

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Notice of Meeting

THE EXECUTIVE

Tuesday, 21 September 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 H J Collins, Councillor S Kallar, Councillor M A McCarthy, Councillor M E McKenzie, Councillor L A Smith and Councillor T G W Wade

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

10.9.04

Graham Farrant
Chief Executive

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

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2004 (to follow)**
3. **Thames Gateway Bridge - Consultation (Pages 1 - 9)**
4. **Parks and Green Spaces Strategy Funding Programme 2004 / 2005 (Pages 11 - 17)**
5. **Planning Delivery Grant 2004 / 2005 (Pages 19 - 24)**
6. **Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent**
7. **To consider whether it would be appropriate to pass a resolution to exclude the public and press from the remainder of the meeting due to the nature of the business to be transacted.**

Private Business

The public and press have a legal right to attend Council meetings such as the Executive, except where business is confidential or certain other sensitive information is to be discussed. There are no such items at the time of preparing this agenda.

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

THE EXECUTIVE**21 SEPTEMBER 2004****REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT**

THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE (TGB) CONSULTATION	FOR DECISION
<p><i>This report has come to the Executive because the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham is a statutory consultee to the planning application for the construction of the Thames Gateway Bridge. As statutory consultee we are commenting on the likely impacts of the bridge and road network.</i></p> <p>Summary</p> <p>This report seeks the Council's agreement in principle to support the Thames Gateway Bridge (TGB), subject to certain caveats in respect of the public transport strategy/provision associated with the bridge; the tolls regime to be applied; traffic mitigation measures; and design quality of the bridge.</p> <p>The report and recommendations are to be forwarded by 30 September 2004 to the London Boroughs of Greenwich and Newham as the Council's formal response to consultation, on the application for planning permission for TGB to be determined by them; and to the Secretary of State for Transport in respect of a number of draft Authorisations/Orders that would also be required for the construction and operation of the bridge.</p> <p>Wards Affected – All Wards</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The Executive is recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the principle of TGB and recommend to London Borough's of Greenwich and Newham that planning permission be granted subject to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) That a commitment to a minimum transit service (East London Transit/Greenwich Waterfront Transit) of 20 bendy-buses per hour in each direction be secured through a s106 agreement on any planning consent; b) That the whole concept of Thames Gateway Transit be reappraised at the earliest opportunity by Transport for London (TfL), specifically in respect of the potential for tram operation and that a commitment to do so be secured through a s106 agreement; c) That such a reappraisal be reviewed every five years and a commitment to do so be secured through a s106 agreement; 	

- d) That the administration, setting and review of tolls is undertaken with input from local Boroughs (Greenwich/Bexley/Newham/Barking and Dagenham) and arrangements to secure this are to be determined and agreed and that a commitment to this be secured through a s106 agreement;
 - e) That the area for discounts on tolls should comprise the whole administrative area of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham;
 - f) That local traffic mitigation measures as described in this report be secured through a s106 agreement;
 - g) That any subsequent planning applications in respect of design should demonstrably seek to achieve the highest possible quality;
2. The following in respect of the draft Authorisation/Orders and that these recommendations be referred to the Secretary of State for Transport as formal comment on the authorisation/orders:
- a) That no objection be raised in respect of the Tolls Order;
 - b) That the Side Roads Order and any subsequent Traffic Regulation Order should restrict use of the public transport lanes to TfL authorised buses/transits only;
 - c) That no objection be raised in respect of the Special Roads and Bridge Scheme 2004 application/authorisation.

Reason

Support of the Thames Gateway Bridge will contribute to the delivery of the Borough Community Priorities particularly, Regenerating the Local Economy and Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener and Safer.

Contacts		
Peter Wright	Head of Planning and Transportation	Tel:020 8227 3900 Fax: 020 8227 3896 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 E-mail: peter.wright@lbbd.gov.uk
David Higham	Group Manager, Strategic Transportation	Tel: 020 8227 3817 Fax: 020 8227 3896 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 E-mail: david.higham@lbbd.gov.uk

1. Background

- 1.1 Thames Gateway Bridge (TGB) is a proposed new crossing of the River. It will run from the A13/A406 junction at Beckton, south east wards over the River to the A2016/Central Way at Thamesmead in the London Borough Greenwich. It will comprise of four lanes in total for general traffic and two other segregated lanes for public transport. There will also be a pedestrian footway and a cycleway.
- 1.2 The bridge is to serve a number of needs:
 - to make up for the dearth of river crossings in the eastern part of London,
 - to give new orbital private and public transport opportunities,
 - to support the regeneration of Thames Gateway.
- 1.3 The transport and regeneration case for the bridge is supported by a full analysis which was submitted with the planning application. They demonstrate how central the project is to support the regeneration of the Thames Gateway. On this basis Councillors are invited at the outset to give their full support, in principle for the project.
- 1.4 Powers to construct and operate the bridge will comprise a combination of planning consent(s) and the granting of a number of Authorisation/Orders.
- 1.5 London Borough of Barking and Dagenham is a statutory consultee in respect of an application for planning permission currently lodged with London Borough's Greenwich and Newham as the statutory planning authorities. A response to consultation on the planning application is required by 30 September 2004 and is the subject of this report.
- 1.6 Concurrent with the submission of the planning application(s) Transport for London (TfL) has also published for consultation a number of draft Authorisation/Orders. These are also required (along with any planning consent) to give certain powers as to the construction and operation of the bridge. These are also the subject of this report. Comment on these is also required by 30 September 2004 to the Secretary of State for Transport
- 1.7 Matters in relation to the planning application are now considered first.

The Planning Application(s)

2. Key Issues – Public Transport.

- 2.1 The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the bridge considers amongst other matters the likely effects of traffic on the surrounding area that would be associated with the construction and operation of the bridge. These traffic forecasts are based on standard methodologies but are also contingent on the following assumptions:
 - the operation of public transport over the bridge
 - the operation of tolls

- 2.2 The assumed public transport provision over the bridge is to join up the East London Transit and Greenwich Waterfront Transit with a service of 20 bendy-buses per hour in each direction, connecting Barking with Abbeywood and Woolwich. This is a level of service TfL considers to be appropriate to meet anticipated demand for public transport. It also reflects the service level described in the report to the TfL Board in March 2004 where further progress and development of the TGB scheme was agreed.
- 2.3 This public transport provision is to be welcomed. It will meet a need; give new travel opportunities; and serve existing and new communities. It will help support the regeneration of the Gateway in a sustainable way.
- 2.4 However, it is important to understand that the granting of any planning permission will not of itself secure these services. That consent will apply only to the development itself - namely the bridge structure. Thus to ensure the delivery of this public transport network it is recommended that agreement to do so is secured from TfL by means of a s106 agreement between TfL and the determining planning authorities i.e. London Borough's Greenwich and Newham.
- 2.5 There is also an important legal issue here that would be covered by such an agreement. The scenario is as follows, London Borough's Greenwich and Newham may be minded to grant planning consent on the basis of an assumed public transport provision as contained in the EIA. If they did, to the extent that there is no guarantee around this public transport provision and it does not form part of the application as such, then the Boroughs may risk leaving themselves open to a challenge in the High Court on the ground of 'misdirection' – namely, that a consent was granted on the basis of a consideration that in fact had no status.
- 2.6 If this were to occur than the whole TGB project could be put in serious jeopardy. Accordingly, to secure the public transport provision through an s106 would not only represent sound transport planning but also underpin any recommendation of consent justified on the basis of public transport associated with the bridge.
- 2.7 Whilst the provision of public transport services as described above is welcomed nevertheless, this could be regarded as a base line minimum. Not least the two transit networks (East London Transit and Greenwich Waterfront Transit) involved have never been evaluated as a single joined up network (proposed name, Thames Gateway Transit). Their individual evaluations also pre date the scale of development and growth now envisaged for this part of London.
- 2.8 Thus in response to consultation on the planning application(s) for TGB it is also recommended that the transit networks should be the subject of a full reappraisal undertaken by TfL. This should be on the basis of a single unified transit network (TGT), set in the context of more up to date planning/population/development assumptions. This should be done at the earliest opportunity, not least to inform future decisions and progress on the existing transit schemes.

2.9 This reappraisal should also revisit the issue of tram technology bearing in mind that the bridge design is such as to allow for any eventual upgrade of bus based services to tram. This would at least give certainty of commitment; such a reappraisal should also be secured as part of any s106 agreement. It would also seem prudent that agreement is secured from TfL that any such reappraisal is regularly reviewed at (for instance) five yearly intervals. This would enable the public transport provision associated with the bridge to be continually 'refreshed' as development and transport needs and aspirations in this part of Thames Gateway change.

3. Key Issues – Tolls

3.1 Tolls are to be levied on cars and goods vehicles that use the bridge:

- to provide a revenue stream to help service the capital required to build the bridge
- to deter use of the bridge by long distance traffic and so mitigate the possibility of adverse traffic impacts

3.2 The EIA demonstrates that tolls can play a major part to ensure the bridge serves intrinsically a local need and local traffic.

3.3 However, there is inevitably a tension between the role of tolls as revenue generator (where traffic maximisation would be the goal) and tolls as a suppressor of excessive traffic levels that may otherwise adversely impact on the local environment. Thus the question of who sets and reviews tolls levels and to what ends is a key matter.

3.4 The bridge is to be built as a joint venture with the private sector. In all likelihood the mechanism would be the granting of a concession to a company or consortium which would build the bridge financed partly, through private capital and then operates the bridge over an agreed period (for instance, 30 years) raising revenue through tolls to both service that capital and give a return on the investment. After the concession period the bridge ownership and operation would wholly revert to the public sector.

3.5 If tolls policy were left solely to the concessionaire then revenue maximisation may become the overriding objective to the detriment of the role of tolls as a mechanism for traffic mitigation.

3.6 Accordingly the principle should be established that the operation and review of any tolls regime should have public sector input to ensure public sector goals are not compromised. This should include local boroughs whose area would be most affected by traffic associated with the bridge.

3.7 It would seem neither appropriate nor feasible at this stage to be specific as to what such an arrangement would comprise. Instead it is suggested that a s106 agreement should be drafted along these lines and which would only be discharged once the parties to it are satisfied that the public sector interest has been safeguarded in respect of any contractual arrangement with the concessionaire.

- 3.8 Tolls are also intended to be applied with a discount for local residents and businesses. This is to deter long distance traffic and reflects the local nature of the crossing. In considering the area to which discounts would apply, TfL has suggested one system that corresponds to geographic and catchment's (as determined by traffic modelling) boundaries. This would mean that the very northern part of the Borough would be excluded from discounted toll rates.
- 3.9 Whilst there may be some technical merit in this approach it is not recommended. Instead, Councillors are advised to agree that toll discount boundaries should apply to borough administrative areas as this would be more readily understood by local residents and businesses and more equitable.

4. Key Issues – Traffic Mitigation

- 4.1 The possible impact of traffic on the surrounding area has been assessed using standard modelling techniques.
- 4.2 The results indicate that for the Borough, traffic (and associated) impacts are likely to be minimal and dispersed, except for increases on the A13 and A406 corridors. Specifically TfL has identified the need to undertake mitigation works on the A406/A124 Barking Road junction (signalisation and slip road widening) and to undertake monitoring of traffic impacts in the Movers Lane/Gascoigne Road area with necessary works to follow if any problem from traffic associated with the bridge becomes apparent.
- 4.3 This approach of advance works and monitoring of any actual impacts is considered a robust and sensible way forward. However, the commitment to advance works and monitoring/later necessary works and associated funding, needs to be guaranteed through an s106 agreement on any planning consent. Councillors are recommended to endorse accordingly.

5. Key Issues – Design

- 5.1 This bridge will be a major structure at a key gateway point to London. As such it will have iconic status and the design quality should be of the highest order to reflect that. However, the need to give sufficient clearance for shipping to pass safely below and aircraft above means that the design options are severely constrained.
- 5.2 Despite this being the case, the principle should be established at the outset that design quality should be of the highest possible order. Accordingly, any later planning applications in respect of reserved/design matters should seek the highest quality.
- 5.3 Issues considered so far in this report relate to the application for planning permission. Matters relating to the draft Authorisation/Orders are now considered.

The Draft Authorisation/Orders.

6. The A2012 GLA Road (Thames Gateway Bridge) Toll Order 2004

- 6.1 The main purpose of this Order is to set the upper threshold of charges below which actual charge and discounted rates can be established. It is silent on the issue of tolls setting and review mechanisms and the involvement of local Boroughs in such arrangements.
- 6.2 Accordingly this underlines the importance of such mechanisms being secured through an s106 agreement on any planning consent that is granted (see above).
- 6.3 Tolls would apply only to traffic on the all purpose carriageways and so public transport in the 'transit-way' would be exempt.
- 6.4 It is recommended that no objection be raised in respect of the Tolls Order. The threshold for charges is sufficiently high to allow for discounts for local users of the bridge and public transport is exempt. The issue of mechanisms for management and review is already covered in the context of comments on the planning application(s).

7. The A2012 GLA (Thames Gateway Bridge) (Side Roads) Order 2004

- 7.1 The purpose of this Order is to authorise TfL to improve/'stop up'/construct highways and provide new means of access to premises. Specifically it relates to the construction of pedestrian/cycle-ways; the segregated public transport lanes; and slip/access roads to the bridge and its approaches. The intention is also to regulate the classes of vehicle that are allowed to use the reserved public transport lanes/transit-way. This would allow use by public transport vehicles and taxis and a Traffic Regulation Order would be made to restrict the use of this highway.
- 7.2 This would permit TfL buses and the transit vehicles (Greenwich Waterfront Transit/East London Transit) use of these lanes.
- 7.3 As currently drafted, use by taxis and other 'public transport vehicles' (commuter coaches etc?) may also be allowed. It is recommended that these classes of vehicle are not appropriate to use the transit-way as they could impede the reliable operation of TfL buses and transits. In this context reliability of public transport operation is a key element in the attractiveness of public transport and the encouragement of people not to use their car. The use of these lanes by other non TfL vehicles may also militate against the eventual upgrade of the transit system to tram operation. Accordingly, it is recommended that a more restrictive use of these lanes should apply as described in the next paragraph.
- 7.4 There is a precedent to a more restrictive approach to the use of the transit-way such as being recommended here. The transit-way on the Greenwich Peninsula is entirely segregated from other all purpose carriageways adjacent, and all entry points to it are controlled by 'no entry' signs with the plate, 'Except TfL Authorised Buses'. Experience suggests this control has been effective in ensuring use of the road is confined to buses only and has promoted their speedy and reliable operation.

8. The A2012 GLA (Thames Gateway Bridge) Special Roads and Bridge Scheme 2004

- 8.1 Essentially this is an application for authorisation to build the bridge and four all purpose traffic lanes to and over the bridge.
- 8.2 This would also prevent use of the bridge by some types of vehicle e.g. those drawn by an animal. This is understandable on grounds of road safety (e.g. no horse riding). Otherwise, it is clear that in effect the bridge would operate as a local, all purpose road operating at 40mph and most certainly could not be described as a motorway.
- 8.3 In this context it is recommended to raise no objection.

9. Key Conclusions.

- 9.1 The TGB project represents a major opportunity to address the barrier effect of the river, give new transport opportunities and support the regeneration of Thames Gateway – not least through improved access to main town centres and redevelopment areas. As such, full in principle support is recommended.
- 9.2 However, there is concern that TfL remains under aspiration in respect of the opportunities for improved public transport the bridge could give – specifically the development of a sub regional tram network (Thames Gateway Transit). At the very least, this concept should be fully reappraised in the light of the new trips and connections made possible by TGB; and new development and regeneration assumptions.
- 9.3 The issue of tolls is also a key consideration in moving this project forward. Their operation is as much about traffic mitigation and management, than just revenue raising. As such, management and review mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure public sector goals are fully reflected in the setting and operation of tolls.
- 9.4 These and other concerns can be effectively taken forward through s106 agreements binding on any planning consent.
- 9.5 Powers for the construction and operation of the bridge are also to be sought through certain Authorisations/Orders. The main issue here is that the operation of the public transport lanes (transit-ways) should not be compromised by use by other traffic. This type of restriction will also safeguard the possible upgrade of the lanes to tram operation.

10. Financial Considerations.

- 10.1. In January 2004 the Government pledged £200m in Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credit for the scheme. Its construction is likely to be funded through some form of concession arrangement whereby private sector capital borrowing will be serviced through toll revenue.
- 10.2 Capital is also reserved and committed by TfL to pay for traffic mitigation measures.

10.3 There should be no direct financial consequences for the Council arising from this project.

11. Consultation

Portfolio Holders:

Councillor Kallar, Lead Member for Regeneration

Councillor McKenzie, Lead Member for Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener and Safer

Internal

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

David Wilson, Transport Consultant

Mike Livesey, Group Manager

Bob Cooper, Interim Head of Finance

External:

Thames Gateway London Partnership. (TGLP)

In view of the strategic nature of the Thames Gateway Bridge project, it is recommended this report be referred to the TGLP Lead Member for Transport and the Chief Executive of the TGLP for information.

Background Papers:

- Application for Planning Permission and all supporting documents.
- The A2012 GLA Road (Thames Gateway Bridge) Toll Order 2004.
- The A2012 GLA Road (Thames Gateway Bridge) (Side Roads) Order 2004.
- The A2012 GLA Road (Thames Gateway Bridge) Special Roads and Bridge Scheme.

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE**21 SEPTEMBER 2004****REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF REGNERATION AND ENVIRONMENT**

PARKS AND GREEN SPACES STRATEGY: FUNDING PROGRAMME 2004 / 2005	FOR DECISION
<p><i>This report concerns the approval of revisions to the capital expenditure programme for the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy for 2004 / 2005, for approval by the Executive.</i></p>	
<p>Summary</p>	
<p>The Executive is being asked to approve the bringing forward of capital funding from the 2005/06 budget into the 2004/05 budget, to meet new staffing costs for the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy programme management and for the project management of the three Transforming Your Space projects. Approval from the Executive is also being sought for bringing forward capital funding from 2005/06 to 2004/05 to cover the costs of commissioning consultants to produce park master-plans for Old Dagenham Park and Valence Park and meet match funding costs for the Project Planning Grant for Barking Park. In addition to this the Executive is being asked to approve the drawing down of a portion of the Big Lottery Fund grant to support the feasibility and consultation stages of the Transforming Your Space projects.</p>	
<p>Wards Affected – All Wards</p>	
<p>Recommendations</p>	
<p>The Executive is recommended to approve a re-profiling of the Capital Programme of £158,000 from 2005 / 2006 to 2004 / 2005, made up as follows (NB: All future expenditure will be subject to full Capital Programme Management Office approval, see item 6):</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Parks and Green Spaces Strategy Programme Management 2004 / 2005 costs (costs to support the recently appointed Park Development Manager post at £54,000). (ii) Project Management 2004 / 2005 costs of the Transforming Your Space (TYS) projects, through the appointment of a dedicated TYS Park Development Officer (currently an Agency post) at £45,000. (iii) Costs to support the procurement of Park Master-plans for Valence and Old Dagenham Parks: £40,000 and £5,000 respectively, match funding for Barking Park Project Planning Grant. (iv) Big Lottery Grant draw-down for the 2004 / 2005 feasibility and consultation phases of the TYS projects (i.e.: Old Dagenham Park, Parsloes Park, and Padnall Green) at £51,000 and for inclusion onto the existing Capital Expenditure Programme. 	
<p>Reason</p>	
<p>Approval of the revisions to the 2004 / 2005 capital expenditure programme of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy will support delivery of the Borough Community Priorities particularly, Making Barking and Dagenham a Cleaner, Greener and Safer.</p>	

Contact: Allan Aubrey	Head of Leisure and Community Services Leisure and Community Services Division.	Tel: 020 8227 3576 Fax: 020 8227 3129 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 E-mail: allan.aubrey@lbbd.gov.uk
David Theakston	Park Development Manager Leisure Community Services Division	Tel: 020 8227 3081 Fax: 020 8227 3129 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 E-mail: david.theakston@lbbd.gov.uk

1. Background

- 1.1 The Parks and Green Spaces Strategy is the adopted twenty-year vision for a renaissance of the Borough's parks and green spaces and will necessarily involve significant capital and maintenance expenditure to ensure the viability and sustainability of the implementation and future upkeep of the programme into perpetuity.
- 1.2 The Parks and Green Spaces Strategy was adopted by the Executive in October 2003. Capital expenditure for 2004/2005 of the Strategy was based on robust calculations; however, more definitive costs have subsequently been established through procurement and delivery processes, resulting in the need to re-profile the 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 budget allocations.
- 1.3 The Executive is being asked to approve a re-profiling of the 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 budget allocations to allow crucial work to go ahead during 2004/2005. This work is split into staffing costs, feasibility works and park master-plans. Staffing costs relate to the programme management of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy and project management of the Transforming Your Space projects. Feasibility work and park master-plans will produce essential costs, consultation, design and management information necessary for the planning and delivery of the 2005/2006 Capital works phases. This re-profiling will not have an effect on the overall £5 million Council Capital funding secured for the Strategy. The re-profiling will also provide the necessary assets required to attract significant external funding opportunities.

2. Parks and Green Spaces Strategy Programme Management: Park Development Manager

- 2.1 The Executive granted approval in principle for the creation of the Park Development Manager post in May 2003 (Executive Minute 27-05-03). Since then Capital Programme Management Office approval has been secured (17-07-03) and The Management Team (TMT) approval (23-09-03) for the creation of the post and the Park Development Manager was appointed in May 2004. The Park Development Manager is responsible for:
 - a. Project management, co-ordination and programming of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy
 - b. Lead officer for all stages of the Strategy, including appointment of consultants, commissioning design briefs, tendering, consultation and implementation.
 - c. Securing external funding for delivery of the Strategy, maximising the Council's Capital investment.

2.2 Costs for the Park Development Manager post are to be met from the Capital Block allocation for the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy 2004 – 2007. From 2007 onwards the post will be funded from revenue budgets.

3. Transforming Your Space Project Management: Park Development Officer

3.1 The Fair Share Transforming Your Space (TYS) programme is an initiative by the New Opportunities Fund (now Big Lottery Fund) targeting local authorities that struggle to access lottery funding in areas of social disadvantage. The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham have secured £400,000 of funding (which will be matched by £325,000 Parks and Green Spaces Block Allocation 2005/2006) for projects in:

- Parsloes Park – establishment of a youth facility.
- Padnall Green – community engagement and biodiversity improvement.
- Old Dagenham Park – renovation of pavilion, arena and ornamental gardens and installation of a BMX track.

3.2 The two-year YYS initiative started in February 2004 with survey work, public engagement and consultation with local people (which commenced in May 2004). Results of this initial feasibility work (which will become available in August) will inform the design stage to be carried out between September and December 2004 for public comment. Big Lottery Fund and Capital Asset Management approvals will be sought in December 2004. Implementation on the ground will take place in 2005/2006. The feasibility phases of the Parsloes Park and Padnall Green projects are being delivered in Partnership with Groundwork East London.

3.3 The Park Development Officer will be responsible for project management and co-ordination of the Transforming Your Space Programme from inception to completion. Principle work duties will include the implementation of project phases, monitoring work programmes of consultants and contractors and budgetary control.

3.4 Since March 2004 (Year 1 of the Transforming Your Space Programme) an agency member of staff has been employed to undertake the Park Development Officer duties. It is proposed to create a two-year fixed term contract post to be funded through the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy allocation. A job description has been produced and the post has been evaluated at SO2 grade.

3.5 The Executive is being asked to approve the formalisation of the post as a two-year fixed term contract, through the appointment of a dedicated YYS Park Development Officer.

4. Park Master-plans

4.1 Park master-plans and management plans will be the crucial vehicles for the successful delivery of sustainable park improvements within the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy, setting the framework for securing external and internal funding.

4.2 Certain park projects have been identified as requiring the commissioning of external consultants due to their specialist expertise in, for example, Heritage Park schemes.

- 4.3 **Valence Park**, due to its importance as a Heritage Park is being offered to tender to specialist external consultants. Costs for the procurement of Valence Park master-plans and management plans are estimated (subject to the tender process) to be in the region of £20,000.
- 4.4 The remaining projects will be delivered through in-house expertise (i.e. the Landscape Architects within the Civil Engineering Group). Old Dagenham Park has been identified for in-house delivery as it is a non-Heritage Park. Costs for procurement of master-plan and management plan production are also estimated to be in the region of £20,000.
- 4.5 The park master-plans and management plans will provide the Council with invaluable assets detailing the necessary cost information required to further develop and deliver the capital elements of the Valence Park and Old Dagenham Park projects from 2005/2006 onwards.
- 4.6 Capital funding of £5,000 is also required to meet the match funding requirements for the Heritage Lottery Fund Project Planning Grant that has been secured for Barking Park. Consultants have been appointed and a master-plan is in the process of being produced.

5. **Big Lottery Fund**

- 5.1 The Executive is being asked to approve the drawing down of a proportion of the Big Lottery Grant to support the 2004/2005 feasibility and community consultation stages of the Transforming Your Spaces projects. There is no Council capital match funding for this stage of the Transforming Your Space Programme.
- 5.2 From the Big Lottery Grant, £51,000 of the £400,000 is to be spent this year. A proportion of this money will be spent on Groundwork East London for consultation and feasibility work.

TYS Project	£
Old Dagenham Park	£10,000
Parsloes Park	£23,000
Padnall Green	£18,000
Total	£51,000

6. **Capital Programme Management Office Approvals**

- 6.1 Projects can only start once they have been approved by the Capital Management Programme Office (CPMO).
- 6.2 The Park Development Manager post was approved in principle by the Executive in May 2003. It received full CPMO approval in July 2003 and TMT approval in September 2003.
- 6.3 Park Master-plans and match funding for the Project Planning Grant for Barking Park has full CPMO approval (July 2003).
- 6.4 The Big Lottery Fund has 'in principle' CPMO approval (May 04) as it relates to feasibility works and will have no impact on Council Capital.

6.5 The Transforming Your Space Park Development Officer post will be submitted for CPMO appraisal following Executive approval.

7. Financial Implications

7.1 A summary of the Capital financial implications is shown below in Table 1.

Year	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	Total
Current Capital Programme Profile ¹	£0	£995,000	£3,000,000	£1,000,000	£4,995,000
Revised Capital Programme Profile ²	£158,000	£837,000	£2,975,000	£1,000,000	£4,970,000
Big Lottery Grant ³	£51,000	£349,000	£0	£0	£400,000

NB: All costs have been rounded to the nearest thousand.

7.2 Table 2 provides a breakdown of the Capital funding by activity:

	Purpose	Finances Required 04/05
1	Parks and Green Spaces Programme Management	£54,000
2	Transforming Your Space Project Management	£45,000 ⁴
3	Park Master-plans (Valence Park and Old Dagenham Park)	£40,000
4.	Barking Park Project Planning Grant Match Funding	£5,000
	Sub-total	£144,000
	Contingency at 10%	£14,000
	Total Council Capital Required	£158,000
	Big Lottery Fund – Feasibility funding	£51,000

7.3 The 10% contingency is a prudent programme management safety net to protect against unforeseen costs, varied or unplanned works, tenders coming in above cost estimates etc.

¹ Funded by Council Capital Receipts £4.97m and external funding of £25,000.

² Funded by Council Capital Receipts.

³ Funded by the Big Lottery Fund.

⁴ This is made up of £32,300 for 8 months agency costs including transfer fee, plus £12,400 for 4 months salary.

- 7.4 Securing Big Lottery Funding will result in this being added as a new project to the Capital Programme. Executive approval is therefore also sought for this.
- 7.5 The costs identified in Table 2 meet the definition criteria for charging as Capital Expenditure. This follows Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) guidelines which permits costs such as staffing and feasibility work to be capitalised on the basis that:
- 1). They relate directly to the delivery and installation of an asset which would otherwise have only been avoided if the asset had not been constructed, e.g. project management costs.
 - 2). They relate to a start-up or commissioning period for the asset. In this case both the Park Development Manager and the Park Development Officer posts meet the criteria and the Park Master-plans feasibility work will result in, invaluable assets for the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy.
- 7.6 Approval of the drawing down of a portion of the Big Lottery Fund money relates only to feasibility works and will have no Capital financial risks or implications for the Council.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 The **£158,000** requested of the Executive in this report is required to allow:
- Important activities to be realised within the early stages of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy.
 - The laying down of key foundations for the success of future years of the Strategy
 - The framework to be set in place for securing significant external funding in future years of the Strategy.
- 8.2 This report represents a request for a re-profiling of funds and will have no impact on the Council's funding position.

9. Consultation

- 9.1 The following Officers have been consulted on this report:

Lead Members:

Councillor M McKenzie, Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener, Safer
Councillor T. Wade, Raising General Pride in the Borough (Public Facilities)

Regeneration and Environment:

Ken Baikie, Group Manager
Tony Grant, Interim Management Accountant
Bob Cooper Interim Head of Finance
Maureen Perkins, Head of Human Resources
Jeremy Grint, Head of Regeneration Implementation

Finance:

Lee Russell, Head of Central Finance

Background Papers

- Executive Minute 12 – 27 May 2003 Parks and Green Spaces Strategy
- Executive Minute 189 – 11 November 2003 Barking Park - Heritage Lottery Fund Project Planning Grant

(N.B. Copies of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy have been deposited in the Members Rooms at the Town Hall, Barking and the Civic Centre, Dagenham).

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE**21 SEPTEMBER 2004****REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT**

PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT 2004 / 2005	FOR DECISION	
<p><i>This report concerns expenditure of £200,000 which is not in the current budget. The decision is therefore reserved to the Executive.</i></p> <p>Summary</p> <p>This report summarises proposals and seeks approval to spend the 2004/05 allocation of Planning Delivery Grant of £451,646.</p> <p>Ward Affected: All Wards.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The Executive is recommended to agree the spend of the Planning Delivery Grant for 2004/05, to be spent in the financial years 2004/05 and 2005/06, on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £151,000 - Interim funding to Planning and Regeneration reorganisation £ 35,000 - Heritage and Conservation Officer (recurring cost) £ 50,000 - Transport Strategy £ 40,000 - E-planning (50% recurring) £ 30,000 - Systems Audit £ 40,000 - Urban Design Programme £ 30,000 - Training and Development £ 10,000 - RTPI accredited post entry training £ 65,000 - Corporate Environmental Stewardship Programme <p>Reason</p> <p>To assist in achieving the Community Priorities of <i>"Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener and Safer"</i>, <i>"Raising General Pride in the Borough"</i>, and <i>"Regenerating the Local Economy"</i>.</p>		
<p>Contact Peter Wright</p>	<p>Head of Planning and Transportation</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 3900 Fax: 020 8227 3896 Minicom: 020 8227 3034 E-mail: peter.wright@lbbd.gov.uk</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) was introduced by the Government in 2003/4 as a means of providing incentives to local Planning Authorities to improve performance in their Planning Departments. Initially, the grant was intended to run for three years. The 2004 Spending Review has extended this for a further three years. Achievement of the Grant is based on a number of factors but it is primarily targeted at improvement in Development Control performance. In 2003/4, the Council received £151,000. All of this allocation went in to supporting the Planning and Regeneration review.
- 1.2 2004/5 has seen a substantial increase in the allocation of PDG to £451,000. The basis for the 2004/05 award is the Borough's location within a designated growth area, its population, the existence of a current Development Plan and for improved performance in the handling of major planning applications.
- 1.3 The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) has confirmed that it will be possible to carry unspent PDG over into future years and will be issuing further guidance in the future.

2. Performance Improvements to Date

- 2.1 The first round of PDG was used to fund, on an interim basis, service expansion in the Planning and Transportation Division as part of the Department's medium-term financial strategy. The immediate benefits have seen the filling of 10 of the Division's vacancies, including a new Group Manager for Urban Design and a Transportation Group Manger. Investment in the Development Control Service and the implementation of the Development Control Improvement Plan has seen a dramatic improvement in performance under Best Value Performance Indicators, particularly the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) critical BV109. Performance has improved between Q1 2003 and Q1 2004 by the following:

BV	Q1/03	Q1/04	Improvement
109a	54.55%	78.00%	23.45%
109b	25.00%	80.70%	55.70%
109c	54.70%	98.00%	43.30%

3. Proposals for Spend in 2004/5

- 3.1 It is proposed to spend this year's grant allocation in rolling out the service restructure resulting from the reorganisation of the Planning and Transportation Service as a result of the Regeneration BV review. In addition a number of areas have been identified to benefit from the additional grant. Unfortunately due to time constraints not all of these areas will be spent fully in 2004/05 but will need to be continued in 2005/06. However as mentioned above the ODPM are happy to carry forward unspent PDG into future years. In summary, the proposed allocation of resources is given in the table below. Further detail on each aspect of the proposed spend is also given below.

3.2 Proposed Allocation of Planning Delivery Grant 2004/5

	2004/05	2005/06	TOTAL
Interim Funding to Planning and Regeneration Reorganisation	£151,000	£0	£151,000
Heritage and Conservation Officer (recurring cost)	£ 15,000	£ 20,000	£35,000
Transport Strategy	£ 50,000	£ 0	£50,000
E-Planning (50% recurring)	£ 40,000	£ 0	£40,000
Systems Audit	£ 30,000	£ 0	£30,000
Urban Design Programme	£ 10,000	£ 30,000	£40,000
Training and Development	£ 15,000	£ 15,000	£30,000
RTPI accredited post entry training	£ 10,000	£ 0	£10,000
Corporate Environmental Stewardship Programme	£ 40,000	£ 25,000	£65,000
TOTAL	£ 361,000	£ 90,000	£451,000

3.2.1 Interim Funding to Planning and Regeneration reorganisation - £151,000

This was the figure included in reports previously submitted to the Executive covering the costs of the restructure.

3.2.2 Heritage Conservation Officer - £35,000

Heritage is seen as an increasingly important component of Urban Design and the delivery of Sustainable Communities. A paper entitled "Moving Towards Excellence in Urban Design and Conservation" has recently been produced by English Heritage in association with the Planning Officer Society and the Commission for the Architectural and Built Environment (CABE). The report, which reflects Government Policy, recognises that urban design and conservation are essential components of the Planning System. They recognise that the historic environment is a precious asset that must be conserved for future generations but also that good conservation ensures that important buildings and spaces continue to have a contemporary relevance and vitality. Good urban design learns from the past and respects it in developing policies and proposals for new building and refurbishment and for the enhancement of the public realm.

To reinforce this message, a new Planning Performance Indicator has been produced entitled "Quality of Service Checklist". The six point indicator has the following sub section:

"In preparing the local Development Plan and determining all types of applications, does the Authority have arrangements to access specialist advice on the historic environment?"

The criteria by which this indicator is judged are;

- the advice should be available for the preparation of the plan and all planning applications.
- advice may be given in-house, by another authority, by CABE, English Heritage or the private sector.
- arrangements should be permanent and continual.

In London, English Heritage used to fund a number of posts within local planning departments. However, despite requests for funding, the Council has been unsuccessful in obtaining any. English Heritage has now abandoned this funding. CABE have no permanent consultancy to offer. Realistically, this leaves the use (and funding) of private consultants or in-house provision.

A post of Heritage Officer was identified in the new Planning and Transportation Division as part of the Regeneration Best Value review. It was agreed that this post would not be filled until external funding opportunities had been explored. We will continue to seek funding but, in the meantime, are seeking to use PDG in order to be able to both provide the necessary advice and expertise and to meet the performance indicator.

3.2.3 Transport Strategy - £50,000

This reflects one of the key outcomes of the Regeneration Best Value Review. To be effective in promoting regeneration in the Thames Gateway, the Council must improve its capacity in lobbying for key strategic transportation initiatives. A new group of officers has been established within the Division and a group manager appointed. The PDG will be used to produce, publish and publicise the Council's position on strategic transport initiatives and provide a fighting fund for lobbying. This could have a direct impact on the Council's future CPA assessment under the Sustainable Communities heading.

3.2.4 E-Planning (Data Administration) - £40,000

Planning is required by Government to be fully e-accessible by 2005. Planning and Regulatory Services On-line (PARSOL) identify 28 criteria to be met to satisfy this target. This PDG has been identified to secure improved computer software for document scanning and the employment of a full time scanning officer (hence the 50% recurring). This is also reflected in the new planning BVPI "Quality of Service Checklist".

3.2.5 Systems Audit £30,000

This PDG will be used to fund external consultants to examine and recommend change, as necessary, to Development Control processes, including administration. This is designed to improve the speed of decision making in Development Control and, hence, produce tangible improvements in BVPI 109 (a-c). This BVPI is CPA critical and we have set ourselves the task of meeting Government set targets for Development Control by the end of this financial year.

3.2.6 Urban Design Programme - £40,000

This reflects one of the key outcomes of the Regeneration Best Value Review. To be effective in promoting regeneration in the Borough and in the Thames Gateway, the Council must improve its capacity in Urban Design. A new group of officers has been established within the Division and a group manager appointed. The PDG will be used to produce, publish and publicise an Urban Design Strategy for the Borough and for training and capacity building for Officers and Members. This is also reflected in the new planning BVPI "Quality of Service Checklist" and could have a direct impact on the Council's future CPA assessment under the Sustainable Communities heading.

3.2.7 Training and Development (including RTPI Accredited training) - £10,000

Town Planning is currently going through the biggest shake-up since the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act. The introduction of the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Sustainable Communities Plan reflects a major shift in thinking for national and local Government. This, coupled with a recruitment crisis within the planning profession, leads to the need for greatly enhanced training requirements for both Officers and Councillors.

3.2.8 Corporate Environmental Stewardship Programme - £65,000

These programmes and outputs all reflect the work of the newly established Sustainable Development Group and, in particular, the promotion of environmental sustainability within the Sustainable Communities and Regeneration agendas. These programmes are designed to raise awareness of the sustainability agenda within the Council, the region and, most importantly, within the community. There are strong ties here to the Community Priority of Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener, Safer, with links to both education and environmental management. This could also have a positive impact on the Council's future CPA assessment under the Sustainable Communities heading.

4. Future Years Grant Allocation

- 4.1 Planning Delivery Grant comprises a total of £350 million nationally and was initially proposed over three years, with this being the second year. However, the 2004 Spending Review has confirmed that the grant will continue for a further three years, above the initial three year period.

ODPM has confirmed that unspent PDG can be carried forward to future years and will be issuing guidance in the future.

5. Consultation

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

Lead Members:

Deputy Leader's Portfolio (Financial Planning and Strategy), Councillor Geddes.
Regeneration Portfolio, Councillor Kallar.

Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener, Safer, Portfolio, Councillor McKenzie.

Bob Cooper, Interim Head of Finance DRE

Background Papers

Executive Minute 46, 8 July 2003. Re: Planning Delivery Grant 2003/04.