing authorities who like your own, have put themselves on track to sustain success beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004.

The fact that you are already ahead of the field in this respect, seems to me, to give you a special opportunity to develop your homelessness strategy and areas of excellence in: homelessness prevention; ending the cycle of repeat homelessness; and extending the housing options open to all who live in your authority's area. Now you are no longer using the most expensive housing option, you also have an opportunity to develop "Spend to Save" programmes which will simultaneously reduce the burden on your General Fund and sustain proactive work at the front line.

My Homelessness and Housing Support Directorate and the Government Regional Office look forward to hearing of your achievements in implementing your homelessness strategy.

**JEFF ROOKER**

This page is intentionally left blank



**THE EXECUTIVE****11 MAY 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF HOUSING AND HEALTH**

<b>TRANSFER OF LAND</b>	<b>FOR DECISION</b>	
<p><i>This report seeks a decision from Members to confirm a previous decision made by Members of a Visiting Housing (Estates and Management) Sub Committee on 2 March 2000.</i></p>		
<p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>This report requests Members to consider a decision made by a Visiting Housing (Estates and Management) Sub Committee to transfer a small strip of land adjacent to 310 Dagenham Road to the owner occupier at no cost, other than the Councils legal fees.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>The Executive is asked to agree to the decision made by the Visiting Sub Committee of 2 March 2000, to transfer the land at charge other than the Council's legal costs, but with the full restrictive covenants preventing the land to be used for extending 310 Dagenham Road or any development on the land.</p> <p><b><u>Reason</u></b></p> <p>The present owner of this property was told when she purchased the house that Members had made a decision to transfer an adjoining strip of land to the previous owner and this decision would also be available to her in order to deal with the nuisance caused by youths congregating in the adjacent alleyway.</p>		
<p><b>Contact:</b> Jim Ripley</p>	<p>Head of Landlord Services</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 3738            Fax: 020 8227 5705            Minicom: 020 8227 5755            E-mail: <a href="mailto:jim.ripley@lbbd.gov.uk">jim.ripley@lbbd.gov.uk</a></p>

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 310 Dagenham Road is situated adjacent to an alleyway which leads into Thorntons Farm Avenue. Over the last few years the alleyway has been a gathering place for youths some of which attend Barking College and cause a nuisance during the lunch period. The property and alleyway are shown in appendix 1. In January 2000 complaints were received from the owner of the property and from a number of residents of the blocks of flats in Dagenham Road about the nuisance, which at the time, was attributed to groups of youths using the covered entrances to the blocks as a shelter during the lunch time. The owner of 310 also complained that the youths were throwing rubbish into his garden and causing a nuisance by standing on the low wall in the alleyway enabling them to look over the fence into his garden.

- 1.2 As a result of the complaints which were made to the Ward Councillors, Members of the Visiting Housing (Estates and Management) Sub Committee held a series of meetings with Ted Parker the Principal of the College in order to find a joint solution to the problem.
- 1.3 The discussions with the Principal resulted in the College jointly funding together with the Housing and Health Department, a security system to two of the blocks of flats which enabled the doors to automatically lock during the lunch hour period and evenings excluding all unwanted visitors.
- 1.4 At the same time Members of the Visiting Sub Committee agreed to transfer a small strip of land between the alleyway and the boundary fence of 310 Dagenham Road to the owner at no charge. It was also agreed that the Council would arrange for a fence to be provided on the low wall in the alleyway to stop youths using the wall as a seating area and to stop them causing a nuisance to the owner by looking over his fence.
- 1.5 It was agreed that Officers from Housing and Health would make the necessary arrangements for the fence to be provided and the land to be transferred.
- 1.6 A Committee clerk was present at the meeting and noted this decision.

## **2. Conclusions**

- 2.1 The owner of the property subsequently became ill and did not want the upheaval of making alterations to his boundary fence so the proposed work was put on hold. The owner subsequently died and the heirs to his estate approached the Council explaining that they intended to sell the house and as the original problem of nuisance was still evident it had been difficult to attract a suitable purchaser. They asked if it would be possible for the original decision to be offered to any intending purchaser. The original Members of the Visiting Sub Committee were consulted and they agreed to this request.
- 2.2 The house was sold and the new owner has requested that the work be carried out to provide the fence and transfer the land.
- 2.3 The fencing work, which has been financed by the Housing and Health Department has now been completed to a very satisfactory standard and has eliminated the problem of youths using the low wall as a seating area.
- 2.4 It is planned to provide a similar fence along the boundary of the Council owned property at 312 Dagenham Road which hopefully will completely eliminate the nuisance problems making the alleyway secure and a totally unattractive place to gather.
- 2.5 Legal Services have advised that they cannot transfer the strip of land as it appears that the decision made by the Visiting Sub Committee was never submitted to the Housing Committee for confirmation.
- 2.6 The present owner of 310 Dagenham Road has been advised of this error and it has also been explained that the current policy requires all land disposals to be made on the basis of the current valuation. In this case the land is valued at £4,000

if subject to full restrictive covenants preventing extension of the property or development on the strip of land. Without such restrictive covenant the value of the land could be closer to £20,000 - £30,000. The Owner says she cannot afford to purchase the land even at the lower cost. If the Council retain the strip of land there will be ongoing maintenance costs and whilst it is felt that the agreement is not legally enforceable the Owner could make a complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman.

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank