

London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Notice of Meeting

THE EXECUTIVE

Tuesday, 2 August 2005 - 7:00 pm
Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Dagenham

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

Declaration of Members Interest: In accordance with the Constitution, Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interest they may have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting.

25.7.05

R. A. Whiteman
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 19 July (circulated separately)**

Business Items

Public Items 3 and Private Items 12 to 19 are business items. The Chair will move that these be agreed without discussion, unless any Member asks to raise a specific point.

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

3. **Attendance at the Society of Information Technology Managers Annual Conference 2005 (Pages 1 - 2)**

Discussion Items

4. **Budget Process 2006 / 2007 (Pages 3 - 15)**
5. **Preparing for Building Schools for the Future (Pages 17 - 26)**
6. **Osborne Partnership - Leasing of Council Property (Pages 27 - 30)**
7. **Renaming of a Former Housing Amenity Green - Paved Area (Pages 31 - 32)**
8. **Memorial Garden, Central Park (to follow)**
9. **Goresbrook Park Play Equipment (to follow)**
10. **Any other public items which the Chair decides are urgent**
11. **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

None.

Business Items

12. **Appointment of Consultants to Support a Review of Public Relations Across the Council (Pages 33 - 50)**
Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraphs 8 and 9)
13. **Barking Child and Family Health Centre (Pages 51 - 57)**
Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraphs 8 and 9)
14. **Dagenham Dock Interchange - Tenders for Specialist Consultancy Advice (Pages 59 - 64)**
Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 9)

15. Regeneration Lobbying Contract (Pages 65 - 77)

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

16. Proposal to make a Compulsory Purchase Order (Pages 79 - 82)

Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 7)

17. Internal Refurbishment - Interim Phase 2 - Appointment of Constructor Partners (to follow)

Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 7)

18. Renewal of Electrical Passenger Lifts to 5 High Rise Blocks (to follow)

19. Renewal of Electrical Wiring to Domestic Properties (to follow)

Concerns a Contractual Matter (paragraph 7)

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

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE

2 AUGUST 2005

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

ATTENDANCE AT THE SOCIETY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGERS ANNUAL CONFERENCE	FOR DECISION	
<p><i>This report seeks approval for attendance at conference in accordance with the Council's Conference, Visits and Hospitality Rules, which states that the Executive must approve such attendance.</i></p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The Society of Information Technology Managers (SOCITM) has an annual conference which delivers National key messages, provides networking opportunities and at which many exhibitors in leading Information Technology attend. The Executive is asked to agree representation from the Council at this conference.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The Executive is asked to agree representation by two managers from the Information Management and Technology (IM&T) Division at the Society of Information Technology Managers Annual Conference on Sunday 16 October 2005 in Brighton, at an estimated cost of £1,070 plus travel. The cost of attendance will be funded from existing training and seminar budget in the IM&T Division.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>The annual SOCITM conference is an opportunity for Managers in IT to network, share experiences, learn from workshops and seminars and discuss new, leading edge IT with suppliers. The conference is the main event organised by SOCITM and is attended by councils throughout the country.</p>		
<p>Contact Officer Sarah Bryant</p>	<p>Head of Information Management and Technology</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 2015 Fax: 020 8227 2060 Minicom: 020 8227 2685 E-mail sarah.bryant@lbbd.gov.uk</p>

1. Background

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

- 1.2 SOCITM holds its annual conference in October at various venues around the United Kingdom, and is a three day conference starting on Sunday 16 October 2005. This year it is at Brighton.
- 1.3 The event combines keynote speakers with workshops on a technical and management level with an exhibition from relevant IT software and hardware suppliers. Speakers include Ian Whatmore, Head of The Cabinet Office e-government Unit, Tony Neate from the National High Tec Crime Unit, and Lord Anthony St John of Bletso, who is focussing on Citizens on-line and digital inclusion. Workshops include Customer Access Strategy, IP telephony and Government Connect.
- 1.4 Members approval is therefore sought to approve the attendance of two managers from the IM&T Division at the SOCITM Autumn Conference.

2. Financial Implications

- 2.1 This year's Autumn conference is being held in Brighton from 16-18 October. The cost is £535 for each delegate and includes meals and accommodation. For two delegates the cost would be £1,070 plus costs of travel. The cost of this will be funded from existing training and seminar budget in IM&T.

Background Papers

www.socitm.gov.uk/public/events/socitm+2005/default.htm

EXECUTIVE

2 AUGUST 2005

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

BUDGET PROCESS 2006 / 2007	FOR INFORMATION
<p><i>This report commences the formal budget process for 2006/07 and deals with recent Government proposals on changes to funding from 2006/07.</i></p> <p>Summary</p> <p>This report endorses the decision of the Assembly of 2nd March to commence the Budget process for 2006/07 in April 2005. The report deals with the proposed budget timetable and identifies initial savings targets for 2006/07 for all Departments. It also addresses the key issues arising from recent Government proposals on future funding to Council's from 2006/07 onwards.</p> <p>The budget process is a key corporate process coordinated by Financial Services, but it is reliant on officers and information across the Council.</p> <p>The production and adherence of a budget timetable supports the objectives of good financial planning.</p> <p>In addition a robust budget timetable will also support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Government's agenda on the implementation of three year revenue and capital settlements for local authorities which is proposed from the 2006/07 finance settlement; • the Council's Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) on the "Use of its Resources" particularly around financial management, financial standing and value for money; • the framework for ensuring that the financial, strategic and service planning processes fit together. <p>The key to an excellent budget process is that sufficient time and attention is given to each of the processes involved to ensure that the use of financial resources are maximised. The timetable in this report sets out the critical factors that are involved in the budget process and a clear timetable for delivering these objectives.</p> <p>The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the three years from 2005/06 to 2007/08 was presented to the Assembly on the 2nd March 2005. In projecting income streams and expenditure levels over the latter two years, the MTFS highlighted a potential deficit of £5.8m in 2006/07, and £7.2m in 2007/08. If the budget is to be balanced for both of these years then significant savings will need to be made across the Council.</p>	

It is important that the process of identifying future savings commences as early as possible in the budget process to allow for a proper consultation process and a robust assessment of their impact and deliverability. Paragraph 5 details the initial savings targets for each department which is based upon each department's controllable costs. Details of those services and costs excluded from this process are attached in Appendix C.

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to note:

1. The proposed summary budget timetable as set out in Appendix A;
2. That a successful budget process is reliant on officers and information across the whole Council and ensure that the necessary support is provided from respective Departments;
3. That the Director of Finance is exploring the potential for bringing forward the Council Tax payment date to the first of each month and the necessary impact on the timetable;
4. The principles adopted in the target savings for both the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account as outlined in paragraph 5 and/or whether it wishes to use an alternative approach to targeting savings e.g. targeting specific areas of service provision;
5. That further reports on the Budget process will be reported to the Executive commencing in the Autumn.

Reason

To assist the Council in assessing its future budget strategy and ensuring that service and financial planning are appropriately linked.

<p>Contact: Joe Chesterton</p>	<p>Head of Financial Services</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 2932 Fax: 020 8227 2995 Minicom: 020 8227 2685 E-mail: joe.chesterton@lbbd.gov.uk</p>
---	-----------------------------------	--

1. Background

- 1.1 A local authority must have a sound financial planning system if it is to achieve the maximum use of its resources. Financial planning is a critical part of the corporate planning process and involves the whole Council not just the Director of Finance. A successful budget process is therefore reliant on officers and information across the whole Council.
- 1.2 However, CIPFA's Standards of Professional Practice does make it clear that the Director of Finance "should take all reasonable steps to ensure that budgets are planned as an integral part of the strategic and operational management of the organisation and are aligned with its structure of managerial responsibilities".

1.3 The objectives of good financial planning include:

- helping elected members to determine priorities and their timing;
- forecasting the changes in demand for services;
- identifying the likely implications of changes in legislation on spending;
- identifying the future costs of alternative policies;
- matching demand with likely resources;
- providing a framework for programming activities by individual services.

1.4 The most important short-term planning activity is the preparation of the annual budget, but the annual budget is of limited value as a policy document if it looks only one year ahead. Consequently the Council has in place a three year forward looking document known as the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) which sets out the framework for using the Council finances to deliver both its community priorities and those objectives highlighted in paragraph 1.3.

1.5 In addition strong financial planning will be essential in supporting:

- the Government's agenda on the implementation of three year revenue and capital settlements for local authorities from the 2006/07 finance settlement;
- the Council's CPA assessment on the use of its resources particularly around financial management, financial standing and value for money.

1.6 One of the key tools to assist in strong financial planning is the need for the Council to have in place a robust budget timetable. This timetable will not only identify when things need to be undertaken but will provide the framework for ensuring that the financial, strategic and service planning processes fit together.

2. Budget Timetable 2006/2007

2.1 Set out in Appendix A is the summary budget timetable for the preparation of both the 2006/07 budget and the MTFS. This timetable sets out the critical factors that are involved in the budget process.

2.2 A further point to consider on the timetable is the feasibility of the Council Tax payment date being brought forward to the 1st of each month, as in line with most other Local Authorities. Work is underway to explore the feasibility of this approach. However, any change will require an earlier Assembly date and would most likely be in the mid to latter part of February. This could mean shifting the final Executive Budget Report being produced and reported earlier. Within the current timetable it is considered feasible to adopt this approach and the Director of Finance will pursue this option.

2.3 The key to an excellent budget process is that sufficient time and attention is given to each of the processes involved to ensure that the use of financial resources are maximised. To this end the budget process is a continuous ongoing cycle whereby work on future budgets commences immediately after (and in some cases before) the Council sets its current year's budget and Council tax in March each year.

2.4 The budget timetable (cycle) can be split into four clear stages and is applicable to both the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account:

Stage One (April/May)

- Setting of budget timetable
- Identification of Initial Savings targets

Stage Two (June/September)

- Issuing of Budget Guidance requesting details on Budget Pressures
- Firming up of potential Funding Gap as identified in MTFS by Directors providing pressures within their Departments
- Identification of potential Savings
- Identification of potential Council Tax levels
- Budget Challenge team assesses all proposals for savings and pressures
- Senior Finance Team challenges budget savings options
- Consultation process with public and other relevant bodies
- Strategic review of Capital Programme

Stage Three (October/December)

- Preparation and completion of detailed Base Budgets for each service
- Notification of grant entitlement from Government
- Confirmation of Savings/Pressures
- Review of MTFS
- Confirmation of capital programme submissions

Stage Four (January/March)

- Preparation and approval of Final Budgets
- Preparation and approval of MTFS
- Approval of Council Tax
- Approval of Rent levels
- Approval of Capital Programme

3. Budget Gap for 2006/07 and 2007/08

3.1 The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the three years from 2005/06 to 2007/08 was presented to the Assembly on the 2 March 2005. In projecting income streams and expenditure levels over these two years, the MTFS highlighted a potential deficit of £5.8m in 2006/07, and £7.2m in 2007/08. If the budget is to be balanced for both of these years then significant savings will need to be made across the Council.

3.2 In summary the deficit comprises the following pressures:

- In 2006/07, £21.9m of pressures have been identified, the key areas being increasing Education spending to FSS (£8.1m), increasing social services spending to FSS (£4.1m) and additional corporate initiatives that need to be funded (£5.6m). This is set against increased grant and Council Tax income of only £14.6m, and a recurring underspend in social services of £1.5m.

- In 2007/08, £16m of pressures have been identified, the key areas being increased Education spending to FSS (£8.3m), increasing Social Services spending to FSS (£3.1m), and additional corporate initiatives (£2.6m). This is set against increased grant and Council Tax income of only £13.2m, and a recurring underspend in social services of £1.5m. This amounts to a yearly deficit of £1.4m, and a cumulative deficit of £7.2m.

3.3 Further detail of the above is shown in Appendix B, which is Annex 3 from the current Medium Term Financial Strategy.

4. Government Funding 2006/07 onwards

4.1 The Government have been reviewing areas around moving to three year settlements from an annual settlement for our grant funding whilst also considering mechanisms for changes to the grant itself.

4.2 Three year settlements

The Minister for Local Government made an announcement on the 19th July 2005 which highlighted the basic principles of this approach which are:

- A move to greater certainty in council tax levels.
- Specific grants generally allocated on a three year basis.
- Aligning formula and revenue grant with all aspects of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) process.
- Using predictions of population and council taxbase in the formulae.
- Generally allocating capital funding on a three year basis.
- No change to the Housing Revenue Account Subsidy (HRAS).

Additionally, the Government is now proposing to move back the next scheduled Comprehensive Spending Review (Government's view on 3 year projections for their overall spending and income plans) from July 2006 until July 2007. This basically means that the projections for 2007/08 from the CSR in July 2004 will remain as they are.

4.3 Review of Formula Grant Distribution

The Government published their consultation paper on their proposals for change on 20 July 2005. The consultation period runs until 10 October 2005. There are some significant changes proposed which may have implications on the level of the formula grant we receive to support our budget for 2006/07 and onwards. The Council will make a full response to the consultation paper and Members will be kept apprised of our response.

Some of the major areas of impact could be:

- The confirmed decision to remove the Dedicated Schools Grant from the Formula Grant for 2006/07 and onwards.
- Area Cost Adjustments.
- Changes around both the Children's and Adult Social Services Formula.
- Free fare scheme and impact on the Environmental, Protective and Cultural Services Formula.
- Highways maintenance but the impact should be relatively minor for our authority.
- Resource equalisation proposals which effectively would distribute more funding to high needs authorities with low Council tax bases relative to their needs.
- Changes to the technical aspect of floors in the Formula Grant allocation.
- Alternative grant system, which moves away from a measure of need to a "four block" model of needs, resources, basic amount and damping.

4.4 Future budget considerations will take into account the potential impact of the proposals.

5. Initial Savings Target 2006/07

5.1 It is important that the process of identifying future savings commences as early as possible in the budget process to allow for a proper consultation process and a robust assessment of their impact and deliverability. The table below details the estimated initial savings targets for each department in respect of the General Fund. These targets are based upon each department's controllable costs but specifically excludes the following services/costs:

Delegated School Budgets (including departmental recharges to this area)
HRA (including departmental recharges to this area)
Accountable Bodies
Capital Charges
Levies
Contingency Budget
Services which are Grant funded
Services funded from the Capital Programme
Services funded from the Pension Fund
Non-Recurring Budgets (i.e. those in 2005/06 but which will not appear in 2006/07)
Other Uncontrollable items
Concessionary Fares
Grants to Voluntary organisations
ALG/LGA Subscriptions
Audit Fees
Members Allowances

5.2 A further £1m has been added to the savings target to allow for redirection into priority service areas.

5.3 A detailed note on the background to the calculation of these savings targets is attached at Appendix C.

	Savings Target (2005/06 & 2006/07)	Savings Achieved to Date	Savings Target (2006/07)
Department	£'000	£'000	£'000
DEAL	1,400	200	1,200
Corporate Strategy	450	300	150
DRE	4,200	1,600	2,600
Social Services	4,400	1,750	2,650
Housing & Health	750	400	350
Finance	1,150	550	600
	12,350	4,800	7,550
HRA	700	100	600
	13,050	4,900	8,150

Note:

1. Based on Customer First Savings allocated per Customer First report and no protection for Cleaner, Greener, Safer service provision.
2. In addition to the £2.65 million target for Social Services there is the need also to meet the recurring £1.5million underspend, as agreed when setting the Council budget for 2005/06. In total this means a savings target for Social Services of £4.15 million.

5.4 In view of the importance of identifying future savings as early as possible in the budget process, Directors have already given consideration to identifying savings in line with the above targets and the process of collation and challenge of those submissions is currently in progress.

5.5 Additionally, a request has been made to Directors to highlight the pressures impacting on their services and this information is due to be returned to the Finance Department by 27 July.

6. Consultation

6.1 The following people have been consulted in the production of this report.

Corporate Management Team.

Background Papers

- Medium Term Financial Strategy
- Government consultation papers

When	Process
STAGE 1	
April	Early - Identification of Initial Savings Target
	Mid - Report to CMT on Budget Process and Savings targets
	Mid - Report to CMT on draft budget timetable
May	All - Identify Future Funding Levels
STAGE 2	
June	All - Commence scoping of future Budget Pressures
June	All - CMT to consider the direction of public consultation in liaison with the Executive
June/July	All - Calculation of Revised Funding Gap based on current MTFS projections
June/Sept	All - Strategic review of capital programme
June/Sept	All - Produce detailed budget pressures and savings (GF & HRA)
July	Mid - Report to CMT on Projected Financial Position
July	Late - Report to Members on Draft projected Financial Position
July	All - Start consultation with Public on Budget
Aug/Sept	All - Budget Challenge Team assess Pressures & Savings
June/Sept	All - Senior Finance Team challenges overall scope for budget savings in service areas
September	Early - Commence Detailed Budget Preparation for all services
September	Mid - First projections of Grant
September	Late - Budget Challenge team reports on findings
September	Late - Savings/Budget Pressure Report to CMT (GF & HRA)
September	All - Education proposals to Schools Forum
STAGE 3	
October	Early - Commence updating MTFS
October	Mid - Report to Members on Updated Projected Financial Position
October	Mid - Central Recharges sent out
October	All - Confirmation of capital programme submissions
October	All - Senior Finance Team challenges overall scope for budget savings in service areas
November	Early - Provisional Grant Released Funding Gap updated in view of grant projection
November	Mid - Further review of Pressures/Savings following provisional grant
November	End - Final Report to Members on Projected Financial Position
November	End - Departmental Base Budgets complete
December	Early - Calculation of Collection Fund Deficit/Surplus
December	Mid - Consultation with Public Sector Stakeholders
December	Mid - Commencement of Base Budget Report
December	End - Departmental Base Budget fully reconciled
December	All - Education to agree passporting position with DFES

STAGE 4

January	Mid	- Base Budget Agreed
January	Mid	- Consultation with Businesses and Labour group
Jan/Feb	All	- All fees and charges reviewed and reported to Executive
February	All	- HRA rent levels determined
March	Early	- Final Budget agreed with all Pressures and Savings & new MTFS
March	Early	- Capital Programme agreed
March	Early	- Council Tax Leaflet produced
March	Late	- Budget Book completed and printed

Note

Throughout the process there will be regular reports to CMT and these will be identified as part of the detailed budget timetable. In addition, there will be the need to report into and align with the work of both the Efficiency sub-group and Service & Financial Planning sub-group. Again, these will be added to the detailed timetable

SUMMARY OF BUDGET PROJECTIONS UP TO 2007/08			
	2005/06 £'000	2006/07 £'000	2007/08 £'000
BUDGET REQUIREMENT B/F Pressures/Changes	220,168	232,252	252,623
Unavoidable	523	200	200
Likely Commitments			
Education spending to FSS	7,002	8,140	8,335
Social Services spending to FSS	3,340	4,145	3,130
Inflation (EPCS Services Only)	1,486	1,575	1,650
Concessionary Fares	0	225	155
Impact of 2005/06 budget decisions - pressures	703	128	-85
Areas of Potential Concern			
Corporate	1,753	5,630	2,545
Other	456	1,635	0
Future issues	0	250	100
Adjustments			
FSS fundamental changes	1,017	0	0
Other changes/Executive decisions	-32	0	0
Total of Pressures/Changes	16,248	21,928	16,030
Less: Impact of Savings agreed for 2005/06	2,664	57	0
Social Services underspend 2004/05 brought forward by use of reserve	1,500	0	0
Social Services recurring underspend - ongoing	0	1,500	1,500
Revised Budget Requirement	232,252	252,623	267,153
Funding			
Formula Grant	187,445	199,040	209,660
Council Tax Collection	45,691	48,045	50,330
Collection Fund Deficit	-884	-250	0
Total Funding	232,252	246,835	259,990
Council Tax Base (1)	50,839	50,839	50,839
LBB Council Tax (2)	898.74	945	990
GLA Precept (3)	254.62	280	310
Total	1153.36	1,225	1,300
Overall change	3.9%	6.2%	6.2%
Funding Gap to be met by savings/elimination of growth/ /delivering Customer First savings/use of reserves/ further increase in Council Tax	0	5,788	7,163
(N.B. This is after allowing a 5% increase in LBB Council Tax)			
Notes			
1. Assumes the same Council Tax base as in 2005/06.			
2. Assumes a 5% increase in Council Tax consistent with projected increase for the Council's Formula Spending Share for both 2006/07 and 2007/08.			
3. Assumes a 10% increase for both 2006/07 and 2007/08.			

This page is intentionally left blank

Savings Target 2006/2007 (General Fund Services)

This savings target is the amount required to be identified from the Council's General Fund Services. It excludes any other savings target that may relate to the Council's other funds such as the HRA, Pension fund, Capital programme.

The basis of calculating the General Fund savings target is as follows:

- Savings are based on Department's Gross Controllable Expenditure.
This includes:

- Employee Costs
- Premises Costs
- Transport Costs
- Supplies and Services
- Agency Costs

It excludes:

- Transfer Payments
 - Support Recharges (As these are dealt with in the savings targets of the service provider)
 - Recharges to Users
 - Income
- In terms of services that are recharged to other users, savings are to be identified from the department that provides the service not the end user. As an example Finance will be responsible for delivering savings within all of its services.
 - The following areas have been excluded from making savings:
 - Delegated School Budgets (including departmental recharges to this area)
 - HRA (including departmental recharges to this area)
 - Accountable Bodies
 - Capital Charges
 - Levies
 - Contingency Budget
 - Services which are Grant funded
 - Services funded from the Capital Programme
 - Services funded from the Pension Fund
 - Non-Recurring Budgets (i.e. those in 2005/06 but which will not appear in 2006/07)
 - Other Uncontrollable items
 - Concessionary Fares
 - Grants to Voluntary organisations
 - ALG/LGA Subscriptions
 - Audit Fees
 - Members Allowances

This page is intentionally left blank

THE EXECUTIVE

2 AUGUST 2005

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, ARTS AND LIBRARIES

Title: Preparing for Building Schools for the Future	For Decision
<p>Summary:</p> <p>This report sets out the latest position regarding Building Schools for the Future (BSF) following the meeting with the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) officials. The report explores the latest advice from the DfES and that Barking and Dagenham will be in the next waves of Building Schools for the Future. It is suggested, in accordance with the advice from the DfES, that the Council now puts in place a structure and support to deliver on this programme, which is an exciting opportunity to develop the learning environments of the Council's Secondary Schools.</p> <p>Awards: All Wards</p>	
<p>Implications:</p> <p>Financial:</p> <p>There is a possible financial risk to the Council if the DfES does not give Barking and Dagenham early funding for delivery of Building Schools for the Future. However, this investment of £2m will be required at some stage to undertake the work. Initially £700k of resources are being requested.</p> <p>Legal:</p> <p>The formation of a Local Education Partnership has legal implications for the Council. The report recommends securing appropriate legal advice in this matter.</p> <p>Risk Management:</p> <p>BSF is a significant investment strategy for the Government of national importance. Preparing our case for BSF will underpin the investment strategy at local level.</p> <p>Social Inclusion and Diversity:</p> <p>The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 places a requirement on local authorities to make an assessment of the impact of new and revised policies in terms of race equality. Existing policies have already been subjected to impact assessments. This Authority has adopted an approach of extending the impact to cover gender, disability, sexuality, faith, age and community cohesion.</p> <p>As this report does not concern a new or revised policy there are no specific adverse impacts insofar as this report is concerned.</p>	

There is a duty on the Council as a public body to have regard for the provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (and the forthcoming Act 2005) to ensure equal access to school buildings. In considering the development of secondary schools every consideration will be given to ensure that remodelled or new provision will be fully accessible.

Crime and Disorder:

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a responsibility on local authorities to consider the crime and disorder implications of any proposals.

There are no specific implications, but consultation will take place to ensure appropriate security provision is included in design.

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to:

Agree that a sum of £700k is added to the Capital Programme, as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report, to allow some early work in drafting proposals, research on site difficulties and drawing up feasibility options for the development of school rebuilding and / or refurbishment of the secondary school estate. This will need to include the establishment of a Local Education Partnership, legal and financial fees for advice (subject to undergoing the CPMO process);

2. Agree that this be initially funded from slippage of £700k from the Warren Science facility scheme;
3. Note that future bids for resources will be considered in February 2006 (as set out in paragraph 4.3 of the report).
4. Agree the advancement of the BSF process along the lines set out in the report and subject to consultation with the DfES / Partnership for Schools; and
5. Agree that officers be authorised to enter into the process of securing advisors to help develop the process.

Reasons

This is a matter of strategic importance to the Council and the Executive needs to consider the investment of resources appropriate to achieve the programme and delivery mechanisms.

Contact Officer: Mike Freeman	Title: Head of Assets and Administration	Contact Details: Tel: 020 8227 3492 Fax: 020 8227 3274 Minicom: 020 8227 3180 E-mail: mike.freeman@lbbd.gov.uk
---	--	---

1. Background

- 1.1 The DfES have invited Council's to submit applications under their programme for Building Schools for the Future to rebuild, refurbish or remodel secondary schools. Barking and Dagenham submitted a bid to the Secretary of State in December 2003 which indicated we needed to invest in the order of just under £214m.
- 1.2 Barking and Dagenham was not included in the pathfinder bids, nor were we invited to be in waves 1 - 3. However, officers were informed at a meeting with DfES officials on 23 February that we would be included in waves 4 - 7, to be announced in 2006/07. A firm date will be announced around Autumn next year.
- 1.3 The other aspect that DfES officials have indicated is that the BSF programme has slipped and that those pathfinder authorities and those and in waves 1 - 3 are not progressing as quickly as was originally planned and hoped for by both the Councils concerned and the DfES. The DfES have indicated a need to be prepared to move things forward quickly and are anticipating being able to go to local authorities with positive news about being able to bring forward waves 4 – 7. This may mean that Barking and Dagenham might be able to achieve some rebuilding or refurbishment work earlier than the schedule indicated above.
- 1.4 Given the Every Child Matters agenda, from now on, school schemes will have an inter-agency, inter-departmental component because of the expectation of co-location of services for children, young people and families. This needs to be more than speculative proposals and, of course, there will need to be investment if we are to get that far advanced. The DfES have also suggested that, working with Partnership for Schools, we should establish a Local Education Partnership (LEP) which would be extremely beneficial in moving our case forward. The DfES is interested in working with the Borough because of its track record of achievement.

2. Next Steps

- 2.1 There was a clear message from the DfES officials that they recognised the success we have had in delivering our capital programme, particularly around Children's Centres, and the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) project to secure a new school, namely the Jo Richardson Community School, and major works at Eastbury School. In order to demonstrate in a practical way to the DfES how this work is delivered and used, Philip Parker – Head of Strategy, Schools Capital – who is a senior figure within the DfES, was invited and visited to see what has been achieved in Barking and Dagenham in terms of delivery by the Council. A copy of a letter from Phillip Parker, in respect of his visit is attached as Appendix A. This will only help to support an early investment by the Government in schools in Barking and Dagenham.
- 2.2 The work that can be done at this stage would be to discuss action with Headteachers of secondary schools the objectives of investment, bearing in mind the new guidance from the DfES that there is likely to be around 50% rebuild and 50% refurbishment work. It is not clear how this funding will come. Some of it may be a borrowing approval; some of it may be through PFI credits. It will be useful to be able to engage consultants to undertake some early feasibility works looking at the options for each school and providing some costings. Clearly, the work for the Jo Richardson School would not need to be repeated and for Eastbury, we have, for

the most part, a plan in place. It would be useful just to revisit the costs in respect of that project. However, for the other 7 schools, it would be a significant piece of work which we need to commission fairly soon so we can be in a position to respond, perhaps as early as Summer 2005, with information to show that we are ready to take forward investment in our schools. For new secondary schools, at Barking Riverside for example, funding will also be available. We are waiting for information from the DfES to clarify investment in existing and new primary schools following the Chancellor's Budget Speech in March 2005.

- 2.3 The other major piece of work which will be necessary is the establishment of the Local Education Partnership which is the Government's DfES' preferred procurement route and will entail establishing a partnership arrangement with the commercial sector and Partnerships for Schools acting on behalf of the DfES. If the Council is to pursue this route, and there can be little doubt that the DfES will require it, then we also need to invest in legal fees for advice and costs associated with financial advice to protect the Council's interest. The Council is also being pressed to establish a vehicle to procure social infrastructure and it could be that the LEP might be used in this way. The possibility is being investigated.

3. Existing PFI Scheme: The Link between Education and Regeneration

- 3.1 The implementation of the PFI Scheme for the Jo Richardson Community School and Joint Service Centre at Castle Green (which includes a Library, the Adult College, a Learning Village, Sports and Fitness, Performing Arts, Connexions, a Children's Centre, the Police and a Health Centre) offers a model for improvement of education and other services, whilst at the same time regenerating the local area.
- 3.2 The continuing positive economic impact of the scheme in the local area is estimated to run into millions of pounds.
- 3.3 The Jo Richardson Community School is an exemplification of the Council's policy for Education which has made the Council the fastest improving education authority in the country.

4. Resources

- 4.1 A combination of the Education, Arts and Libraries Department (DEAL) Assets Section and the PFI Team could undertake the principles of this work, but the requested £2m would be essential to carrying out feasibility studies, site investigations, financial and legal advice and to achieve the state of readiness that the DfES are expecting through support from external consultancy.
- 4.2 This represents good value for money as there is clear evidence to support the way that the PFI project was procured which, if replicated, saves time in the long run, sets definite standards by which the new buildings have to be delivered, achieves better designs and, most importantly, is planned to improve teaching and learning environments for students and teachers.
- 4.3 This project will be one that stretches through to 2012 when it is expected that, through various routes, new buildings or refurbishment works will be completed. At this stage, it is envisaged that spending will follow the profile suggested and outlined below:

2005/06	£200,000
2006/07	£500,000
2007/08	£500,000
2008/09	£200,000
2009/10	£200,000
2010/11	£200,000
2011/12	£150,000
2012/13	£50,000

- 4.4 At this stage it is not necessary to commit the full £2m and this the Executive is being asked to allocate sufficient funds to commence the work, namely £700k, £200k in 2005/06 and £500 in 2006/07.

Further sums will be considered in February 2006 in the context of the review of the entire Capital Programme.

- 4.5 Within the DEAL allocated capital programme an examination has been made of the projects currently being undertaken to see where it might be possible to reduce demands for resources. There has been an underachievement of targets on the capital spend profiled budgets in 2004/05 and the latest position on monitoring looks as though there will be slippage on the spend in the capital programme in 2005/06. This slippage could help to fund the programme indicated above, paragraph 4.3, but the Executive should note that the overall programme cannot show a saving as there are still commitments to existing projects.

Slippage will come from the following project:-

Warren science facilities - £700k

- 4.6 It should be noted that by allocating an additional £700k to the BSF initiative, at this stage it reduces the sums available for all future capital projects.
- 4.7 The addition of the project to the programme would be subject to the appraisal process through the Capital Programme monitoring office.

5. Managing the BSF Process

- 5.1 It is suggested that the success of the PFI Steering Group should be used as a model for managing the BSF process and can be utilised as a resource for informing Lead Members about progress on the project. If Members feel this would be useful then a suggested Membership based on the existing Steering Group could be put forward to a future meeting of the Executive.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 It is not clear at the moment as to how much funding the Council will receive via the Government's secondary schools BSF initiative. Barking and Dagenham is included in waves 4 - 6 and details are due to be announced in 2006/07. However the DfES have indicated that, due to slippage within the current BSF programme, they may consider providing funding early to Councils within waves 4 - 6 provided they can demonstrate that they are in a position to progress quickly.

6.2 Consideration has been given to the possibility of developing Dagenham Park, which would include the school and both village Infants and William Ford Junior Schools as a priority. However, it does seem more appropriate to look at this development in the round and with the possibility of BSF funding. Clearly, if funding can be obtained from central government to invest at Dagenham Park, this would be preferable to spending the Council's own resources.

7. Advancing the Project

7.1 If the Council is able to demonstrate to the DfES that we can deliver on BSF in the same way that we have throughout the capital programme process, as indicated in this report some resources will be needed. A figure of £2m (with £700k being allocated initially) has been mentioned and this will be managed as indicated elsewhere in the report through DEAL, and we will be looking at our own structures to accommodate this. There is a need to support this management through additional resources from the private sector. A list of the types of things that we need to address are set out below.

- having our educational vision endorsed by the DfES ;
- identifying external resources to establish a strategy for delivering BSF;
- designing a strategy for delivery;
- establishing our procurement methodology including the Local Education Partnership;
- working with stakeholders, governors, schools and councillors and the wider community;
- legal advice in respect of the above;
- financial advice for establishing the business case;
- setting up agreements for the future, and PFI arrangements;
- designing overarching developments for individual schools;
- preparing statutory proposals for changes.

7.2 This early work will mean that the Council will be able to respond very quickly once the DfES designate us as a BSF authority. Much of the cost associated with setting up the structures and particularly around the establishment of the Local Education Partnership (LEP) will be of a legal and financial nature. Clearly discussions will need to be held with colleagues in Legal Services and the Finance Department about the appointment of suitable advisors. Advisors will need to be recruited through the OJEU process; the sooner this process is started, the more likelihood there will be of being successful.

8. Consultation

8.1 This report has been compiled following consultation with:

Councillor Jeanne Alexander	Lead Member for Children's Services
Julie Parker	Director of Finance
Joe Chesterton	Head of Financial Services
Muhammad Saleem	Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer
Alan Russell	Head of Audit
Jeff Elsom	Crime and Anti Social Behaviour Unit Manager
Bill Coomber	Corporate Equalities & Diversity Advisor

Jim Mack
Paul Pearson
Other Consultees:

Head of Asset Management and Development
Finance, Planning and Procurement Manager
Corporate Asset Management Group

Background Papers

There is a whole raft of documents available at www.bsf.gov.uk/documents/. Of particular importance are the following:

- Consultation document Building Schools for the Future: A New Approach to Capital Investment (*February 2003*)
- Outcome of the Public Consultation and Feedback from Regional Conferences (*June 2003*)
- Guidance to LEAs on Consulting Proposals and Expressions of Interest for Capital Investment under BSF (*July 2003*)
- LEAs and Schools' Guidance for Anticipating Building Schools for the Future Investment (*March 2004*)
- Covering letter from David Goldstone, Chief Executive of Partnership for Schools and Sally Brooks, Divisional Manager, Schools Capital and Buildings Division (*March 2004*)
- Educational Vision Nov 2004 (*March 2004*)

Copies of these documents can be made available if you do not have internet access.

Additional documents:

- Report to the Executive - Building Schools for the Future, 9 March 2004, Minute 313
- Report to the Executive - Building Schools for the Future, 7 October 2003, Minute 133

This page is intentionally left blank

Mr James Hodgson
PFI Manager
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
Barking Town Hall
Barking
London IG11 7LU

Direct line: 020 7925 6566

9 May 2005

I wanted to let you and your colleagues have our thanks for a fascinating visit on Friday. We all learnt a lot and appreciate the time you all spent with us. Can you pass our thanks on to everyone both at the council and at the three schools.

We also discussed a few business issues over lunch.

Barking quite rightly wants to position itself well to take best advantage of forthcoming capital programmes. As you know, we have given you planning information that Barking is likely to be included in waves 4 to 6 of Building Schools for the Future, where preparation could be starting as early as next year. You will also want to consider the new primary capital programme just announced, which will start from 2008. Our approach in designing these programmes is to give authorities plenty of incentive to prepare well. Such preparedness (e.g. identifying senior responsible officers and project staff, having your educational vision agreed, having carried out consultations, being ready for any statutory proposals, etc.) could mean a difference of at least 12 months in the starting date for any project. As we and Partnerships for Schools learn how to run a national programme of many waves, good preparedness could also mean bringing projects forward to take the place of other projects that are in difficulties.

There is nothing to prevent Barking looking at the various documents we prepare for waves 1 to 3 and starting to think how they might apply. You can find these at www.bsf.gov.uk/documents. You may also want to talk to Martin Lipson at the 4ps as he is developing a capacity building programme, including preparatory work that can be done with local stakeholders such as councillors and governors. You may also want to look at the 4ps local government gateway system, which again will give you insight into how to prepare effectively.

In due course, we would be happy to consider with you whether there would be any advantage in seeking to set up a joint venture in advance of BSF. We will need to

involve PFS with this, but you will appreciate that they are fully taken up with setting off waves 1 to 3 at the moment.

Steve Avis has offered to talk to you or finance colleagues about the pros and cons of supported and prudential borrowing, including with ODPM colleagues if that is helpful. As I mentioned, my understanding is that some of the incentives for authorities to be debt free are no longer there.

We would be happy to co-sponsor a learning/ evaluation event about your PFI experience. Please treat me as the contact for that. Lastly, I suggested that, given the considerable knowledge that Barking has built up in its PFI team, you might consider getting involved in the EBD OG (Shirley Turner) or AMP (Ian Cook) networks, and also might want to discuss with the 4ps (Martin Lipson) whether you might become gateway assessors for other PFI and BSF projects (which enables others to benefit from Barking's experience and also gives you wider experience).

So, plenty for us all to get on with! But once again, our sincere thanks for a very worthwhile and impressive visit to Barking.

P J PARKER
Schools Capital, Head of Strategy

THE EXECUTIVE

2 AUGUST 2005

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES

OSBORNE PARTNERSHIP: LEASING OF COUNCIL PROPERTY	FOR DECISION	
<p><i>This report asks The Executive to agree to a concessionary rent for a voluntary organisation wishing to lease a Council building since the grant of this concession will require that the Council forgo a substantial amount of rent which could be at odds with the Council's general fiduciary responsibilities.</i></p> <p>Summary</p> <p>This report informs the Executive of the proposal by the Osborne Partnership to establish a social enterprise to pack motor components and of the Partnership's request to lease Council premises at a concessionary rent as a base for the enterprise.</p> <p>Wards Affected – All wards.</p> <p>Recommendations / Reasons</p> <p>The Executive is asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognise that the establishment of a social enterprise by the Osborne Partnership will be an important stepping-stone to employment by some of the most disadvantaged groups in the Borough; 2. Accept that the financial profile for such a social enterprise would preclude the possibility of paying an economic rent for appropriate premises; 3. Recognise that granting a concessionary rent to the Osborne Partnership for the premises at Valence, as outlined in the report, would mean the loss of income of up to £35,000 pa but nonetheless agree in principle to grant such a lease for a period not exceeding 18 months on condition that the Partnership use that period to find other premises; and 4. Authorise officers to negotiate an appropriate lease arrangement and offer all assistance to the Osborne Partnership in establishing the enterprise. 		
<p>Contact Officers: Philip Baldwin</p> <p>Andy Bere</p>	<p>Social Services</p> <p>Department of Regeneration and Environment</p>	<p>Tel: 020 8227 2530 E-mail: philip.baldwin@lbbd.gov.uk</p> <p>020 8227 3047 E-mail: andy.bere@lbbd.gov.uk</p>

Terry Regan	Department of Regeneration and Environment	Tel: 020 8227 5315 E-mail: terry.regan@lbbd.gov.uk
-------------	--	--

1. Background

- 1.1 The Osborne Partnership is a registered charity and a company limited by guarantee that is based in the Borough and has operated for 8 years. It provides training and support for people with learning disabilities. With the assistance of officers from Social Services and the Department of Regeneration and Environment the Osborne Partnership has recently been running a pilot scheme to assess the capacity of people with disabilities to be employed assembling automotive components. This work is carried out on contract to Trelleborg Stanton Limited and has operated in partnership with Rethink Employment Services, who are commissioned by Social Services and the Primary Care Trust (PCT) to provide a range of employment support to people with mental health problems.
- 1.2 Trelleborg Stanton Limited is a private limited company that concentrates on the manufacture of parts for the automotive industry, especially for car manufacturers based in the UK. The company has a good record of supporting staff with disabilities and a policy of outsourcing to contractors who can offer work opportunities to people who because of disability are on the margins of the job market. Currently it has packaging contracts with four other organisations in the region.
- 1.3 The limited pilot that has been undertaken so far has demonstrated that local people with learning disabilities and mental health problems can produce good quality output well up to the required standard. The Osborne Partnership believe that they have the potential to establish a social enterprise in the Borough – that is a commercially successful business with primarily social objectives that will operate on a not-for-profit basis and re-invest surpluses to support those social objectives. In this case they would, in partnership with Rethink Employment Services and other local partners such as the Disablement Association of Barking & Dagenham, be able to offer employment to a range of people with disabilities. Officers of Social Services believe that such a social enterprise could form part of a range of services intended to support a return to normal employment for people who have significant disabilities or enduring mental health problems.
- 1.4 The commitment to support the establishment of social enterprises and to help disadvantaged residents into work is set out in the Council's Economic Development Strategy. There is currently an externally funded social enterprise worker post in the Regeneration Implementation Division's Economic Development Group.
- 1.5 For a social enterprise to succeed in developing a normal work experience for employees who have been out of the job market for a long time it is necessary to ensure that payment levels are equivalent to national minimum standards or better and do not reflect the previous practice in similar situations of paying much reduced rates of "therapeutic earnings". The overriding need for proper wage rates does impact on the economic viability of the project and the pilot, which has run for three months, has not been sufficient to allow a full assessment of the economics of the enterprise, though the results to date are encouraging. A longer-term pilot is

dependent on securing suitable premises but will explore the potential for other sources of financial support, such as through Jobcentre Plus and the Learning & Skills Council London East (it is intended to offer NVQs in Manufacturing Operations with an educational partner that will allow funding to be drawn down).

2. Current Situation

- 2.1 The Osborne Partnership, working with Council officers is seeking to extend the initial pilot to a full-scale scheme and is currently applying for funds from a number of sources to make that possible. The current scheme has been operating on two days each week from St Elizabeth's Church Hall in Dagenham but that arrangement cannot continue long term and does not allow the project to operate at full capacity and properly test the scheme. As part of the Council commitment to support the pilot and pave the way to a proper commercial operation officers have been trying to find better premises for the project to continue.
- 2.2 The Osborne Partnership has expressed interest in a building on the Council site at Valence Depot. This area of the depot (the ex window factory) is currently leased to the contractor Lovell's and is being used to store and issue replacement kitchens for the 'Decent Homes' improvement project managed by the Housing and Health Department. The lease is based on the market valuation and expires at the end of September this year. Whilst Lovell's have indicated they might be interested in extending this arrangement, they are aware that we may require the area for an alternative use such as the Osborne Partnership. In the longer term there is a plan for the Valence Depot and though that is subject to a successful Heritage Lottery bid any arrangement with Osborne Partnership or any other tenant would have to be in keeping with that timetable. At present the longest period that any new lease could be granted for is 12 months.
- 2.3 Though the market rent for the property at Valence is £35,000 pa it is clear from the information already available that if the new enterprise is to remain viable the Osborne Partnership could not afford such a sum and would therefore need to be considered for a concessionary rent.
- 2.4 Officers are confident that the property at Valence Depot could be let commercially for a further period of 12 months at the market rent. Therefore if the Council wishes to demonstrate support for the work of the Osborne Partnership by allowing it to lease the property at Valence Depot it would have to recognise that this is only possible with the loss of all of the commercial rent.

3. Other considerations

- 3.1 The general expectations on the Council in this situation are clear – that it must be mindful of best value considerations and in most cases that would mean only letting buildings for a market rent. However the Council is entitled to take other matters into consideration when reaching any decision and it is clear that there are important social benefits associated with this proposal. These benefits are centred on the importance of creating employment for residents of the Borough who would otherwise have no work and face significant barriers to their employment. Supporting such citizens into employment directly relates to Council priorities such as increasing prosperity by increasing access to jobs.

- 3.2 If the Council were to grant a concessionary rent this needs to happen in the full knowledge that the social enterprise will be contracting with Trelleborg Stanton Limited which is a standard profit making company and not a charitable one. However it needs to be considered that since the whole purpose of a social enterprise of the sort that the Osborne Partnership are attempting to establish is to create a normal work experience for employees then it is inevitable that from time to time it will be necessary to work with commercial organisations.
- 3.3 Any lease arrangement with the Osborne Partnership would be on a full repairing and insuring basis and the Council would undertake a full condition survey before any negotiations were concluded to ensure that all parties were aware of the condition of the building.
- 3.4 Any lease would be likely to be for a period of 12 months only and there would be no necessary commitment on the part of the Council to support the Osborne Partnership for a longer period. Indeed the Council would wish to make it a condition of the granting of a concessionary rent for 12 months that the Partnership use that period to find another appropriate building for the social enterprise.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The help made available to the Osborne Partnership from Council departments to date can be absorbed within existing budgets. If the Executive agrees to the granting of a concessionary rent the full market rent would still need to be recorded as transfer of resources though no monetary cost is involved.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 The Department of Regeneration and Environment (Asset Management and Development) have been consulted and the Corporate Asset Management Group have agreed to this proposal.

THE EXECUTIVE

2 AUGUST 2005

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE STRATEGY

Title: Renaming of a Former Housing Amenity Green / Paved Area	For Decision
<p>Summary:</p> <p>The River, Village and Goresbrook Community Forum has, over the past couple of years, supported, through its small budget provision, a local environmental project involving the redevelopment of a former housing green adjoining land at the junction of Dagenham Avenue and the Heathway. The aim behind the project was to make a statement for the locality by seeking to improve an otherwise drab underused area, and in doing so provide a place for the local community to sit and rest and for young children to play.</p> <p>The project has demonstrated partnership working between the Council, the community, and other agencies.</p> <p>The final phase has now been completed, supported with monies from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister of around £63,000. This along with other match funding for earlier phases has enabled the Forum through its limited budgets to secure in the order of £100,000 of external funding towards this project.</p> <p>The labelling of the project originally as ‘Scheme on the Green’ was a reflection on the former housing amenity green which has now long gone. As a result the Forum Budget Steering Group, made up of Councillors and community representatives, has proposed that there should be a formal naming ceremony to mark the project’s completion, and to that end they feel a more appropriate name for the area would be Heathway Gardens, for which an official plaque will be produced.</p> <p>Wards Affected: River Ward</p>	
<p>Implications:</p> <p>Financial:</p> <p>No cost to the Council as provisions for a naming ceremony has already been accounted for in project costs.</p> <p>Legal:</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Risk Management:</p> <p>There are no risks to the Council insofar as this report is concerned.</p>	

Social Inclusion and Diversity:

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 places a requirement on local authorities to make an assessment of the impact of new and revised policies in terms of race equality. Existing policies have already been subjected to impact assessments. This Authority has adopted an approach of extending the impact to cover gender, disability, sexuality, faith, age and community cohesion.

As this report does not concern a new or revised policy there are no specific adverse impacts insofar as this report is concerned.

Crime and Disorder:

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a responsibility on local authorities to consider the crime and disorder implications of any proposals. In relation to this report there are no specific implications insofar as this report is concerned.

Recommendation

The Executive is asked to:

1. Consider naming the former housing amenity green adjoining land at the junction of Heathway and Dagenham Avenue as 'Heathway Gardens'; and
2. Note that subject to 1 above, an official naming ceremony will be arranged.

Reason

To assist the Council in achieving its Community Priorities of 'Raising General Pride in the Borough' and 'Making Barking and Dagenham Cleaner, Greener and Safer' as well as to mark the project's completion.

Contact Officer:

John Dawe

Title:

Democratic and Electoral
Services Manager

Contact Details:

Tel: 020 8227 2135

Fax: 020 8277 2171

Minicom: 020 8227 2685

E-mail: john.dawe@lbbd.gov.uk

Background papers used in the preparation of this report:

Agendas and minutes of River, Village and Goresbrook Community Forum and associated Budget Steering Group meetings.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 8, 9 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) 7, 8, 9 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