



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

# Cabinet

## Agenda

**MONDAY**  
**7 NOVEMBER 2011**  
**7.00 pm**

**COURTYARD ROOM**  
**HAMMERSMITH**  
**TOWN HALL**  
**KING STREET**  
**LONDON W6 9JU**

### Membership

Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh, Leader  
Councillor Nicholas Botterill, Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)  
Councillor Mark Loveday, Cabinet Member for Strategy  
Councillor Helen Binmore, Cabinet Member for Children's Services  
Councillor Joe Carlebach, Cabinet Member for Community Care  
Councillor Harry Phibbs, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement  
Councillor Andrew Johnson, Cabinet Member for Housing  
Councillor Greg Smith, Cabinet Member for Residents Services

**Date Issued**  
**27 October 2011**

If you require further information relating to this agenda please contact:  
David Viles, Committee Co-ordinator, Governance and Scrutiny, tel:  
020 8753 2063 or email: [David.Viles@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:David.Viles@lbhf.gov.uk)

Reports on the open Cabinet agenda are available on the Council's website: [http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council\\_and\\_Democracy](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Council_and_Democracy)

### DEPUTATIONS

Members of the public may submit a request for a deputation to the Cabinet on non-exempt item numbers **4-11** on this agenda using the Council's Deputation Request Form. The completed Form, to be sent to David Viles at the above address, must be signed by at least ten registered electors of the Borough and will be subject to the Council's procedures on the receipt of deputations. **Deadline for receipt of deputation requests: Wednesday 2 November.**

### COUNCILLORS' CALL-IN TO SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

A decision list regarding items on this agenda will be published by **Wednesday 9 November 2011**. Items on the agenda may be called in to the relevant Scrutiny Committee.

The deadline for receipt of call-in requests is: **Monday 14 November 2011 at 3.00pm**. Decisions not called in by this date will then be deemed approved and may be implemented.

A confirmed decision list will be published after 3:00pm on **Monday 14 November 2011**.

**Members of the Public are welcome to attend.**  
**A loop system for hearing impairment is provided, together with disabled access to the building**

# Cabinet Agenda

7 November 2011

<u>Item</u>		<u>Pages</u>
1.	<b>MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 10 OCTOBER 2011</b>	1 - 8
2.	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
3.	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b>	
	<p>If a Councillor has any prejudicial or personal interest in a particular report he/she should declare the existence and nature of the interest at the commencement of the consideration of the item or as soon as it becomes apparent.</p> <p>At meetings where members of the public are allowed to be in attendance and speak, any Councillor with a prejudicial interest may also make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter. The Councillor must then withdraw immediately from the meeting before the matter is discussed and any vote taken, unless a dispensation has been obtained from the Standards Committee.</p> <p>Where members of the public are not allowed to be in attendance, then the Councillor with a prejudicial interest should withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is under consideration, unless the disability has been removed by the Standards Committee.</p>	
4.	<b>THE GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME, HOUSING REVENUE CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND REVENUE BUDGET 2011/12 - MONTH 5 AMENDMENTS</b>	9 - 15
5.	<b>FUNDING REQUEST FOR TRI-BOROUGH ADDITIONAL COSTS</b>	16 - 19
6.	<b>USE OF 2011/12 HFBP PROFIT SHARE TO FUND E-SERVICES IN 2011-12</b>	20 - 24
7.	<b>CUSTODY PATHFINDER PILOT - YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE</b>	25 - 31
8.	<b>APPROVAL TO DELEGATE AWARD OF SEX AND RELATIONSHIPS AND SUBSTANCE MISUSE EDUCATION CONTRACT</b>	32 - 36
9.	<b>HEALTH AND SAFETY AUDIT PROGRAMME FOR HOUSING AND REGENERATION.</b>	37 - 46

<b>10.</b>	<b>OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION ON THE HOUSING ESTATE INVESTMENT PLAN</b>	<b>47 - 68</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>PLANNED PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE AND BREAKDOWN REPAIRS OF MECHANICAL PLANT IN SPECIALIST NON-HOUSING PROPERTIES; WORKS: PLANNED PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE FOR MECHANICAL SYSTEMS (INCLUDING AIR CONDITIONING) 2011-2015</b>	<b>69 - 72</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS</b>	<b>73 - 85</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF OPEN DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS, AND REPORTED TO CABINET FOR INFORMATION</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER, REPORTED TO THE CABINET FOR INFORMATION</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>15.</b>	<b>EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</b>	

The Cabinet is invited to resolve, under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, that the public and press be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business, on the grounds that they contain the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the said Act, and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption currently outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

<b>16.</b>	<b>EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 10 OCTOBER 2011 (E)</b>	
<b>17.</b>	<b>USE OF HFBP PROFIT SHARE TO FUND E-SERVICES IN 2011/12 : EXEMPT ASPECTS (E)</b>	
<b>18.</b>	<b>PLANNED PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE AND BREAKDOWN REPAIRS OF MECHANICAL PLANT IN SPECIALIST NON-HOUSING PROPERTIES. WORKS: PLANNED PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE FOR MECHANICAL SYSTEMS (INCLUDING AIR CONDITIONING) 2011 - 2015 : EXEMPT ASPECTS (E)</b>	
<b>19.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF EXEMPT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS, AND REPORTED TO CABINET FOR INFORMATION (E)</b>	
<b>20.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF EXEMPT URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER, AND REPORTED TO THE CABINET FOR INFORMATION</b>	

# Agenda Item 1

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham



# Cabinet

## Minutes

Monday 10 October 2011

### **PRESENT**

Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh, Leader  
Councillor Nicholas Botterill, Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)  
Councillor Helen Binmore, Cabinet Member for Children's Services  
Councillor Harry Phibbs, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement  
Councillor Andrew Johnson, Cabinet Member for Housing  
Councillor Greg Smith, Cabinet Member for Residents Services

### **ALSO PRESENT**

Councillor Caroline Needham

### **76. MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2011**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5 September 2011 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings, and that the outstanding actions be noted.

### **77. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from

### **78. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **79. NEW CORPORATE STRUCTURE**

The Leader announced that the post of Bi-borough Executive Director (previously known as Executive Director 'B' in the Bi-borough Environment Services proposals) will be entitled Bi-borough Executive Director of Transportation and Technical Services (para. 2.2 of the report).

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That approval be given to the new structure as set out in section 2 of this report.
2. That Full Council be recommended to amend the Council's Constitution to reflect the new job titles and job roles.

### **Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

### **Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

### **Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

### **Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

## **80. GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME, HOUSING REVENUE CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND REVENUE BUDGET 2011/12 - MONTH 4 AMENDMENTS**

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the changes to the capital programme as set out in Appendix 1 be approved.
2. That the changes to the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account revenue budgets as set out in Appendix 2 be approved.

### **Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

### **Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

### **Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

### **Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

## 81. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TAXICARD SCHEME**

With the permission of the Leader, Councillor Needham addressed Cabinet about the use of Taxicards for health-related journeys. While accepting that Taxicards were not designed to be used for this purpose, Councillor Needham pointed out that many people did use them for hospital and other health-related journeys. If the 30% of Taxicard trips made for health-related purposes were instead made by hospital or other transport, the resultant savings could be used to make the Taxicard scheme more generous. Councillor Needham felt that an opportunity had been missed to relieve pressure on the Taxicard scheme by negotiating with hospital transport providers.

Councillor Binmore pointed out that there were other means of making health-related journeys.

The Leader commented that Councillor Needham's point was well-made. Innovative ways of reducing costs would be needed, and delaying the introduction of further cost-saving measures until April 2014 would allow discussion to take place with other transport providers, including health partners.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the minimum user charge be increased by £1 per trip from £1.50 to £2.50 from January 2012.
2. That the Council's subsidy contribution be reduced by £2 per trip from January 2012.
3. That the automatic eligibility criteria be expanded and non-automatic eligibility from January 2012 be removed, as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report.
4. That in response to the public consultation, double swiping be maintained until April 2014.
5. That in response to the public consultation, the current annual trip limit be maintained until April 2014 when a monthly trip limit of 8 trips per month, as set out in paragraph 3.4 of the report, will be introduced.
6. That the eligibility of Taxicard users be reviewed and that the Taxicard database be sent to the national fraud initiative every two years.
7. That any unused contingency be carried over in the Taxicard scheme budget until 2014/15
8. That the Leader transfers Cabinet responsibility for the Taxicard scheme from the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Children's Services to the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Residents Services under the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

9. That the Leader transfers responsibility for the Taxicard scheme from the Director of Children's Services to the Director of Finance and Corporate Services under the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**82. DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORMHOLT AND WHITE CITY COLLABORATIVE CARE CENTRE AND HOUSING SCHEME LAND DISPOSAL AND SWAP**

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed swap of land within Wormholt Park with land at Sawley Road and Bryony Road as detailed in Appendix 2 (as amended) of the report be approved.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**83. LBHF AND RBKC RESPONSE TO THE GOVERNMENT'S REVISED PREVENT STRATEGY**

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Government's revised Prevent Strategy and its objectives be noted.
2. That the work with the Home Office and RBKC to develop a Prevent Programme be approved.
3. That the Leader of the Council, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Residents Services, signs off the Council's Prevent Programme and

use of any funding allocated to the borough for 2011/12 and 2012/13 by the Home Office.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**84. THE CONTRACT FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE BISHOPS PARK CAFE**

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**85. AWARD TO THE LOWEST TENDERER FOR THE REMOVAL OF ASBESTOS AT: RIVERSIDE GARDENS BLOCKS A-Q (1-171) AND S-T (180-199)**

**RESOLVED:**

That approval be given to place an order in the sum of £292,796 to Ayerst Environmental Ltd for the removal of asbestos to the roof compartments of selected blocks situated at Riverside Gardens.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.



**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**86. EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO THE CHILDREN'S ORAL HEALTH TASK GROUP**

**RESOLVED:**

That approval be given to the Executive Response to the Children's Oral Health Task Group set out at Appendix 1 and that Cabinet commend the Task Group report and recommendations to the NHS Primary Care Trust (PCT) for consideration.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**87. FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

The Forward Plan was noted.

**88. SUMMARY OF OPEN DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS, AND REPORTED TO CABINET FOR INFORMATION**

The summary was noted.

**89. SUMMARY OF URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER, REPORTED TO THE CABINET FOR INFORMATION**

The summary was noted.

**90. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED:**

That under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the remaining items of business on the grounds that they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of a person (including the authority) as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption currently outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

[The following is a public summary of the exempt information under S.100C (2) of the Local Government Act 1972. Exempt minutes exist as a separate document.]

**91. EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2011(E)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5 September 2011 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings, and that the outstanding actions be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**92. THE CONTRACT FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF BISHOPS PARK CAFE : EXEMPT ASPECTS (E)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the recommendation of the exempt report be approved.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**93. AWARD TO THE LOWEST TENDERER FOR THE REMOVAL OF ASBESTOS AT AT RIVERSIDE GARDENS BLOCKS A-Q (1-171) AND S-T (180-199) : EXEMPT ASPECTS (E)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

As set out in the report.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

As outlined in the report.

**Record of any conflict of interest:**

None.

**Note of dispensation in respect of any declared conflict of interest:**

None.

**94. SUMMARY OF EXEMPT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS, AND REPORTED TO CABINET FOR INFORMATION (E)**

The summary was noted.

**95. SUMMARY OF EXEMPT URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER, AND REPORTED TO THE CABINET FOR INFORMATION**

The summary was noted.

Meeting started: 19.00  
Meeting ended: 19.20

Chairman .....

# Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**LEADER**

*Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh*

**THE GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME,  
HOUSING REVENUE CAPITAL PROGRAMME  
AND REVENUE BUDGET 2011/2012 – MONTH 5  
AMENDMENTS.**

**Wards  
All**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval for changes to the Capital Programme and the Revenue Budget

**CONTRIBUTORS**

All Departments

**HAS A PEIA BEEN  
COMPLETED?**

N/A

**Recommendations:**

- 1. That the changes to the capital programme as set out in Appendix 1 be approved.**
- 2. That the changes to the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account revenue budgets as set out in Appendix 2**

**HAS THE REPORT  
CONTENT BEEN RISK  
ASSESSED?**

N/A

## 1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report sets out proposed amendments to both Capital and Revenue Estimates as at month 5.

## 2. GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

- 2.1 Table 1 summarises the proposed amendments to the 2011/12 General Fund capital programme and is detailed in Appendix 1.

**Table 1 – Summary of Proposed Amendments to the General Fund Capital Programme**

Service Area	Revised Budget at Month 4	Additions/ (Reduction)	Slippage	Revised Budget at Month 5
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Children's Services	15.729	0.114	0.202	16.045
Community Services (Adult Social Care )	1.898	0	0	1.898
Environment Services	15.849	(0.178)	(0.37)	15.634
Finance and Corporate Services	1.500	0	0	1.500
Resident's Services	8.887	(0.007)		8.880
<b>Total</b>	<b>43.863</b>	<b>(0.071)</b>	<b>0.165</b>	<b>43.957</b>

### 2.2 Movement in Expenditure

#### **Children's Services**

The budget movement from period 4 results in a net increase in the month 5 budget of £0.316m. A combination of reasons account for the changes (both additions and reductions) and these are detailed by scheme in Appendix 1.

#### **Environment Services**

The budget movement from period 4 results in a net reduction in the month 5 budget of £0.215m. A combination of reasons account for the changes (both additions and reductions) and these are detailed by scheme in Appendix 1.

#### **Residents Services**

The budget movement from period 4 results in a reduction in the month 5 budget of £0.007m. This relates to parks expenditure as detailed in Appendix 1.

## 3. REVENUE BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

- 3.1 The total adjustments to revenue budgets is £0.700m (Appendix 2).
- 3.2 Virements totalling £0.600m are required to realign the Housing Revenue Account budgets to account for services moving between divisions. The net effect to the Housing Revenue Account from this adjustment is nil.

- 3.3 One virement of £0.100m is proposed to General Fund budgets. This virement transfers budget from corporate resources to the Residents Services Department to cover the costs of a MTFS savings shortfall.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No.	Brief Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext. of holder of file/copy	Department
1.	Revenue Monitoring Documents	Gary Ironmonger Ext. 2109	Corporate Finance Room 38 , Town Hall
2.	Capital Monitoring Documents	Isaac Egberedu Ext. 2503	Corporate Finance Room 5, Town Hall

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Schemes	2011/12			
	Last Reported Budget at Month 4	Additions/ (Reductions)	Slippage	Revised Budget at Month 5
	£'000	£000's	£000's	£'000
<b>Targetted Capital</b>	125	0	0	125
<b>Lyric Theatre Development</b>	2,950	0	0	2,950
<b>Kitchens</b>	292	0	0	292
<b>Early Years</b>	0	0	51	51
<b>Primary Capital Programme</b>	2,986	0	0	2,986
<b>Devolved Capital to Schools</b>	452	0	0	452
<b>Other</b>	0	114	151	265
<b>Schools Capital Programme</b>	8,924	0	0	8,924
<b>Total Children's Services</b>	<b>15,729</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>16,045</b>

## General Fund Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16 Appendix 1

<b>ENVIRONMENT SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>				
<b>Schemes</b>	<b>2011/12</b>			
	<b>Last Reported Budget at Month 4</b>	<b>Additions/ (Reductions)</b>	<b>Slippage</b>	<b>Revised Budget at Month 5</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<b>Footways and Carriageways.</b>	1,950	294	0	2,244
<b>Planned Maintenance/DDA Programme</b>	4,543	1	(41)	4,503
<b>River Wall Repairs</b>	114	0	0	114
<b>Transport For London Schemes</b>	5,192	78	4	5,274
<b>Parking Reserve/mainstream</b>	850	102	0	952
<b>Developer Contribution Funded</b>	2,177	(653)	0	1,524
<b>Efficiency Reserve Fund</b>	436	0	0	436
<b>West London Grant</b>	540	0	0	540
<b>Others</b>	47	0	0	47
<b>Total Environment Services</b>	<b>15,849</b>	<b>(178)</b>	<b>(37)</b>	<b>15,634</b>



## General Fund Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16 Appendix 1

### RESIDENT'S SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Schemes	2011/12			
	Last Reported Budget at Month 4 £'000	Additions/ (Reductions) £'000	Slippage £'000	Revised Budget at Month 5 £'000
Other Parks Expenditure	451	(7)	0	444
Bishops Park	4,330	0	0	4,330
Play Builders	0	0	0	0
Shepherds Bush Common Improvements	4,106	0		4,106
Recycling	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Residents Services</b>	<b>8,887</b>	<b>(7)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8,880</b>

**APPENDIX 2 - VIREMENT REQUEST FORM**

**BUDGET REVENUE MONITORING REPORT – PERIOD 5**

<b>Details of Virement</b>	<b>Amount (£000)</b>	<b>Department</b>
Transfer of Regeneration team from Housing Services to Property Services	256 / (256)	HRA
Transfer of the Resident Involvement team which was formerly part of Commissioning & Quality Assurance division to Housing Services division	344 / (344)	HRA
Transfer from Corporate resources to RSD to offset an ongoing MTFs shortfall	100/(100)	RSD/CMB
<b>Total of Requested Virements (Debits)</b>	<b>700</b>	



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

### LEADER

*Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh*

### FUNDING REQUEST FOR TRI-BOROUGH ADDITIONAL COSTS

**Wards:  
All**

This report requests funding for the H&F share of the necessary additional staff costs, identified to date, that are being incurred in order to secure the delivery of the Tri-borough proposals and associated benefits which include £11m savings for H&F by 15/16.

### CONTRIBUTORS

Head of  
Transformation  
EDFCG  
ADLDS

**HAS A EIA BEEN  
COMPLETED?**

N/A

**HAS THE REPORT  
CONTENT BEEN RISK  
ASSESSED?**

N/A

### Recommendations:

1. That approval be given to fund the currently identified additional staff requirements as set out in para. 3 of the report for the period up to the end of 2011/12 - £314,000 and for 2012/13 – £238,000.
2. That specific Tri-borough business cases are presented to secure funding for further investment.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The 3 Councils agree that it is in their collective interest to keep to a necessary minimum the additional costs they each incur in order to deliver Tri-borough and secure the £33.4m savings alongside other benefits, such as protecting front line services. The H&F share of these savings is £11m<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 The Councils have therefore undertaken wherever possible to adjust the priorities of existing staff in order to undertake Tri-borough work; and thereby to avoid the need for additional spending.
- 1.3 However, in certain cases there is a requirement to create specific posts in order to secure the successful delivery of Tri-borough.
- 1.4 The Chief Executives of the 3 Councils agreed the principle to share the additional costs of filling these posts between the 3 Councils (or 2 Councils in the case of Bi-borough work). For the purposes of this report, the H&F cost share is simply calculated as either 1/3<sup>rd</sup> for Tri-borough or 1/2 for Bi-borough work.

## **2. REQUIREMENT FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF**

- 2.1 The main additional requirement is for programme and project management staff, to work alongside Directors and Senior Managers with the skills and capacity to drive the implementation and ensure that the Councils are able to secure the planned savings and other benefits.
- 2.2 The criteria used to determine additional staff costs are:
  - where a post has necessarily been created specifically to secure the delivery of the Tri-borough implementation and associated benefits; and
  - a Council has incurred additional costs as a result.
- 2.3 At regular intervals, aggregate costs incurred by each borough will be calculated and reviewed by the Chief Executives. Any payments necessary to distribute these costs fairly across the three boroughs will be made.

---

<sup>1</sup> (Attribution around Environment and Corporate Services is being further considered)

### **3. COSTS**

- 3.1 The H&F share of the additional costs identified to date for the period up to April 2012 are estimated to be £314,000.
- 3.2 The H&F share of the additional costs identified to date for April 2012 to April 2013 is £237,891.
- 3.3 With initiatives of the scale and complexity of Tri-borough it is highly likely that additional requirements, requiring funding, will be identified in the future. No contingency or allowance in the above figures for these yet to be specified requirements.
- 3.4 There are likely to be additional staff costs beyond April 2013 although based on current work plans these are not expected to be of the same magnitude.
- 3.5 There will be additional costs associated with ICT infrastructure, specialist large scale procurement e.g. Athena, Facilities Management. These will be the subject of separate business cases.

### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 4.1 Responsibility for Tri Borough Programme risk management resides within the governance structure outlined in the February 2011 Cabinet report and the proposal document 'Bold ideas for Challenging Times'. Further detail is set out in the document 'Tri-borough Risk Management' published to the H&F Overview and Scrutiny Board 21 September 2011.

### **5. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

- 5.1 It is estimated that the tri-borough programme will deliver annual revenue of more than £11m savings for Hammersmith and Fulham by 2015/16. Upfront investment is required if such savings are to be realised. As set out in this report approval is now required for this authority to contribute £0.314m in 2011/12 and £0.238m in 2012/13 toward the additional staff resources needed to take forward the programme. This will be met from contingency balances.
- 5.2 Further costs may well arise particularly regarding IT investment and use of procurement specialists. Approval for such expenditure will be subject to the agreement of specific business cases.

## 6. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, the Council must consider its obligations with regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). It must carry out its functions (as defined by the Human Rights Act 1998) with due regard to the duty and its effect on the protected characteristics in relevant and proportionate way.
- 6.2 In this case, none of the protected characteristics is relevant to, and none will be impacted by, the creation of posts or attributing costs to each borough, as these will have no effect on service users. H&F will comply with its own policies and procedures when recruiting to the posts.

## 7. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)

- 7.1. The Council's powers to enter into Tri-borough arrangements have been set out in earlier reports.

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000** **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Description of Background Papers</b>	<b>Name/Ext of holder of file/copy</b>	<b>Department/ Location</b>
1.	Bold Ideas for Challenging Times – Feb 2011	Martin Nottage x3542	FCS
2.	Tri-borough Implementation Plans – Cabinet paper June 2011	Kayode Adewumi x2499	FCS
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>		<b>NAME: EXT.</b>	



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**LEADER**

*Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh*

**USE OF HFBP PROFIT SHARE TO FUND E-SERVICES IN 2011/12**

**Ward(s):  
ALL**

In response to the administration's priorities of reforming public service delivery to ensure best possible outcomes at lowest cost, it is recognised that the Council needs to transform its relationship with customers and increase the ability for them to serve themselves whilst also ensuring satisfaction. In June 2011, HFBP presented the Council with a set of cost saving opportunities to support the delivery of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). This included an 'e-services' element that had been jointly developed by H&F and Agilysys. This report requests approval to use the anticipated HFBP profit share to pursue the e-services agenda as part of a wider self serve strategy.

A separate report on the exempt Cabinet agenda provides exempt information relating to the outcome of negotiations with Agilysys.

**Recommendation:**

**That the £825k HFBP profit share due to the Council in 2011/12 be used to deliver the Council's self serve agenda and to deliver £874k annual MTFS savings from 2012/13 as set out in the exempt report.**

**CONTRIBUTORS**

AD Customer Transformation  
EDFCG  
ADLDS  
AD IT Strategy and Procurement

**HAS AN EIA BEEN COMPLETED?  
YES**

**HAS THE REPORT CONTENT BEEN RISK ASSESSED?  
YES**

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1. In response to the administration's priorities of reforming public service delivery to ensure best possible outcomes at lowest cost, it is recognised that the Council needs to transform its relationship with customers and increase the ability for them to serve themselves whilst also ensuring satisfaction.
- 1.2. At the HFBP Board in early June 2011, the Leader of the Council and other Board members considered a set of cost saving opportunities to support the delivery of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). This included an 'e-services' element that had been jointly developed by H&F and Agilisys. This presented a range of opportunities to further automate access to services and indeed, where appropriate, full service delivery by telephone, web and mobile phone as part of a wider self serve strategy. This strategy would provide customers with the ability to transact with us 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This wholly aligns to the Government's 'Digital by Default' agenda.
- 1.3. This paper sets out proposals around e-services for Cabinet approval. Funding is now required to progress the self service strategy during 2011/12.

## **2. DEVELOPING A 'SELF SERVE' STRATEGY**

- 2.1. Self service is not a new concept. Self service is a deliberate and a critical element of the operating models of a range of private sector service organisations such as banks, supermarkets and utilities to put the customer in control and to reduce business operating costs. As part of this, customers are provided with the means to self serve a range of products and services on the web, telephone and indeed in face-to-face operations (e.g. self serve checkouts in supermarkets).
- 2.2. Learning from these experiences, H&F officers are analysing how the concept of self service can be applied more fundamentally in a Local Authority context and as a core part of the operating model to reduce costs.
- 2.3. Experience from other industries indicates that successfully achieving a shift in customer behaviour and thus a reduction in costs of customer access and service provision requires a more intelligent and customer focused approach. Moving away from a 'build it and they will come' philosophy, the most successful businesses have recognised the need to effect a capability shift ,e.g. developing our telephony and web capability as well as a mindset shift, e.g. customers being motivated and actively doing more for themselves.



### **3. THE ROLE OF E-SERVICES IN THE SELF SERVE AGENDA**

- 3.1 E-services are a key enabler to delivering a self serve agenda. The development of 'My Account' (our web based customer portal) in 2010/11 has been a significant step in improving the transactional capability of our website and indeed improving our online experience for customers. Since launching, 42,000 customers have registered and are actively using the portal. As a result, our website is deemed to be one of the best in the country. The development of this and other improvements have attracted a range of interest from other authorities who are trying to develop online services.
- 3.2 A recent external review of our website placed us in the SOCITM top 20, rating our website 17<sup>th</sup> in the country and third in London.
- 3.3 However, it is recognised that there is more that we can do. Further developing our website, telephony and mobile technologies to deliver a wider range of services and indeed delivering full, rather than parts of, services is a critical element in reducing the costs of service delivery.

### **4. 2011/12 STRATEGY AND KEY BENEFITS**

- 4.1 Our 2011/12 strategy focuses on high volume, transactional areas of the Council. By May 2013 we will provide a full self service offer to customers in the following areas:
- Housing Register
  - Development Management (Planning)
  - Licensing
  - Building Control
  - Libraries
  - Environmental Reporting
  - Adult Learning
- 4.2 The key benefits for the customer and the Council are:
- Providing 'end to end' e-enabled transactions- making it easier for our customers to transact with us both in terms of reporting, applying for, booking or paying for services.
  - Enabling customers to access services whenever they choose to do so – up to 365 days per year 24 hours per day.
  - Improving turnaround times for service provision by getting the customer to provide more information themselves or providing it in such a way that it enters direct into our systems, therefore not reliant upon officer input.

- Managing customer demands more effectively and reducing error demand;.
- Reducing our cost to serve and therefore enabling value to be extracted in terms of cashable savings.
- Protecting or in some cases driving up income including through cross selling services.
- Exploring implementing differing service levels and associated variable charging models to drive income and also incentivise behaviour. This builds on the service provided by Pay and Park where customers are able to pay a premium to receive their parking permit guaranteed the following day. Like many insurance companies, we will also explore discounting to encourage customers to access services in ways that are cheaper for the Council to administer.

## **5. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 5.1 This programme will be monitored by the Council's Transformation Management Office and will be listed on the corporate risk register. The programme will have a board of senior officers and associated stakeholder forum which will meet on a regular cycle to manage issues and risks and escalate these, as appropriate, through to the Assistant Director (Cleaner Greener Neighbourhoods), the senior responsible officer for the customer access and service delivery model portfolio. In addition, progress against this delivery and customer outcomes will be overseen by the corporate Transformation Board. Corporate benefits realisation will be tracked via the MTFs process, managed by Finance.

## **6. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There are no immediate equality implications relating to agreeing that the HFBP profit share be spent in this way. Further Equality Impact Assessments will be completed once the constituent projects are underway and service redesign options are being considered.

## **7. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

- 7.1. Further to the initial one off investment, the outlined 2011/12 self serve strategy will deliver ongoing net general fund annual savings of £874k per annum from 2012/13. One-off cash funding is requested to deliver the capability and associated efficiencies and it is proposed that this be made available from the HFBP profit share.

**8. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

8.1. There are no direct Legal implications.

**9. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PROCUREMENT and IT strategy (if relevant)**

9.1 There are no direct Procurement implications. The AD Procurement and IT strategy agrees with the recommendations of this report.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Description of Background Papers</b>	<b>Name/Ext of holder of file/copy</b>	<b>Department/ Location</b>
1.	Self serve strategy paper	Marie Snelling	RSD
<b>CONTACT OFFICER: Marie Snelling</b>		<b>NAME: EXT. 4288</b>	



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

### CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES

*Councillor Helen Binmore*

### CUSTODY PATHFINDER PILOT - YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE

**Wards:**  
**All**

**HAS THE REPORT CONTENT BEEN RISK ASSESSED?**  
**YES**

**HAS A EIA BEEN COMPLETED?**  
**YES**

Government plans to transfer costs of youth custody to local authorities, starting with a tapered transfer of costs for remanding young people in custody from 2012. This project provides means to reduce costs to the minimum, whilst ensuring public safety is not compromised.

It is a central element of government strategy to reduce costs of custody seeking evidence through this two year pilot so that savings can be made without compromising public safety. **Payment by results** – this is the first Youth Justice Pilot with a potential “claw back” arrangement; i.e. Government recovering investment grant (£300,000) at the end of year 2, proportionate to the degree that targets are achieved.

**Delivery** - A third sector partner is to be engaged to deliver the main programme over 2 years, following a competitive selection run by City of Westminster as lead authority. A four borough consortium has been established (Tri-Borough plus Ealing) to ensure sufficient scale to meet Youth Justice Board criteria. There are 3 other pilot sites – North east London (7 authorities) West Yorkshire and Birmingham.

### CONTRIBUTORS

EDCS  
EDFCG  
ADLDS

### Recommendations

1. **That approval be given to participate in Custody Pathfinder at a maximum potential cost of £85,335 if the claw back procedure has to be invoked due to targets being missed.**
2. **That progress from months 6 to 9 (April to June 2012) be reviewed to determine if progress is satisfactory to enter year 2 and the potential claw back phase.**

- 3. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, in conjunction with the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance and the Triborough Executive Director of Children's Services, to review progress and authorise progress to year two in September 2012 or withdrawal from the pilot at no financial cost.**
-

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. In preparation for an anticipated government policy change relating to local authority responsibility for paying for young offenders in custody, a West London Consortium of Boroughs made up of Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea, Westminster and Ealing have negotiated with the Youth Justice Board (YJB) to become a pathfinder area, with the aim of reducing the costs for young people in custody across the four boroughs.
- 1.2. The majority of cost of custody for young people is currently funded centrally by the Ministry of Justice (Under 15's remanded to local authority secure accommodation are funded at 1/3 by the local authority and 2/3 central government at present.) With a view to reducing the number of young people in custody the government has outlined its policy to transfer the costs of custody to Local Authorities in the future, starting with all costs for remanding young people in custody from 2014. This would remove any financial disincentive for local authorities to renege on their responsibilities to have effective supervision of young offenders in the community.
- 1.3. The two year pathfinder provides an upfront investment (£300,000) across the consortium to deliver a range of activities aimed at reducing the risk of custody and reducing risks of reoffending with an overall reduction in custody bed nights used by the consortium. As well as improving performance and sharing best practice across the four boroughs the consortium is currently proposing to commission a third sector partner to deliver these activities.
- 1.4. The West London consortium is to achieve at least an 11.8 % reduction against 2010/11 baseline. This is an equivalent of 7 less beds used for a year.

The Project consists of:

- Remand triage – engaging families to support their child in court and during a period of being on bail in the community rather than in custody
- Enhanced interventions – 1:1 tracking to engage disaffected young people to use bespoke activities designed for them in the community.
- Resettlement and accommodation – in year two to use registered social landlords to provide single units of accommodation for high risk young people to allow them to return from custody more quickly.

- Pre-sentence report improvement / court liaison – further improve the design and presentation of programmes of supervision in the community to strengthen court's confidence.
- 1.5. It has been necessary to work across 4 authorities to achieve a scale of potential saving that meets government's criteria. An investment grant is linked to the scale of the potential saving. The consortium in West London is large enough to attract £300,000 investment over 2 years. This allows adequate additional delivery in targeted areas to increase probability of achieving the required reductions in demand for custody beds and for a contract to be let to a third sector partner, further sharing risk.
  - 1.6. The grant agreement is governed by 'payment by results' criteria, in which a target reduction of custody bed nights (11.8% over two years) is set by the YJB and if this is not achieved over the course of the pathfinder, the consortium will have to repay some or all of this upfront investment. This process is known as "claw back". If the consortium does not achieve any reduction in the use of custody bed nights by the end of the pathfinder period then the full investment would have to be repaid. This is an unlikely outcome.
  - 1.7. The consortium will have the option of withdrawing from the pathfinder at the end of year one, on 30 September 2012, without incurring any claw back costs. This allows a decision on the potential risk for claw back being incurred can be based on information on the impact of the activities introduced through the pathfinder scheme.

## **2. RISK MANAGEMENT:**

- 2.1. **Financial Risk:** To share and mitigate the risk of claw back and share it appropriately between consortium members the following risk management plan is suggested. There is no risk of claw back in year one. If targets are not achieved the project can be ended with no penalty by either side.
- 2.2 To work together with consortium members and a third sector provider to achieve an 11.8% reduction in custody bed nights (2,391 bed nights) in each Local Authority by September 2013. Officers across the four local authorities believe this is an achievable target reduction. This follows an assessment based on existing trends, which demonstrate an overall reduction in custody bed nights across the four local authorities for the last five years and the opportunities identified for sharing best practice.
- 2.3 The conditions of the grant agreement recognise the risk of 'spike events', where custody numbers are distorted by a one off group of previously unknown young people. If a spike event occurs during the course of the pathfinder, which results in three or more previously

unknown young people being remanded or sentenced to custody for any length of time, these young people will not be counted as part of the pathfinder target.

- 2.4 A project board has been established to monitor progress and to measure reductions in custody bed nights, culminating in a six month review of progress across the consortium. Monitoring reports will be made available to all senior officers/members involved. If, after six months, an aggregate of less than a 4% reduction in bed nights has been achieved across the four Local Authorities involved, the consortium will withdraw from the pathfinder with no risk of claw back.
- 2.5 If a 4% reduction is achieved after six months, risk will be managed by continuing to monitor progress from month six to month eleven and agree that if the reduction in custody bed nights is between 4.1% and 6.7% at the end of month nine further analysis and sign-off from lead officers/members would be required to continue with the pathfinder project. If the risk is deemed too great the consortium will serve notice during month eleven to withdraw from the pathfinder with no risk of claw back.
- 2.6 To agree that if a 6.7% reduction or higher is achieved across the consortium by month nine, the consortium would automatically continue with the pathfinder. A 6.7% reduction at the end of month nine would mean that even if no further reductions are achieved in year two the total risk of claw back is reduced to £150,000 or approximately £37,500 per borough. There remains a greater risk attached if the number of bed nights increases in year two.
- 2.7 To establish a model for sharing the amount of claw back if a 6.7% reduction is achieved after nine months and the pathfinder continues into year two. If custody levels were to increase in year two, the maximum risk of claw back remains at £300,000, the full grant payment. The model for sharing the amount of claw back has an element of equal sharing of repayment risk to recognise the shared responsibility across the consortium, and an element based on the proportion of bed nights currently used to recognise the different degrees to which each borough impacts on the overall reduction. Additionally, the consortium would set aside an amount of funding equivalent to the difference between the maximum liability each borough would have under a purely proportional split of the repayment so that no borough is subsidising another in the event of repayment. This is outlined in detail below.
- 2.8 To share any successes equally across the consortium i.e. where a Local Authority exceeds the 11.8% target reduction in custody bed nights the benefits will be shared equally across the consortium in order to mitigate against any underachievement.



- 2.9 To incorporate payment by results criteria within the tendering process to ensure that the risk of claw back is also shared with the third sector partner, encouraging best practise and further reducing the risk of claw back for each Local Authority.
- 2.10 The project will be put on the risk register fro the Children's Services Department in September 2012 if the project progresses to year two when the risk of claw back of the investment by central government could be invoked.
- 2.11 **Risk of harm to the public:** It is not considered that a risk to the public will arise. Assessments will be made on suitability for a young offender to be remain in the community, as now and decisions made by courts. Any indication of failing to comply will result in arrest and return to court. Additional services are being used to engage young people and their families to mitigate increased risks.

### **3. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

- 3.1. Being part of the Pathfinder is a good opportunity that allows the 4 boroughs to gain funding which can then be used to put in place new processes and interventions, as well as the sharing of best practice, to help reduce custody bed nights prior to the introduction of Local Authorities becoming responsible for funding this.
- 3.2. Alongside the £300,000 investment from the Youth Justice Board, each of the four boroughs has agreed to put forward £5,000 from their remand budgets in order to boost initial funding for project management to allow the project to commence.
- 3.3 The risk to each borough has been worked out as follows:
1. The first £150,000 shared equally amongst the boroughs - £37,500 each.
  2. The remaining £150,000 shared proportionally amongst the boroughs on the basis of how many bed nights in custody each borough contributed towards the base line amount of bed nights which was for the year 2010/11. For Hammersmith & Fulham, this was 31.9% of the total.
- 3.4 Hammersmith & Fulham's maximum liability to contribute to the claw back therefore is £85,335, or 28% of the funding. It is unlikely that some reduction in bed nights will not be achieved, therefore this figure is a worst case scenario. As soon as the reduction in bed nights hits 5.9%, which it is hoped to do by the end of year 1, the risk is shared equally as the maximum claw back is then £150,000.

3.5 With a break clause at the end of year 1, the financial risk to the borough can be reduced to £0 if the Pathfinder does not look to be delivering the expected results. Therefore it is important to monitor the reduction against the base line figures, and work has already started to produce combined reports across the four boroughs that allows this monitoring.

**4. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 25% of those in custody in Hammersmith and Fulham are white, with Black, Mixed and other ethnic groups making up 75%. 7% are female. The plans to provide enhanced services to support individual young offenders to make use of bespoke activities to reduce their risk of offending is designed in explicit recognition of the additional support needed for young offenders from minority ethnic groups.

**5. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

5.1 There are no direct legal implications for the purposes of this report.

**6. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PROCUREMENT**

6.1 Westminster City Council is acting as lead authority for the Custody pathfinder project and they will run a competition on behalf of the consortium to select the partner, with input from Hammersmith and Fulham and the other two authorities. Hammersmith and Fulham procurement officers will be used to advise the Head of YOS on the proposed tendering documents when they are available from Westminster.

6.2 Once the contract has been awarded by WCC, it will need formal Cabinet approval in Hammersmith and Fulham to access the contract. The contract will be entered into by the lead authority and access will be approved by the 4 borough Project Board.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	Cabinet Briefing 19/9/11	Larry Wright ext 6219	YOS/Children's Services
2.	Risk Register Appendix 1	Larry Wright ext 6219	YOS/Children's Services
3.	Project Delivery Plan	Larry Wright ext 6219	YOS/Children's Services
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>		<b>Larry Wright</b>	<b>EXT 6219</b>



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**CABINET MEMBER  
CHILDREN'S  
SERVICES**

*Councillor Helen  
Binmore*

**APPROVAL TO DELEGATE AWARD OF SEX AND  
RELATIONSHIPS AND SUBSTANCE MISUSE  
EDUCATION CONTRACT**

**Wards  
All**

This tender is seeking a single provider to re-develop, manage and deliver the highly regarded sex and relationships and substance misuse programme currently delivered in LBHF schools, colleges and youth settings.

**Rationale for tender**

- Reduce inefficiencies
- Improve effectiveness
- Ensure better value for money

The report requests approval to delegate the award of the contract to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services.

**CONTRIBUTORS**

EDFCG  
ADLDS  
EDCS

**HAS A EIA BEEN  
COMPLETED?  
YES**

**Recommendations:**

1. **That the joint commissioning of this service be approved.**
2. **That approval be given to enter into a contract for a value of £148,810 from Hammersmith & Fulham.**
3. **That approval be given to a 16 month contract from 1 December 2011 to 31 March 2013 with a possible extension of up to two years, subject to funding and good performance.**
4. **That Contract Standing Orders be waived (for the reasons detailed under section 3.4.1 of the report ) and the awarding of the contract for the delivery of Sex and Relationship and Substance Misuse Education Programme be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services in conjunction with the Tri-borough Executive Director of Children's Services.**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services agreed through a Cabinet Member's Decision that officers undertake a commissioning exercise for the delivery of a Sex and Relationship and Substance Misuse Education Programme within Hammersmith & Fulham.
- 1.2 As part of our tri-borough working officers from H&F and Westminster explored the opportunities to develop a joint service specification for the delivery of such a programme across the two boroughs.
- 1.3 In September 2011 Westminster agreed to the joint commissioning of this service, with the finances for Westminster set out at section 3.5.3 of this report.

## **2. SERVICE TO BE COMMISSIONED**

- 2.1 The Council plans to commission a service that will offer a universal, holistic sex, relationships, drug and alcohol education, advice and guidance service (only drug and alcohol in Westminster). This entails the liaison between schools (primary, secondary, special, etc), colleges, youth clubs and voluntary groups and the coordination, recruitment and human resources support for the delivery staff.
- 2.2 In previous years we have delivered a similar service, with some in-house co-ordination and some external spot purchasing. It has been recognised by the Teenage Pregnancy Board that the delivery of such a programme has been one of the key contributory factors to our successful reduction in teenage pregnancy rates (there has been a decrease of 38.8% since the strategy started in 1998, which is the third largest decrease in London and the sixth largest in England).

## **3. PROPOSALS**

- 3.1 To commission one organisation to manage the end to end process for the above service within Hammersmith & Fulham and City of Westminster.
- 3.2 That Hammersmith & Fulham are the lead commissioners for this service.
- 3.3 That the contract runs for 16 months from 1 December 2011 until 31 March 2013 with up to two years extensions subject to continued funding and good performance from the successful provider.

### 3.4 Timeframe

3.4.1 Following the creation of the Localities teams and staff securing new positions, it was agreed by the Cabinet Member that officers should undertake a commissioning exercise in order to realise efficiencies as outlined under section 3.5. In order to have as short a gap in service delivery as possible, we need to ensure a contract is in place for December 2011 to allow for the following:

- Programme re-design
- Recruitment of staff
- Co-ordination and planning of class based sessions

Activity	Date
Advertise Contract	09/09/11
PQQ Deadline	26/09/11
Invite to Tender	17/10/11
ITT Deadline	14/11/11
Contract Award	November 2011

### 3.5 Finances

3.5.1 The proposed commissioning of this service has allowed savings of £47,493 to be identified within 2011.

3.5.2 The contractor will also be expect to make saving of 10% year on year throughout the lifespan of this contract on the H&F element from 2012. The contractor will be expected to identify how the savings can be made, it is envisaged that this will be through economies of scale and lower overheads.

3.5.3 The available budget year on year with savings deducted is as follows:

Authority	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
H&F	44,310	104,500	94,050	84,645
WCC	9,000	36,000	16,693	16,693 – Although not confirmed yet
<b>Total</b>	<b>53,310</b>	<b>140,500</b>	<b>110,743</b>	<b>101,338</b>

### 3.6 Tender Appraisal Panel

3.6.1 A Tender Appraisal Panel has been established for the commissioning of this service, which consists of the following:

- Youth commissioner – H&F
- Children's commissioning manager – INWL NHS

- Acting head of joint commissioning substance misuse – WCC
- Localities Team Manager
- School Representative
- Legal
- CHS Finance
- Corporate Procurement

3.6.2 Tenders will be evaluated by at least 3 members form the Tender Appraisal Panel.

3.6.3 Short-listed bidders will be invited to submit their best value proposals for delivering the service over the contract period. Award of the contract will be made on the basis of the following quality:cost ratio; 70% quality and 30% cost.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 That Cabinet agree to the joint commissioning of this service.

4.2 That Cabinet agree to enter into a contract for a value of £148,810 from Hammersmith & Fulham

4.3 That Cabinet agree to a 16 month contract from 1 December 2011 to 31 March 2013 with a possible extension of two times 12 months, subject to funding and good performance.

4.4 That Cabinet agree waive Contract Standings orders and delegate to the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services in conjunction with the Director of Children’s Services the contract award for the delivery of Sex and Relationship and Substance Misuse Education Programme.

#### **5. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

5.1. There is full funding available in the 2011-12 and 2012 -13 budget required for this tender. The finance team will work with the department to ensure that the project is on track throughout the year, and it will be included in the budget monitoring process.

#### **6. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

6.1 Legal Services will work with the client department to ensure that the procurement of the contract is in accordance with the Council’s contract standing orders and EU procurement rules.

**7. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY)**

7.1 The award of contracts in excess of £100,000 would normally be a Key Cabinet Decision. However, waivers to this requirement are permissible under the Council's Contracts Standing Orders where the services required are urgent; it is in the Council's overall interest; there are exceptional circumstances; prior Cabinet approval has been obtained.

7.2 Corporate Procurement will work with the client department to ensure that the procurement of the contract is tendered in accordance with the Council's contract standing orders, policies and procedures.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Description of Background Papers</b>	<b>Name/Ext of holder of file/copy</b>	<b>Department/ Location</b>
1.	National Teenage Pregnancy Strategy	Emma Sleight 020 3350 4324	Children's Services
2.	Local 2009-2010 Teenage Pregnancy Strategy and Action Plan	Emma Sleight 020 3350 4324	Children's Services
3.	National Drug Strategy	Emma Sleight 020 3350 4324	Children's Services
4.	The National Alcohol Strategy	Emma Sleight 020 3350 4324	Children's Services
5.	Hidden Harm: responding to the needs of children of problem drug users	Emma Sleight 020 3350 4324	Children's Services
6.	Cabinet Members Decision Paper	Committee Service X2368	Committee Services
7.	Westminster Gate Paper	Helen Byrne	Westminster City Council
8.	Tender Documents	Terry Clark X6220	Children's Services HTHX
<b>CONTACT OFFICER: Terry Clark</b>		<b>NAME: Terry Clark</b> <b>EXT. 6220</b>	

# Agenda Item 9



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**LEADER**

*Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh*

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING**

*Councillor Andrew Johnson*

**HEALTH AND SAFETY AUDIT PROGRAMME FOR HOUSING AND REGENERATION**

**Wards: All**

Outlining the proposed independent health and safety audit programme for the Housing and Regeneration Department, focusing on the main property related legislative requirements with respect to gas, fire, legionella and asbestos safety.

**CONTRIBUTORS**

EDHR  
EDFCG  
ADLDS

HAS A EIA BEEN COMPLETED?  
YES

HAS THE REPORT CONTENT BEEN RISK ASSESSED?  
YES

**Recommendations:**

1. That approval be given to appoint Frankhams Ltd as the health and safety auditor for the four year assurance programme for gas, fire, legionella and asbestos safety across the HRD portfolio.
2. That approval be given to a Health and Safety Audit Programme for Housing and Regeneration at a total cost of £111,937.50 over four years funded from existing budgets.



## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1. Health and safety auditing is an essential part of the monitoring and review process, providing essential feedback enabling continuous improvement of LBHF HRD health and safety management system.
- 1.2 Following reintegration with the Council an independent process is needed to ensure HRD is compliant with legislative requirements with respect to the key property health and safety areas, primarily gas, asbestos, fire and legionella safety.
- 1.3 The audit programme will provide the information to assure HRD that it is legally compliant and furnish recommendations on how to improve performance where identified.
- 1.4 The specific legislation with respect to this work is:
  - Gas safety :The Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations 1998
  - Fire safety :The Regulatory Reform (Fires Safety) Order 2005
  - Asbestos :The Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 2006
  - Legionella :The Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations 2002
- 1.5 The audit process will test compliance with internal and external requirements, that roles and responsibilities are allocated and that the management system in each case is suitable.
- 1.6 The audit will also comment on the suitability of the safety management system for each of the four disciplines, including their clarity, potential effectiveness and the degree of compliance with legislation found.
- 1.7 The audit will involve physical inspection of a sample of 40 premises across the portfolio per quarter for the first two years and forty properties per six months for years three and four, over a four year programme.
- 1.8 This work falls outside of the existing remit of the Council's audit team, and is not within the scope of their routine audit work. The requirement of this proposed statutory compliance audit is for auditors to hold specific health and safety qualifications as cited in the tender brief i.e. to have all four areas of gas, fire ,asbestos and legionella covered by a competent person(s). This proposal is for a technical audit that investigates LBHF management of the manner in which our policies are applied, as well as testing the safety management system.

## **2. PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

- 2.1. Soft market testing was done in March 2011 which indicated a cost of £72,000. HRD DMT extended the scope of the audit programme to include

Housing Options stock and extended the length of the programme by an additional year to 4 years.

2.2 A full tender was then undertaken using the RFQ process on the London Tenders Portal. An ITT, Specification, Form of Tender and a Consultancy Agreement were prepared in conjunction with Legal Services. The tender was posted on the portal on 4 August 2011 with a return date of 1 September 2011. During the tender period, some tenderers' questions were posted on the portal, and two requests for an extension to the tender period received. Questions were responded to via the portal and a week's extension to the tender period granted. Opportunity was taken at this time to positively remind tenderers that the return time was 03.00 hrs as defined by the 24 hour clock.

2.3 The tender documentation stated that the contract would be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender calculated on the basis of a 70:30 quality: price split.

2.4 Forty six expressions of interest were received, nine opt-out notices were returned through the portal and two tenders received. The lower of the two tenders received was from Frankham Consultancy, the higher of the two tenders (which was approximately double the price from Frankham) was technically non-compliant on the following counts:

- No accounts information received or available through CreditSafe
- Only one acceptable reference received (the ITT specified that two acceptable references were required and tenderers were asked to submit three)

Frankham's tender was scored at 87% overall, and their tender submission represents a sound, professional approach to the requirement.

2.5 Due to the fact that there was only one compliant tender, a value for money exercise reviewed the lower tender against the original estimate derived from the soft market testing. The initial estimate was based on a three year programme with twenty properties visited per audit, at an approximate cost of £24k per annum.

2.6 The lower tender, taking into account that each audit will involve forty property visits, is based on a full first year cost of £42k. The tendered cost of £112k takes into account that certain elements of the specification reduce over subsequent years.

Spend profile is as follows:

Year 1	£42k
Year 2	£35k
Year 3	£17.5k
Year 4	£17.5k

- 2.7. This amounts to a total of £112k. If the pre-tender estimate were to be extrapolated on a pro-rata basis to the final requirement, it would provide an estimated figure of £130k. The tender from Frankham Consultancy is based on them being able to provide all of the expertise in house, and therefore affords the most economic solution. On the basis of the re-visited pre-tender estimate, the offer from Frankham Consultancy represents value for money.

### **3. CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 The audit is a necessary undertaking to demonstrate that our activities in respect of these four key areas are compliant with statutory legislation. The audit specification has been designed to provide in-built efficiencies by making use of common access arrangements across all four disciplines. The offer from Frankham Consultancy affords value for money and it is therefore recommended Frankham Consultancy is appointed as the Health and Safety auditor for a four year assurance programme for gas, fire, legionella and asbestos safety across the HRD portfolio.

### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 4.1. Following the reintegration of Housing Options and Regeneration Services with H&F Homes into HRD an independent assurance process is needed to ensure the change management process has not affected health and safety performance and that legal compliance is achieved. This objective is specifically reflected in the council's risk policy.
- 4.2 Compliance with gas, fire, legionella and asbestos safety across the HRD portfolio is included on the HRD risk register.

### **5. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 An EIA is available electronically. This audit programme helps ensure that the statutory maintenance requirements are being undertaken, and benefits all tenants equally, irrespective of vulnerability or protected rights.

### **6. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

- 6.1. The costs of the Health & Safety Audit programme will be funded from within existing revenue provision within the Housing Revenue Account and General Fund.

**7. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

7.1. Legal services has advised the client department during the procurement process. The procurement has been carried out in accordance with the Council's contract standing orders and EU procurement rules and principles.

**8. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (PROCUREMENT & I.T. STRATEGY)**

8.1 The AD supports the recommendations contained in the report.

8.2 The tender has been undertaken using the Council's e-tendering system and complies with the Council's Contracts Standing Orders.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Description of Background Papers</b>	<b>Name/Ext of holder of file/copy</b>	<b>Department/ Location</b>
1.	Tender documentation	Ian Watts 1848	HRD
<b>CONTACT OFFICER: Health and Safety Adviser</b>		<b>NAME: Paul Williams</b> <b>EXT. 07825504131</b>	

**APPENDIX 1**  
**SPECIFICATION**

**For**

**SERVICES TO UNDERTAKE**

**A**

**STATUTORY COMPLIANCE AUDIT**

**IN RESPECT OF**

**GAS SAFETY, LEGIONELLA MANAGEMENT, FIRE SAFETY &  
ASBESTOS MANAGEMENT**

**for the**

**THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM**

**From October 2011 to July 2015**

**The information contained in this brief is strictly confidential and exempt from  
disclosure under FOI.**

## **SUMMARY**

The Housing & Regeneration Department (HRD) (and any successor departments) of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham (the Council) has arrangements in place to carry out Gas Safety Testing, Management of Legionella, Fire Safety Management and Asbestos Management across its housing stock. The Council wishes to establish that these arrangements are statutorily compliant.

A routine audit process is to be commissioned to cover all four areas of compliance for a period of 4 years, starting October 2011.

The Council is looking to appoint a contractor who can demonstrate appropriate qualifications in all four areas amongst its staff, and which can deliver the audit outputs in the most efficient manner.

### **1.0 BACKGROUND**

Arrangements for provision of the four services are outsourced. There is a separate provider for each service (note: Other providers may be used for temporary accommodation).

Gas Safety Checks by PH Jones (northern area) & Robert Heath (southern area)  
Legionella Management currently provided by Clearwater with a new contractor due to start 1 September 2011.  
Fire Risk Assessments under RRO 2005 by Cyril Sweett  
Asbestos Management by Ayerst Environmental

The audit is intended to demonstrate suitable assurance of these arrangements.

### **2.0 BRIEF**

Health and safety auditing is an integral part of the monitoring and review process, providing essential feedback for continuous improvement of the Council's HRD health and safety management system.

A process is required to ensure HRD is compliant with legislative requirements with respect to gas, asbestos, fire and legionella.

The audit programme shall be designed to provide HRD with the information to demonstrate that it is legally compliant, and to provide recommendations on how to improve performance. The audit programme shall test to see if legal compliance is being achieved, and if an appropriate level of performance is being achieved for the Social Housing sector.

Audits shall be undertaken on the four main risk areas, namely:

- Gas safety
- Management of Legionella
- Fire Safety
- Management of Asbestos

These are the current key areas of risk within HRD, and it is vital that the Council, as a provider, achieves a high level of management in each area.

### **3.0 APPROACH**

The audit programme shall be designed and developed to report on the following:

- Identification of policies, processes and procedures required by legalisation and best practice guidance for each area

- Identification of staff/managers who are given specific responsibilities, and the nature of these responsibilities
- Identification of the specific legal duties in each case, and the relevant guidance & best practice
- Report on the suitability of the safety management system for each area, in terms of their approach to the relative risk, clarity, potential effectiveness, and the degree of compliance with legislation found.

Key test criteria are:

1. The degree of compliance with health and safety performance standards;
2. The degree of compliance with respect to legislation;
3. Areas where standards are absent or inadequate;
4. Achievement of stated objectives within given time-scales;
5. Trends and common features;

The audit approach shall be developed through an assessment of risks and management controls operating within each area of the scope.

A rating system to determine level of compliance as part of the process shall reflect the following;

*Level 4* - Best practice that *at least* equals the requirements of legislation and frequently exceeds them

*Level 3* - Good practice in health and safety management, giving a high degree of reliability and assurance that the department is meeting the requirements of legislation as they apply to the department

*Level 2* - Reflects positive action, which demonstrates that the department is taking steps to improve its systems for health and safety management, though these systems are not sufficiently robust to assure compliance with all aspects of legislation and national guidance

*Level 1* - Indicates a basic level of performance, such that policies are passively accepted without taking positive steps to integrate them into the management systems

*Level 0* - No identified performance against the relevant indicator

#### **4.0 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

To prepare a quarterly audit plan, with the initial audit comprising a full audit of systems and site inspections. The subsequent audits in the year only involving site inspections.

Subsequent years will involve a review of systems in the first audit plus site inspections, subsequent audits in that year only involving site inspections.

If a high level of compliance is demonstrated in Years 1 & 2, the frequency of audits in Years 3 & 4 may be reduced to 6 monthly.

The contractor shall prepare a programme, and report on the delivery of service against that programme.

The contractor shall report periodically during each audit and shall submit proposals for reporting frequencies with the bid.

The audits are to demonstrate compliance in the following areas:

- Gas

The Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations 1998 (3rd edition) concerns all gas installations. The audit would test our compliance with the landlord's legal duty to both maintenance and annual safety inspections and the LBHF process for this and include those that LBHF has a duty of care to such as those in temporary accommodation.

- Legionella

A legionella audit was carried out in 2009 which resulted in a significant contract review. The new contract which is due to commence on 1 September 2011 is specified to be compliant with L8.

- Fire

Fire risk assessments are required under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. The audit would examine the arrangements in place to comply with this legislation and in particular that risk assessments are in place and suitable and sufficient.

- Asbestos

The control of Asbestos at Work Regulations set a strict framework for the management of asbestos. The audit shall test the defined responsibilities and processes in asbestos management. The audit will consider the nominated legislative roles being discharged, compliance in terms of information available, communication of the information and training of those involved.

For the avoidance of doubt, where there are changes to the legislative or regulatory requirements during the duration of the contract, the audits must demonstrate compliance with any such new requirements.

## **5.0 ON SITE AUDIT WORK**

In addition to the office based systems audit work, the audit process shall sample compliance in 40 properties on a quarterly basis visiting 160 premises over a one year cycle.. The contractor will be provided with a full list of properties classified by size or type of property. The housing stock consists of circa 18,000 tenanted & leasehold properties with 67 high rise blocks and a blend of 4 storeys and below, and street properties, 10 hostels and 12 sheltered blocks. A further 1000 properties are comprised of Private Licence Agreements (PLA) and Public Sector Leasing (PSL), with some hostel and bed and breakfast premises used for housing people on a temporary basis.

## **6.0 COMPETENCIES**

The contractor shall provide auditors with demonstrable experience in carrying out audits with large multi-site organisations, preferably within a social housing context. Specific auditor qualifications shall be:

- Gas

A Gas Safe qualification enabling understanding gas systems and the legal requirements with respect to compliance to gas safety legislation.

- Legionella

WMS accredited or City and Guilds qualification with respect to safety of water systems or a relevant public health qualification such as the Environmental Health Diploma.

- Fire

The fire safety management element of the audit programme must be carried out by someone who has attained the competency standard for persons who carry out fire risk assessments on a commercial basis. This would include the NEBOSH Fire Certificate or IFE Fire Risk Assessors course or Professional membership (or entitlement to) a recognised body minimum level of Tech IOSH or AIFireE.



- Asbestos

The SO301 qualification with respect to asbestos management.

## **7.0 TIMELINE**

Fieldwork will commence during October 2011 and each quarterly audit shall be completed and reported on within one calendar month of commencement.

An exit meeting shall be held on completion of the fieldwork after 20 days to discuss findings and recommendations, and the draft report shall be issued within 10 working days of the exit meeting being held.

Any slippage to the programme shall be managed out during the next audit. Should the programme slip for two successive audits, the contractor shall be viewed as being in default.

## **8.0 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

**8.1** The contractor is to allow within his tender to carry out all of the specified works and no claim for additional costs will be accepted on the grounds of lack of knowledge.

**8.2** The contractor shall be responsible for arranging access to the selected properties. The Council will issue the contractor with a letter of authorisation outlining the work the auditor is undertaking on site. The contractor's personnel are to wear identification badges in a prominent position at all times when undertaking in site visits.

**8.3** The following documents, provided with the tender documents, form part of the Contract Documents:

- 8.3.1 Council's Health & Safety Policy
- 8.3.2 Council's Legionella Management Policy
- 8.3.3 Council's Fire Safety Policy
- 8.3.4 Council's Asbestos Policy

**8.4** The contractor will be issued with drop keys to gain access to most multi storey blocks. It is the contractor's responsibility however to gain access to all properties for the purposes of carrying out the required services.. Where street properties are difficult to access and no keys are available for issue, the contractor must operate a process for making appointments outside normal working time during the hours of 18:00 hours – 20:30 weekdays or 09:00 – 14:30 hours on Saturdays. The contractor is to include for all associated costs within his tender price.

# Agenda Item 10



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

## Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**CABINET MEMBER  
FOR HOUSING**  
*Councillor Andrew  
Johnson*

**OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION ON THE  
HOUSING ESTATE INVESTMENT PLAN**

**Wards:  
All**

This report details the outcome of the consultation process on the Housing Estates Investment Plan and the next steps planned in bringing forward the first estate to be considered under this new programme

**CONTRIBUTORS**

EDFCG  
ADLDS

**Recommendations:**

- 1. That the outcome of the consultation exercise on the Housing Estate Investment Plan be noted.**
- 2. That approval be given for officers to undertake an assessment, using the selection criteria under the Housing Estate Investment Plan selection criteria, and to report back to Cabinet with a recommended estate to be the first to benefit from the Housing Estate Investment Plan.**

**HAS A EIA BEEN  
COMPLETED?**  
N/A

**HAS THE REPORT  
CONTENT BEEN  
RISK ASSESSED?**  
YES

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On 18 April 2011 Cabinet approved consultation on the Housing Estate Investment Plan (HEIP). The report set out a borough wide process by which Council estates of more than 100 units would be considered for wider estate improvements, the type of improvements that would be considered, how the improvements would be funded and the selection criteria that would be used to decide which estates would be brought forward.
- 1.2 The Council is committed to improving the lives of residents across the borough, and to making neighbourhoods and housing estates in the borough attractive places with good reputations where people want to live, both now and in the future.
- 1.3 The Council recognises that in some parts of the borough there are lower levels of satisfaction with the local area and public services, problems with crime and anti social behaviour and where there are worse outcomes for some residents and their families, with, for instance, poorer health, poorer educational outcomes, higher levels of overcrowding, unemployment, and lower than average incomes.
- 1.4 Methods for improving neighbourhoods are numerous. Where it is appropriate and viable comprehensive regeneration, involving demolition and rebuilding, is being taken forward by the Council. However, for most neighbourhoods in the borough comprehensive regeneration is not an appropriate solution. Achieving positive change will require alternative approaches.
- 1.5 There is a body of independent research (set out in the April Cabinet report) to guide the Council on what methods work best to improve neighbourhoods. Independent research indicates that proactive intervention into neighbourhoods can have positive and lasting effects, particularly in relation to place-based gains. In addition, methods such as tenure and income mix can achieve both place- and people-based improvements.
- 1.6 In broad terms priority for assistance would be given to neighbourhoods evidenced as having:
  - High levels of unemployment and benefit dependency, low incomes and high levels of debt relative to income.
  - High levels of overcrowding and housing need
  - High levels of unemployment and benefit dependency.
  - Low educational attainment
  - High incidences of crime and ASB
  - High proportion of lets to first-time tenants and a high incidence of arrears and other tenancy breaches
  - Poor health outcomes
  - Low levels of home ownership

- High reliance on statutory and acute services
- Low residents satisfaction with services and the area
- Low area popularity

1.7 Appendix A sets out sample of methods that may be potentially used to improve neighbourhoods.

## 2. CONSULTATION

2.1 At the April Cabinet it was agreed that statutory consultation with all the borough's Council tenants on the HEIP policy framework would be conducted, including consultation on the selection and assessment process and the various potential improvement methods. In particular consultation would take place through the Borough Forum which was to be supplemented by consultation through tenant newsletters to ensure all tenants have the opportunity and the time to learn about the proposals and air their views.

### *Borough Forum*

2.2 Following April Cabinet officers undertook the first stage of consultation with the Borough Forum, which is attended by representatives of Tenant and Resident Associations across the borough as well as Hammersmith and Fulham Federation of Tenants and Resident Associations (HAFSTR), the Cabinet Member for Housing and LBHF Housing and Regeneration officers.

2.3 The Borough Forum meeting was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2011, attended by eleven Tenant and Resident Associations, HAFSTR, HAFNEP, the Cabinet Member for Housing and officers from the Housing and Regeneration Department. On 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2011, all TRAs were sent a copy of the report prior to the meeting and officers gave a presentation on the main details of the HEIP.

2.4 The Forum had a wide ranging discussion with recognition of both the benefits and concerns of the HEIP. Details of the questions and answers raised at the Forum are contained in Appendix B of this report. The main issues discussed were around

- who would be able to buy any vacant or new build properties on the selected estates
- how residents on selected estates would be involved in determining what estate improvements would be undertaken
- if there was any intention to demolish buildings on estates
- concerns on subletting on estates

During the discussion officers advised that the Council was keen for local residents to benefit from any properties that were developed/refurbished for low cost home ownership and that the only

buildings that may be demolished were derelict buildings that no longer had any function in delivering estate services. Any properties sold for low cost home ownership would have detailed lease agreements to prevent illegal subletting.

The Forum agreed that the HEIP was a positive step forward in identifying resources to continue estate improvements in an environment where financial resources were restricted. Many TRA representatives would be interested in working with officers to identify what improvements would be appropriate for their estates. The Forum was reassured that the policy was not about “parachuting” improvements onto estates and was very much intended to be working with residents on the selected estates and bringing forward bespoke action plans.

- 2.5 At the meeting officers advised they would welcome further comments on the report and that these should be sent to the relevant Council officer responsible for the HEIP. Officers advised that the report would be uploaded onto the Council’s website and that if any TRA would like officers to visit their estate to discuss the HEIP, they would be happy to arrange this.
- 2.6 No further comments have been received from the Borough Forum by officers since the meeting. Appendix B sets out the main summary discussion points from the Borough Forum meeting.

#### *“Your Borough” Magazine*

- 2.7 Following the Borough Forum, officers submitted an article in the July edition of “Your Borough” magazine, which is delivered to every residential and business address in the borough. The article covered the main points of the HEIP, advised the full report was available on the Council’s website and gave the contact details for officers to discuss the report or give any comments.
- 2.8 To date officers have not received any comments in response to the article or the Cabinet report.

### **3. NEXT STEPS**

- 3.1 It is officers’ view that following the consultation undertaken over the past three months, there is no material change required to the report as presented to Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2011 resulting from the consultation exercise. The HEIP policy advocated in the report should now be approved and officers be tasked with assessing the estates and recommend back to Cabinet the first estate to be brought forward.
- 3.2 Smaller neighbourhoods will be selected first to pilot and refine models before moving onto larger project.

- 3.3 Decisions on which areas to bring forward as action areas for improvement would be evidence-based. Wide-ranging profile data will be used to inform decision making in this regard. Appendix C details the assessment and selection criteria (agreed by the Cabinet in April), which will be applied in identifying the first estate to be brought forward.
- 3.4 For the selected neighbourhoods a detailed action plan would be developed in consultation with local residents and will require Cabinet approval. Resident involvement is crucial to improving neighbourhoods. All improvement programmes will include consultation with local residents in programme design. The Council and its partners will support those living in designated neighbourhoods to take wherever possible an active part in shaping and delivering improvement for their own areas.

#### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 4.1. The department is committed to delivering each project within the agreed council project management approach. This includes the need to record, review and report risk. The programme has not been recorded on the corporate risk register at this time since the initial report advised Members of a consultation process which they are now being asked to consider. The report also asks that Officers report back to Cabinet at a future date with a recommended estate to be the first to benefit from the Housing Estate Investment Plan. At that point the risks associated with the project would be assessed and if significant recorded on the councils risk register.

#### **5. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

- 5.1 The latest capital monitoring report for the Decent Neighbourhoods programme includes anticipated receipts from the void disposals some of which are intended to fund the Housing Estates Investment Plan. This indicates that a surplus of £10.5m is expected in 2011/12. The cumulative surplus is projected to increase in each of the following four years based on current expenditure projections. Therefore, funding is currently available to meet the needs of the HEIP for capital expenditure.
- 5.2 Expenditure is likely only to be classified as capital after each individual case for investment has been approved therefore any costs involved in pulling together such a case would be classified as revenue expenditure, these would have to be met from HRA balances. This should be considered as part of the preparation of the estimates for next and subsequent years.

- 5.3 Applications for investment under the HEIP will need to be reported to Cabinet and approved in line with the Council's constitution. Each proposal should include detailed financial and investment appraisal.
- 5.4 All void disposals will be subject to existing regulations governing capital receipts.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

- 6.1 The Council has been obliged to consult with secure tenants in accordance with Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, as indicated in the report to Cabinet of 18<sup>th</sup> April 2011.
- 6.2 The consultation had to conform with the Council's published consultation arrangements (being arrangements considered by the Council to be appropriate to enable those secure tenants likely to be substantially affected to be informed of the authority's proposals and to make their views known within a specified period).
- 6.3 All representations received have to be conscientiously considered before any decision is taken.
- 6.4 Officers will need decide what, (if any) further consultations will be required before any estate is selected and on the improvements to be undertaken to the selected estate. Unlike on the introduction of the policy itself, consultation in those cases may be confined to particular estates substantially affected by the proposed decision at that stage,

## **7. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 Consultation on the area based improvement policy will be designed to ensure tenants are able to participate fully and have the opportunity to learn of the proposals and air their views. For example, where disabled residents require materials in accessible formats, we will provide these, and we will ensure that the venues are accessible, and that any needs highlighted by disabled people to access the meeting are taken into account.
- 7.2 An equality assessment of the policy was undertaken in relation to the Housing Estate Investment Plan and other policies for the Cabinet Report of 18<sup>th</sup> April 2011. This is available electronically for background information. It has found impact to be varied in relation to age, race, sex, and disability. Provisional investigation suggests there are some adverse impacts in relation to disability and access to low-cost home ownership, and ethnicity and increased disposals and initial mitigation proposals have been considered.

- 7.3 When an estate has been selected under the HEIP criteria, a full equality impact assessment will be undertaken to take account of feedback from residents in proposing an estate action plan for the selected estate.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Description of Background Papers</b>	<b>Name/Ext of holder of file/copy</b>	<b>Department/ Location</b>
1.	Housing Estate Improvement Plan File	Ian Ruegg/Ext 1722	Housing Strategy & Regeneration Unit/ 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor, Hammersmith Town Hall Extension
<b>CONTACT OFFICER: Ian Ruegg / Angela O'Connor</b>		<b>NAME: Ian Ruegg / Angela O'Connor EXT. 1722 /1951</b>	



## **APPENDIX A**

### **TOOLS FOR AREA-BASED IMPROVEMENT**

The following tools for improvement may be combined by the Council and its partners to deliver a bespoke flexible solution for an estate by engaging with, providing support to and enhancing the lives of residents. This sample of methods, some validated by the independent research, is by no means an exhaustive list of those that may be potentially used:

#### **i. – Physical and Environmental improvements**

Such improvements can take a range of forms. These might include installing more advanced CCTV, improved landscaping, refurbishing or providing new community buildings, providing new housing for sale, extensions and conversions to relieve overcrowding, removing physical barriers that enclose and segregate neighbourhoods from surrounding streets, and changing the layout to deter crime and anti-social behaviour.

#### **ii. - Local Lettings Plans**

Local Lettings Plans allow more control over allocations in particular areas with higher levels of economic and social problems. They can be used, for example, to set aside rented properties for working households if thought beneficial to improve an area's income mix, or as shown by the research a neighbourhood's standing on people-based indicators such as health, or can be used to prioritise allocations to tenants with proven household skills where there is a high incidence of tenancy breakdown. Neighbourhood based outreach for places marked by a high incidence of overcrowding and housing need could be developed to complement this method.

#### **iii. – Improving tenure diversity**

As indicated in the independent research mixing tenure has been shown to have positive impacts for neighbourhoods, improving resident satisfaction and area popularity, with fewer reported crimes and incidents of ASB. Therefore, in neighbourhoods with low levels of owner-occupation the Council would look to promote a tenure balance approaching the borough average, though remaining in proportion to other improvement goals and consistent with discharging the Council's main housing duties. A number of properties either newly built or within the existing Council housing stock would be ringfenced for sale to households on low incomes who have an aspiration to move into home ownership. They would be sold on a shared ownership basis maybe via a housing association (Registered provider) making them affordable. Preference would be given to residents already living in the neighbourhood and those on the housing list with a recognised housing need, and thereafter to residents or those who work in the borough registered on the Council's Home Buy register.

Disposing to a housing association would have the advantage of residents being able to draw on the considerable experience and specialist expertise housing associations have acquired over many years of constructing, marketing and administering shared ownership accommodation. The Council currently does not hold this expertise in-house and would need to find the finances to staff and develop such a capacity or pay significant agency fees if a housing association were to be appointed to provide this service on the Council's behalf. Housing associations also potentially have access to capital funding from the Homes and Community Agency unavailable to the local authority which can be put to refurbishing properties up to a high standard so as to attract buyers who may not otherwise have chosen to purchase in less popular neighbourhoods.

Disposing units to a housing association also has a number of direct financial advantages for the Council:

- The full value of the dwelling is passed to the Council immediately. In contrast if the Council sells directly to a shared-owner the receipts would be limited to the proportion sold which is frequently only 25% (to ensure affordability). Shared-owners would be under no obligation either at the outset or in the future to buy the unsold share, whether in whole or in part.
- The receipt would not count as a right to buy receipt and if the correct procedures were followed would not be caught by pooling, ensuring the retention of the full receipt by the council.
- Properties could be sold in packages with the sales and marketing risks, (especially significant if pepper potted) including the cost of refurbishment for sale, transferred to the Registered Provider, who would also bear future stair-casing, arrears and repossession risks.

Having properties under different management within a block does present a management risk, especially on issues such as antisocial behaviour, sub-letting and leaks, this would be taken into consideration as part of any proposal.

#### **iv. – Coordinated Housing Management Services and Collaborative Neighbourhood Focussed Services**

Neighbourhood and Housing Management Services must be delivered effectively as they have a significant impact on all residents. Poor landlord services are unacceptable and can have a negative effect on residents' day to day lives. It is essential that tenancy management issues are addressed at the first point of call and rent management is maintained and controlled. To maintain effective and efficient services and provide assistance to residents when the need is identified, the Council could introduce as part of area improvements, and in partnership with social landlords, a Coordinated Housing Management Service.

A model for this service would be a Neighbourhood Team where the style of management would shift from a transactional approach to a more relationship based service. Officer objectives would be to develop relationships with residents and community groups, offering a generic service able to respond proactively to situations. The co-ordinated Housing Management Service would enable pooling of resources, knowledge and expertise from a cross section of professionals rather than organisations working in isolation which in turn will avoid duplication and provide value for money. The service should ensure residents receive a tailored person centred package of support, which meets their needs, promotes preventative solutions, assists households to be self reliant, lessening dependence on crisis-based or acute services.

#### **v. - Employment and training**

Maximising employment and skills training opportunities is a critical strand of any improvement programme. The aim would be to offer results-driven services which carefully consider the different starting points for residents in their journey off welfare benefits and into work.

The NDC research indicates that improvements in this area can take a long time. A programme including the following could be devised to achieve sustained outcomes:

- practical employment support workshops based on estates and pitched at the level of the residents e.g. people furthest from the labour market or lone parents
- flexible and immediate unpaid work experience places with local employers including key large employers such as the council
- short courses or training programmes targeted at filling current vacancies, particularly industry specific offers, e.g. food hygiene training for restaurant or hospitality work
- apprenticeship and traineeship opportunities aimed at young people including NEETs (i.e. young people not in education, employment or training) and others without formal qualifications
- integrated debt and financial advice/support
- community outreach work with schools, community groups, etc. to update residents on job opportunities coming up locally and training needs
- co-ordinated access to supplementary services, e.g. ESOL, childcare availability.

#### **vi. - Resident involvement**

Resident involvement is crucial to improving neighbourhoods. All improvement programmes will include consultation with local residents in programme design. The Council and its partners will support those living in designated neighbourhoods to take wherever possible an active part in shaping and delivering improvement for their own areas.

## APPENDIX B

### SUMMARY OF MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS FROM BOROUGH FORUM MEETING -

- The Forum queried the source of the funding to maintain stock as described in point 7.3 of the April Cabinet report.

Officers confirmed that the figure referred to in the report was an annual capitalised sum set aside only to maintain the housing stock in its current condition and that the HEIP was a much more tailored approach to specific estates.

- Referring to the first paragraph of the report, the Forum asked if this is to be offered only to people living on the estates and mentioned problems associated with 6 month Short Hold tenancies.

Officers confirmed that properties would be Low Cost Home Ownership (LCHO) built by housing associations, with strictly controlled access and nominations. Officers stated that there was very limited possibility of LCHO tenants being able to sublet, and then only in exceptional circumstances.

- The Forum asked if LCHO properties for sale would only be available to people on LOCATA

Officers replied that the same principal would apply to any sale of vacant home or new build LCHO property. The Council would have 100% nomination rights through its LCHO team H&F Home buy and that the aim is to only sell properties to residents or workers in the Borough.

- A member of the Forum made the point that the scheme involved the sale of council housing and that in her opinion even LCHO in LBHF was relatively “high cost” and that LCHO schemes may be open to abuse.

Officers advised that the Council seek to create a range of affordability for low cost home ownership housing in the borough. The intention would be to create the same range of affordability with any low cost home ownership created under the HEIP.

- A Forum member also stated that in her opinion, lack of investment over the years was the reason for investment being needed now.

Officers replied it was necessary to invest in improvements to estates but also essential in order to help people in the borough to get on the property ladder, and that it was a more effective use of resources to

sell properties in poor repair or which are hard to let. Any receipts raised from disposals would be ringfenced for affordable housing and regeneration purposes.

- The Forum asked if residents had been involved in drawing up the policy.

Officers replied that at this stage the policy was a “work in progress” and that presenting it to Borough Forum was only the first consultation exercise and there would be further consultation, for example in the H&F magazine, before officers reported back to Cabinet on the HEIP. If the HEIP progresses, an estate will be selected using the HEIP criteria and the Council will then consult with residents on the selected estate on what estate improvements they would like to see before submitting a further report to Cabinet on that estate’s improvement action plan .

- The Forum expressed concern over the way estates and properties on them are viewed and observed that some tenants on the estates are vulnerable and wanted to know when and how they will be consulted. It was the Forum’s view that other organisations engage more effectively and tenants view estates in a negative way which causes problems and suggested that a programme of engagement could work to improve estates.

Officers agreed that it was important to engage with as many residents as possible. One of the principle aims of the HEIP is to work with residents on selected estates to agree what improvements would be most beneficial and officers welcomed suggestions from the Forum on how tenant engagement could be improved. Officers emphasised that no improvements will take place on estates without full consultation with residents of the estate.

- The Forum made the point that the sale of council homes would dilute the objectives of the London Plan.

Officers pointed out that the Council had exceeded its housing targets under the London Plan and that people moving out of the borough due to a lack of affordable housing for sale was a big issue.

- The Forum asked whether under the HEIP policy, buildings would be demolished to build new properties on the site?

Officers replied that this was not the intention at this time as the intention was to bring back into use any disused areas of land such as bin store areas, garages, pram sheds and undercrofts to enhance the area and design out possible ASB areas.

- A member of the Forum made a point about what he saw as the unfairness of many private rented tenants living in former council properties on estates, and the issue of illegal subletting.

Officers confirmed that any new build would be controlled by the lease agreement granted to whoever purchased the property. This agreement would not stop legal sub – letting but would require the landlords permission to agree to any subletting.

- Forum representatives stated that estates needed to find a way of finding resources to continually improve them and that the HEIP seemed a good plan to fund estate improvements. The Forum were particularly reassured that under the HEIP proposals the Council would not be looking to “parachute” improvements onto selected estates but working with residents to develop bespoke estate action plans based on residents knowledge of their estates and what improvements would make the biggest differences.
- One Forum representative commented on the excellent relationship built up with residents and officers at Fulham Court in developing the new community and children’s centre as a good example of how the HEIP could work on the ground.
- The Forum asked where the jobs mentioned in the policy were being generated from, and suggested that what was being proposed sounded like a Youth Training Scheme.

Officers cited the example of Westfield where 7000 jobs had been created. Part of the aims in the HEIP was to offer training in education and employment to residents to raise the level of achievement so that local people can access new employment opportunities as they arise

- The Forum asked what would happen if residents are opposed to developments on estates.

Officers provided the example of Fulham Court new tenants hall where tenants initially opposed the location, but which was progressed after successful consultation. However if a majority of residents were opposed to estate improvements following consultation on their estate, then those views would be taken into consideration to ensure residents felt involved in any decision making.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **HEIP ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

#### **Overarching criteria**

1. Neighbourhoods that may be potentially suitable for comprehensive regeneration do not fall within the purview of this policy and are therefore outside the scope of selection.
2. Neighbourhoods may be brought forward for improvement and have their priority increased where they attract resources and a programme of activities outside the frame of this policy, providing there are sound business reasons (of a predominantly housing nature given sources of funding) and the evidence shows Community Strategy goals would be furthered by designating the neighbourhood as an Action Area for Improvement.
3. At the outset officers will not look to initiate an improvement programme on the Council's largest estates (save in wholly exceptional circumstances), given this is a new approach and the Council will seek to move by degrees.
4. In deciding which neighbourhoods to bring forward officers will be mindful of the findings of independent research, insofar as they indicate that proven methods of improvement are contingent on (1) area size and (2) the geographic boundaries of improvement areas equating with the spatial brief of the main delivery agents.

#### **Defining a neighbourhood**

5. Neighbourhood boundaries will in all cases encompass Council housing estates and in most cases will be delineated by estate boundaries. There are several reasons for this:
6. working at an area level on housing and the physical environment is known to bring a wide range of benefits
7. deprivation data disproportionately maps onto the borough's social housing estates
8. the main delivery partner for housing and the physical environment is Housing Services whose operational brief, where it is spatial, is in relation to housing estates
9. In relation to size, neighbourhoods will be defined as areas made up of 100 or more dwellings with 100 or more social rent tenants in keeping with the improvement methods which so far have been mainly tested on larger populations.
10. Where a number of small estates are in the selection pool and are in close geographical proximity and all evidence high levels of need, the viability of

them being treated as a single neighbourhood for improvement purposes may be considered.

11. Where high deprivation is mapped onto an estate below 100 units, and that estate is in close geographical proximity to an estate identified for improvement, officers will consider the viability of the former constituting part of the neighbourhood for improvement.
12. As expertise is gathered in the use of estate improvement methods, future reviews will consider the feasibility of extending this policy (1) to estates below 100 units and (2) to neighbourhoods not dominated by Council Estates and Council-owned housing and (3) to the largest estates.

### **The assessment process**

13. Housing estates falling under the scope of this policy will in the first instance be put through a needs analysis. Needs evidence will be compiled to compare and rank housing estates that fall under the scope of the policy.
14. A shortlist will be drawn up from this exercise of the 3 neediest estates.
15. This first stage analysis is conceived as a transparent and rudimentary means of sifting out the estates most obviously requiring support, however it will be rudimentary and by no means an exact science. There will be gaps in the statistical picture as data that is not available for all estates will be excluded. This is particularly the case with sub-ward data which is of limited use once catchments fall below a certain size. Estate-level statistics on the various Community Strategy priorities will also be uneven, with some priorities well-served by data and others less so. Universal indicators while ensuring all estates are judged on the same criteria are also unlikely to capture all the complex circumstances of an individual estate, however well devised. Resource constraints, in addition, will hinder sourcing data for all the estates from databases not configured to extract such reports.
16. The top 3 estates will therefore be subjected to a second-stage analysis, involving examining further data sets which may be easier to source for 3 estates, rather than 22. The size of the estate and its main needs will be considered at this point. This will be in terms of whether the improvement methods proposed are likely to have much purchase, and also, at the outset, whether the estate is of an appropriate size for conducting a trial, i.e. not one of the largest.
17. The selection process will be repeated as and when the Council is ready to bring forward the next neighbourhood for improvement, subject to review of the policy and any amendments arising from that review.

### **The Assessment Tool**

18. The assessment tool to be used is set out below.
19. The estates will be accorded a rank for each of the evidence measures. The placings will be collated and averaged out, with weighting applied.



- 20.** Levels of weighting reflect the differing quality and quantity of data for the various community strategy priorities: higher weighting for priorities well represented by data is to ensure the evidence is given due influence. Higher weighting has also been accorded to priorities that encompass the type of needs the improvement methods are most likely to combat – e.g. poor area satisfaction, high crime and ASB, tenure imbalance, concentrations of unemployment and benefit dependency – bearing in mind the twin goal of targeting assistance where it is most needed and where the methods will have most effect. Low weighted priorities acknowledge the fact that the core improvement approach will not be a principally area-based one, though these will remain as priorities for the Council and its partners and the expectation will be that area-based support complements those core approaches.
- 21.** The theme ‘Promote home ownership and housing opportunities’ will receive the highest weighting. This is for the reasons expressed in the paragraph above i.e. to ensure resources are channelled to neighbourhoods that would benefit most from the methods and to reflect the quality and quantity of the data. Additionally, it is because the biggest cost in any programme will be physical improvement which will be paid for from housing funds, and would, thus, require any Council estate receiving such funds to demonstrate that it is the neediest for housing investment, over and above what other non-housing needs the area or the residents may have.

<b>Community Strategy Priority</b>	<b>Reason to intervene at a neighbourhood-level</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> stage analysis – Evidence Measure</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> stage analysis – Evidence Measure</b>	<b>Weighting in overall assessment</b>
Provide a top quality education for all	Many children on the estate need support at school	% of pupils on the estate registered as having special educational needs	% of 7 year olds achieving Level 2 or above in reading, writing and maths in local primary schools  % of 11 year olds achieving Level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 in English, maths and science in local primary schools	5%
Tackle crime and ASB	The estate has high levels of crime and ASB	Rate of ASB per 100 residents  Average incident of crime (i.e ABH, criminal damage, residential burglary, drugs possession) per head of population		20%
	Graffiti is a problem on the estate	Incidence of graffiti per 100 dwellings		
Deliver a cleaner, greener borough	Graffiti is a problem on the estate	Incidence of graffiti per 100 dwellings	% of estate that is green space	15%
	Litter and caretaking are a problem	Caretaking performance on % of tasks raised and inspected		
	There is insufficient green space			

Promote home ownership and housing opportunities	The estate is mainly monotenure social rented with few owner occupiers	% of properties that are leasehold on the estate  Capacity to accommodate new infill housing for low cost home ownership	% of properties that are owner-occupied on the estate	25%
	There are high levels of housing need	% of tenants awaiting a transfer in Bands A-C (excluding under-occupiers and beneficial transfers)  % of households in Bands A-C (excluding under-occupiers and beneficial transfers)  % of residents applying as homeless as an annual average based on figures for last 3 years  % of tenants served with a NOSP (Notice of Seeking Possession)  % of new lettings annually to first-time tenants or those that have lost homes in the recent past, based on figures for the past 3 years.		
Setting the framework for a healthier borough	Residents suffer more with their health than elsewhere in the borough	% of residents engaged with children social care (per 100 dwellings)  % of residents engaged with adult social care (per 100 dwellings)  Incidence of hospital admissions per 100 population as an annual average based	Ambulance call outs per 100 dwellings as an annual average based on figures for last 3 years (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)  Teenage pregnancy rate per estate	5%

		on figures for the last 3 years (2006-2009)	% of adult working age population on JSA, Income Support, Incapacity Benefit or Employment and Support Allowance (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)	
Delivering high quality, value for money public services	The area is unpopular	% of residents satisfied with the area*  % of new lettings to existing tenants annually, based on figures for the past 3 years.	% of leasehold property that appears to be buy-to-let	15%
	Residents are dissatisfied with services	% of tenants satisfied with the general condition of their property*  % of tenants satisfied with the estates management service*		
	Residents have a high take up of costly acute services	% of residents applying as homeless  % of residents engaged with children social care (per 100 dwellings)  % of residents engaged with adult social care (per 100 dwellings)  Fire brigade call outs per 100 dwellings as over the last 5 years  Incidence of hospital admissions per 100 residents as an annual average based on figures for the last 3 years	Ambulance call outs per 100 dwellings as an annual average based on figures for last 3 years (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)	
Regenerating the most	Many residents subsist on	% of Council tenants on Housing Benefit	% of all tenants on Housing Benefit	15%

deprived parts of the borough	benefits, most people are on a low income, debt is a problem, and many working age residents are not in employment	<p>% of school age children receiving free school meals</p> <p>% of tenants in rent arrears of 4 weeks or more</p> <p>% of households with incomes of £20k or less</p>	<p>% of leaseholders in service charge arrears</p> <p>% of adult working age population on JSA, Income Support and Incapacity Benefit/ Employment and Support Allowance (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)</p> <p>Average household income of a single person household per estate</p> <p>Average household income of a household with a dependent child per estate</p>	
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

### The evidence indicators

19. The measures used to assess need are by and large self-explanatory. The notes below provide more detail on those statistical measures thought to need more explanation.

20. Population data from the 2001 census is the last complete account of the resident population available at a postcode level which is the closest for data coverage of an estate. This data has been used sparingly given its age. Specifically, it has been used as the head count element in proportioning ASB incidence and hospital admissions. Figures from the forthcoming 2011 census will not be available until 2012.

21. Evidence will have more than one use. For example, numbers approaching the Council as homeless have been counted as a measure of housing need as well as to measure levels of engagement with acute, crisis services.

### A Top Quality Education

Primary school data is being relied on as most local children (78%) attend primary school in the borough whereas only a third of local secondary school age residents (34%) attend borough secondary schools. For key stage results performance is collected by school, rather than residential location. This will be a 2<sup>nd</sup> stage analysis given the resource intensity of identifying what the local primary schools are for each of the respective estates in the 1<sup>st</sup> stage pool.

### Deliver a Cleaner, Greener Borough

Improvements to the physical environment has proven benefits, however, there is little overarching data available on which to consider the comparative merits of one estate's needs for physical improvements - for example, in relation to being cut off and unintegrated with the surrounding local area or to spatially design out crime – against another's. For resource reasons, consideration of these factors will be limited to the 2nd stage analysis.

### Promoting home ownership and housing opportunities

The number of units owned on an estate are not necessarily identical with the number that are owner-occupied. The distinction is important as independent research indicates that estate improvements gained from more home owners is dependent on them buying-to-live, rather than buying to let. Figures on current owner-occupation levels are derived from leaseholder records and whether the owner's address for service charge correspondence is the same as the property address. Where the two do not match it can be assumed that the property is not owner-occupied. This is time consuming data to collect and therefore will be reserved for 2<sup>nd</sup> stage analysis.

The main source of data for determining levels of housing need in the borough is the Housing Register, a list recording all requests for housing received by the Council. Once received, applications to the Housing Register are assessed and accorded a band between A-D, defined as follows:

Band A = Emergency and very severe housing need

Band B = High priority or urgent need to move

Band C = Households with an identified housing need to whom the Council is required to give reasonable preference under s.167 Housing Act 1996

Band D = All other applicants

Households to whom the Council is required by law to give reasonable preference include the homeless, those who are overcrowded and those needing to move for health reasons. Given the above, the significant bands for enumeration and analysis of housing need are therefore bands A-C.

### Delivering high quality value for money public services

\*The results of the annual Tenants Satisfaction Survey on satisfaction with area, property condition, and estate management will be used, however in accordance with the fact that the respondent sample is small these indicators will be given half the weighting they would have ordinarily received were they equal to the other indicators in the group.

The Decent Homes survey which included a questionnaire on tenant satisfaction had a greater number of respondents. It was undertaken, estate by estate across the course of the last 4 years during a period that has seen significant improvement in HFHomes service standards. Therefore survey feedback would differ depending on when it was collected on the improvement curve. The presence of this variable makes the data set unreliable for purposes of comparison.

The proportion of lets to transfer tenants will be used as an indicator of area popularity. Transfer tenants, having the benefit of a high level of security of tenure, are in stable housing, which affords greater opportunity to accumulate favourable waiting time on the Housing Register and exercise options about when and where they move than those in the same Housing Register band who are homeless, or in short-term tenure in the private rented sector or households living with friends or family, whose more precarious circumstances are likely to result in them taking lettings on estates that are less desirable.

Figures for buy-to-let will be derived from comparing the property address with the owner's service charge address. Where the two do not match it will be assumed that the property address is rented. Housing Benefit data may be used to provide further verification

# Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**DEPUTY LEADER (+  
ENVIRONMENT AND  
ASSET  
MANAGEMENT)**

*Councillor Nicholas  
Botterill*

**PLANNED PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE AND  
BREAKDOWN REPAIRS OF MECHANICAL PLANT IN  
SPECIALIST NON-HOUSING PROPERTIES; WORKS:  
PLANNED PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE FOR  
MECHANICAL SYSTEMS (INCLUDING AIR  
CONDITIONING) 2011 – 2015**

**Wards:  
All**

This report seeks approval to accept a tender for the above contract.

A separate report on the exempt Cabinet agenda provides exempt information about the tendering process for this contract.

## CONTRIBUTORS

AD Finance and  
Resources  
ADLDS  
EDFCG

## Recommendation

**To note that the contract is expected to start on 1  
January 2012 for a period of 4 years with the options to  
extend on annual basis for 3 further years.**

<p><b>HAS A EIA BEEN COMPLETED? YES</b></p>
---

<p><b>HAS THE REPORT CONTENT BEEN RISK ASSESSED? N/A</b></p>
--



## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The existing Measured Term Contract expired in March 2011 and has been extended to the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2011.
- 1.2 This contract is for the carrying out of Planned Preventative Maintenance of plant in specialist Council properties on an annual cycle, and for carrying out any necessary remedial works. The contract does not give any details of specific remedial works or any guarantees of work as these are given on an ad-hoc basis as the need arises and are the subject of separate individual orders.

## **2. DETAILS OF TENDER**

- 2.1 The proposed overall expenditure (over 4 years) required that a Contract Notice seeking expressions of interest was published in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) and this was carried out. The recommendation for the contractor to be appointed is based on the most economically advantageous tender received. The selection criteria were to be based on a pre-defined price/quality weighted appraisal of the tender submissions and interviews. The quality/price model was set at 80% price and 20% quality. The selection of contractors for the tender list was based upon an evaluation (utilising a pre-defined weighted appraisal) of all submitted Pre-Qualification Questionnaires and was approved by a Key Cabinet Decision in February 2011.
- 2.2 The tenders were invited primarily on an annual cost of maintenance for plant specified on an asset register for each site, but also included supplementary rates for works valued on a Daywork or out-of hours working basis, with percentage additions for Provisional Sums for Materials, Plant and Specialist Sub-Contractors. In addition Provisional Sums for Works valued against the PSA Schedule of Rates for Mechanical Services were included and the Tenderers were required to indicate their required percentage additions/deductions thereto. The Tenderers were also required to insert Sums for the cost of complying with TUPE Regulations and (provisionally) for providing a Performance Bond. All the above were monied out (on an annual basis) thus providing a straightforward comparison of total (per annum) tendered sums.
- 2.3 The incumbent service provider advised that in the event of not being re-awarded the contract, the two on-site engineers would be put forward for TUPE transfer, and this information was provided to the Tenderers.

## **3. FEES**

- 3.1 The professional services previously provided by Building & Property Management (Environment Directorate) are now, following market testing, being provided by EC Harris LLP. Consequently fees are calculated on the basis of the tendered schedule of rates plus the cost of the Client Agent Team, which is funded via a percentage fee to the value of the commissions placed. Fees are charged on the basis of 15% with final account reconciliation at the end of each financial year. Scheme financial approval will include the appropriate fees.

#### **4. ANTICIPATED PROGRAMME**

4.1	Approval (Cabinet)	7 <sup>th</sup> November	2011
	Term Commencement	1 <sup>st</sup> January	2012
	Term Completion	31 <sup>st</sup> December	2015

#### **5. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

5.1 It must be noted that currently it is unknown whether the identity, extent and values of breakdown repairs and necessary works will exceed the contract threshold value of £192,544.09. However, since expenditure must fall within budget cash limits set by the Council, regular budget monitoring will highlight any issues which may arise. The annual servicing costs (for planned maintenance) should also be closely reviewed on award of the contract for reductions.

5.2 Further comments are given in the separate exempt report.

#### **6. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PROCUREMENT & IT STRATEGY**

6.1 The Contract has been tendered in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Council's Contract Standing Orders. The exercise has been managed through the Council's e-tendering system and 72 companies downloaded the original pre-qualification questionnaire when the opportunity was published at the end of January 2011. From this number 1 was late (and not considered) 11 opted out and 25 sent in competed expressions of interest.

6.2 Officers from the Corporate Procurement Team have been providing advice throughout the procurement exercise. Consequently the AD is satisfied that the process complies with the requirements of the Regulations and CSOs and agrees with the recommendations contained in the report.

#### **7. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)**

7.1 The Council's contract standing orders and EU procurement rules have been complied with in relation to this procurement process. Legal Services has been represented on the TAP making the recommendation for award.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000**  
**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Description of Background Papers</b>	<b>Name/Ext of holder of file/copy</b>	<b>Department/ Location</b>
1.	OJEU Notice, Contractor Applications, Short Listing Details, TAP Documents, Tender Report	A. McGahan EC Harris LLP 07810 850 330.	EC Harris 181 King Street Hammersmith W6 9JU
2.	Project Development	P. Nolan Ext. 4516	BPM/ENV 6 <sup>th</sup> floor HTH Ext King Street Hammersmith W6 9JU

<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	<b>NAME: Pat Nolan</b> <b>EXT: 4516</b>
-------------------------	--

# Agenda Item 12



## **FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

*Proposed to be made in the period November 2011 to February 2012*

The following is a list of Key Decisions, as far as is known at this stage, which the Authority proposes to take in the period from November 2011 to February 2012.

**KEY DECISIONS** are those which are likely to result in one or more of the following:

- Any expenditure or savings which are significant, regarding the Council's budget for the service function to which the decision relates in excess of £100,000;
- Anything affecting communities living or working in an area comprising of two or more wards in the borough;
- Anything significantly affecting communities within one ward (where practicable);
- Anything affecting the budget and policy framework set by the Council.

The Forward Plan will be updated and published on the Council's website on a monthly basis. (New entries are highlighted in yellow).

**NB:** Key Decisions will generally be taken by the Executive at the Cabinet. The items on this Forward Plan are listed according to the date of the relevant decision-making meeting.

*If you have any queries on this Forward Plan, please contact  
Katia Richardson on 020 8753 2368 or by e-mail to [katia.richardson@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:katia.richardson@lbhf.gov.uk)*

## **Consultation**

Each report carries a brief summary explaining its purpose, shows when the decision is expected to be made, background documents used to prepare the report, and the member of the executive responsible. Every effort has been made to identify target groups for consultation in each case. Any person/organisation not listed who would like to be consulted, or who would like more information on the proposed decision, is encouraged to get in touch with the relevant Councillor and contact details are provided at the end of this document.

## **Reports**

Reports will be available on the Council's website ([www.lbhf.org.uk](http://www.lbhf.org.uk)) a minimum of 5 working days before the relevant meeting.

## **Decisions**

All decisions taken by Cabinet may be implemented 5 working days after the relevant Cabinet meeting, unless called in by Councillors.

## **Making your Views Heard**

You can comment on any of the items in this Forward Plan by contacting the officer shown in column 6. You can also submit a deputation to the Cabinet. Full details of how to do this (and the date by which a deputation must be submitted) are on the front sheet of each Cabinet agenda.

### **LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM: CABINET 2010/11**

<b>Leader:</b>	<b>Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh</b>
<b>Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management):</b>	<b>Councillor Nicholas Botterill</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Children's Services:</b>	<b>Councillor Helen Binmore</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Community Care:</b>	<b>Councillor Joe Carlebach</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Community Engagement:</b>	<b>Councillor Harry Phibbs</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Housing:</b>	<b>Councillor Andrew Johnson</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Residents Services:</b>	<b>Councillor Greg Smith</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Strategy:</b>	<b>Councillor Mark Loveday</b>

*Forward Plan No 114 (published 14 October 2011)*

## LIST OF KEY DECISIONS PROPOSED NOVEMBER 2011 TO FEBRUARY 2012

*Where the title bears the suffix (Exempt), the report for this proposed decision is likely to be exempt and full details cannot be published.*

**New entries are highlighted in yellow.**

\* All these decisions may be called in by Councillors; If a decision is called in, it will not be capable of implementation until a final decision is made.

Decision to be Made by: (ie Council or Cabinet)	Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason	Proposed Key Decision	Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected
<b>November</b>			
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<p><b>The General Fund Capital Programme, Housing Capital Programme and Revenue Monitoring 2011/12 Month 5</b></p> <p>Report seeks approval to changes to the Capital Programme and Revenue Budget.</p>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<p><b>Use of 2011/12 HFBP profit share to fund e-services in 2011-12</b></p> <p>This report requests approval to use the HFBP profit share to pursue further e-services as part of a wider self serve strategy.</p>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<p><b>Planned preventative maintenance and breakdown repairs of mechanical plant in specialist non-housing properties; planned preventative maintenance for mechanical systems (including air conditioning) 2011-2015</b></p> <p>Tender Acceptance to appoint contractor to carry out servicing of mechanical plant, day-to-day repairs, inspection and planned maintenance repairs to Non-Housing Properties.</p>	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Approval of delegated award of Sex and Relationship and Substance Misuse Education Contract</b>  To agree delegation of contract award to Cabinet Member.	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Earl's Court Redevelopment Project</b>  The Council has been exploring the benefits of including the West Kensington and Gibbs Green estates within the proposed comprehensive redevelopment of Earl's Court and Lillie Bridge depot.	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): North End
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Social Housing Fraud</b>  Paper to outline the strategy to ensure social housing properties are used for those in need and to identify where this funding fits into that strategy, asking for approval for the funds.	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Nos 5 and 17-31 Carnwath Road, London, SW6</b>  Sale of Council's Freehold Interest in Collaboration with Current Tenants.	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): Sands End
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Health and safety Audit Programme for Housing and Regeneration.</b>  This paper outlines the proposed independent health and safety audit programme for the Housing and Regeneration Department, focusing on the main property related legislative requirements with respect to gas, fire, legionella and asbestos safety.	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Statutory Compliance Audit</b>  Contract for undertaking a four year programme of auditing for compliance of the Departments arrangements for Gas Safety, Fire Safety, Asbestos Management and Legionella Management.	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Funding Request for Tri-Borough Additional Costs</b>  This report requests funding for the H&F share of the necessary additional staff costs, identified to date, that are being incurred in order to secure the delivery of the Tri-Borough proposals and associated benefits which include £11 savings for H&F by 15/16.	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Outcome of Consultation on the Housing Estate Investment Plan</b>  This report notes the outcome of the consultation exercise on the Housing Estate Investment Plan.	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	7 Nov 2011	<b>Custody Pathfinder</b>  Two year project with Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea and Ealing to cut the costs of youth custody in advance of financial responsibility being transferred to local authorities.	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward		Ward(s): All Wards
<b>December</b>			
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>The Archives Service Review</b>  This report will outline the current position and recommend options for the future delivery of the Council's archives service.	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward		Ward(s): All Wards



<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Highways Planned Maintenance Programme 2012/13</b>	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	The purpose of the report is to seek approval for the projects listed within the Carriageway and Footway Planned Maintenance programme and to establish a degree of flexibility in the management of the budgets and programme during the year.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Shepherds Bush Common Improvement Project</b>	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Approval to appoint works contractors to undertake restoration works on Shepherds Bush Common.	Ward(s): Shepherds Bush Green
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Parking Projects Programme 2011/12</b>	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	This report outlines the key parking priorities of the Council and presents a parking projects programme for 2011/12.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Travel Assistance Policies</b>	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward	Travel Assistance Policy – Special education needs (SEN)	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Serco Contract Review</b>	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Following a review of the financial and service performance of the Serco Waste and Cleansing contract, a clearer performance regime is proposed that provides greater value for money, improves service quality and is based on the principles of risk and reward.	Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<p><b>Corporate Network Strategy</b></p> <p>Significant parts of the existing corporate data network have been in service for over nine years and critical components have reached the end of their life. From June 2013, a number of products become unserviceable and will need to be replaced. Other elements of the corporate network need work to make them suitable for tri-borough working or to provide business continuity.</p>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<p><b>Update on Libraries Strategy: Barons Court Community Library</b></p> <p>On 10th January 2011 Cabinet agreed to end the Council-run service at Barons Court Library from 31st March 2011 and to transfer the library provision to a community-run service. Due to timing issues, on 18th April 2011 Cabinet agreed to additional one-off funding. This was to ensure a continuous provision of service from the site, pending implementation of the new arrangements which are currently being progressed.</p>	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Significant in 1 ward		Ward(s): Avonmore and Brook Green
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<p><b>Housing Capital Programme 2012/13</b></p> <p>The purpose of the report is to seek approval for the proposed 2012/13 housing capital programme</p>	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<p><b>The General Fund Capital Programme, Housing Capital Programme and Revenue Monitoring 2011/12 Month 6</b></p> <p>The report seeks approval to changes to Capital Programme and Revenue Budgets.</p>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Contracts for the Management, Maintenance and Development of Satellite Tennis Centres</b>	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward	Outsourcing management and maintenance of tennis facilities at Hurlingham Park, Ravenscourt Park, and Eel Brook Common	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Leasing of Glasshouses and Garden in Ravenscourt Park to Hammersmith Community Garden Association (HCGA)</b>	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Significant in 1 ward	Proposed leasing of glasshouses and curtilage area to HGCA for 7 years as an environmental centre for outdoor learning and volunteering.	Ward(s): Ravenscourt Park
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Measured Term Contract for Day-to-Day Breakdown Repair and Maintenance to Lift Plant and Associated Equipment to Housing Properties</b>	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Tender Acceptance Report to appoint contractor to carry out day to day breakdown repair and maintenance to lift plant and associated equipment in Housing Properties.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Measured Term Contract for Day-to-Day Breakdown Repair and Maintenance to Lift Plant and Associated Equipment to Non-Housing Buildings</b>	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Tender Acceptance Report to appoint contractor to carry out Day-to-Day Breakdown Repair and Maintenance to Lift Plant and Association Equipment in Non-Housing Properties.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Measured Term Contract for Planned Preventative Mechanical Maintenance for Boroughwide Housing Properties 2011-2015</b>	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Tender Acceptance to appoint contractor to carry out	Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
		servicing of mechanical plant, day-to-day repairs, inspection and planned maintenance repairs to Housing Properties.	
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Measured Term Contract for Planned Preventative Maintenance to Mechanical Plant - Specialist Works 2011 - 2015</b>  Tender Acceptance to appoint contractor to carry out servicing of mechanical plant, day-to-day repairs, inspection and planned maintenance repairs – Specialist Works.	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Measured Term Contract for Door Entry Systems – Boroughwide Housing Properties 2011 - 2015</b>  Tender Acceptance to appoint contractor to carry out day to day reactive breakdown callout repairs together with a small element of routine servicing to door entry systems and automatic doors and barriers to the Council's Housing Properties.	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet  Full Council	5 Dec 2011	<b>Treasury Management Mid Year Review</b>  This report covers Quarter 1 and 2 for 2011/12 and provides information on the Council's debt, borrowing and investment activity up to the 30 September 2011.	Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh
	1 Feb 2012  Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Disposal of the Council's Property Interest in the Novotal, 1 Shortlands, London, W6, Basement Car Parking, and Metro Building, 1 Butterwick, London, W6</b>  The report will set out the prices agreed for the disposal of the council's freehold and leasehold interests in the properties set out in the title of this report.	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): Hammersmith Broadway

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>White City Collaborative Care Centre</b>  Approval of final business case and authorisation to reach financial close	Cabinet Member for Community Care
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): Wormholt and White City
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>S153 Equality Act 2010</b>  Publication of Information and setting of Equality Objectives	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>European Social Fund - Supporting Residents to Secure Employment</b>  Officers have successfully bidden for £1,000,000 GLA European Social Fund (ESF) finance to deliver services which help unemployed residents secure employment.  ESF funding must be matched equally with an complementary £1,000,000 from LBHF.  This report seeks approval for £1,000,000 Council expenditure over two years as match funding from 1st Oct 2012 – 31st March 2014. This sum sits in the corporate Third Sector Investment Fund and is already allocated for employability support services until 30th September 2012.	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Dec 2011	<b>Borough Investment Plan</b>  Document setting out the Council's future affordable housing investment priorities to the Homes and Communities Agency and the Mayor of London.	Cabinet Member for Housing
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward		Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
<b>9 January</b>			
Cabinet	9 Jan 2012	<b>Advertising and sponsorship opportunities</b>	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward	To market test for external expertise, on payment by reward basis, to help realise advertising and sponsorship opportunities across H&F.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	9 Jan 2012	<b>Workplace replacement</b>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Proposal to upgrade Microsoft Office to support collaborative tri borough working while also renewing the workplace IT device (PC) offer and the core desktop infrastructure to replace end-of-life hardware and software, increasing flexibility of deployment.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	9 Jan 2012	<b>Cost reduction programme</b>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Procurement of a five year contract for support on a gain share basis through two initiatives; savings from the renewal and renegotiation of contracts; enhanced revenues collection through improved debt management.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	9 Jan 2012	<b>The General Fund Capital Programme, Housing Capital Programme and Revenue Monitoring 2011/12 Month 7</b>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Report seeks approval to changes to the Capital Programme and Revenue Budgets.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	9 Jan 2012	<b>SmartWorking Stage D: Paperlight Office</b>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward	Funding drawdown for corporate rollout of SmartWorking: update on SmartWorking, presents a business case and requests funds for the next stage (Stage D).	Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
<b>30 January</b>			
Cabinet	30 Jan 2012	<b>Award of Term Contract for Public Lighting and Ancillary Works 2012-2015</b>	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Decision to award the new Public Lighting and Ancillary Works contract to the most economically advantageous tender.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	30 Jan 2012	<b>Remodelling of Day Services</b>	Cabinet Member for Community Care
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward	Remodelling of day services, including proposals on relocation of some services and sharing building space with various care groups.	Ward(s): All Wards
<b>March</b>			
Cabinet	5 Mar 2012	<b>West London Housing Related Support Joint Framework Agreement</b>	Cabinet Member for Community Care
	Reason: Affects more than 1 ward	Approval of the new framework agreement for housing related support services across eight West London boroughs. LBHF is the lead procurement borough for the new framework.	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Mar 2012	<b>Corporate Planned Maintenance Programme 2012-2013</b>	Deputy Leader (+Environment and Asset Management)
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	Approval to commit to a programme of works	Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	5 Mar 2012	<b>The General Fund Capital Programme, Housing Capital Programme and Revenue Monitoring 2011/12 month 8</b>	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000	The report seeks approval for changes to the Capital Programme and Revenue Budgets.	Ward(s): All Wards

<b>Decision to be Made by:</b> (ie Council or Cabinet)	<b>Date of Decision-Making Meeting and Reason</b>	<b>Proposed Key Decision</b>	<b>Lead Executive Councillor(s) and Wards Affected</b>
Cabinet	5 Mar 2012	<b>Market Management Sponsorship</b>  Contract for Advertising and Sponsorship Services	Cabinet Member for Residents Services
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
<b>April</b>			
Cabinet	16 Apr 2012	<b>The General Fund Capital Programme, Housing Capital Programme and Revenue Monitoring 2011/12 month 9</b>  The report seeks approval to changes to the Capital Programme and Revenue budgets.	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards
Cabinet	16 Apr 2012	<b>The General Fund Capital Programme, Housing Capital Programme and Revenue Monitoring 2011/12 month 10</b>  The report seeks approval to changes to the Capital Programme and Revenue Budgets.	Leader of the Council
	Reason: Expenditure more than £100,000		Ward(s): All Wards





# Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

## SUMMARY OF OPEN DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS REPORTED TO CABINET FOR INFORMATION

### CABINET MEMBER

#### **LEADER**

*Councillor Stephen Greenhalgh*

#### **13.1 APPOINTMENT OF PRICE WATERHOUSE COOPERS (PWC) TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TAX ADVICE AND GUIDANCE IN RELATION TO TO THE COUNCIL'S ENGAGEMENTS WITH CONSULTANTS AND INTERIMS**

This report seeks approval to delegate to the Director of Finance and Corporate Services the authority to instruct PWC to provide tax advice and guidance over and above that which it has already given to the Council under an existing letter of engagement.

#### **Decision made by Cabinet Members on: 10 October 2011**

- 1. That approval is given to delegate to the Director of Finance and Corporate Services the decision to instruct PWC to review the action being taken by LBHF to mitigate the tax risks arising from its engagement of consultants and interims. The delegation will not exceed £30,000.00**
- 2. That a waiver of contract standing orders is approved in respect of the procurement process to appoint PWC for the reasons set out in paragraph 4 of this report.**

**Ward: All**

# Agenda Item 14

## **SUMMARY OF URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE LEADER REPORTED TO CABINET FOR INFORMATION**

The following reports were considered in accordance with paragraph 1.21 of the Leader's Portfolio.

### **ITEM**

#### **14.1 REQUEST TO RELEASE FUNDING TO SUPPORT THE RELOCATION OF MARKET LANE SUPPORTED HOUSING SERVICE WITHIN THE SHEPHERDS BUSH MARKET REGENERATION SCHEME**

The report seeks approval to grant additional funding from the Supporting People programme to support the relocation of the Market Lane supported housing service.

#### **Reasons for Urgency:**

The relocation of Market Lane hostel is the subject of a complex negotiation process between the council, the developers for the Shepherds Bush Market regeneration scheme, the support provider and the building owner. The negotiations have taken a considerable length of time to complete. An agreement is being reached on a proposal, however confirmation of additional funding is required to secure the agreement to relocate the hostel.

#### **Decision taken by the Leader on: 11 October 2011**

#### **Recommendations:**

**That approval be granted for additional funding from the Supporting People programme to support the relocation of the Market Lane supported housing service at a total cost of £100,000 as set out in para. 1.6 of the report.**

**Ward: Shepherds Bush Green**