


Cabinet 13 May 2015	 TOWER HAMLETS
Report of: Robert McCulloch-Graham, Corporate Director, Education, Social Care & Wellbeing	Classification: Unrestricted
Primary School Places Programme	

Lead Member	Councillor Gulam Robbani, Cabinet Member for Education and Children's Services
Wards affected	Bow East, Lansbury
Community Plan Theme	A Prosperous Community
Key Decision?	Yes

Executive Summary

This report includes proposals for two sites to provide additional primary school capacity to meet the rising need for school places in the borough.

These sites are the Former Bromley Hall Special School and the former site of Bow Boys' School. Both are vacant and provide opportunities to be brought into primary school use.

Recommendations:

The Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Approve the adoption of a capital estimate of £9.0m for the proposed works to the former Bromley Hall Special School;
2. Delegate to the Corporate Director, Development & Renewal, the power to appropriate land in Lochnagar Street shown in Appendix A from the HRA to the General Fund for Education purposes, subject to prior consultation with the Service Head – Legal Services, and agree that the land is incorporated into Bromley Hall School site;
3. Approve the proposed procurement of works to the Bromley Hall School by use of a suitable pre-tendered framework;
4. Approve the adoption of a capital estimate of £11m for the proposed works to the former site of Bow Boys' School;
5. Approve the proposed procurement approach for the former Bow Boys' School site of working with Tower Hamlets Schools Ltd ;
6. Authorise the Corporate Director of ESCW to agree tenders for projects referred to in this report within the approved programmes and capital estimate; and
7. Authorise the Corporate Director, Development and Renewal, following consultation with the Service Head – Legal Services, to agree and enter into the contracts required to give effect to the above recommendations.

1. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 1.1 The LA has a duty to provide sufficient school places for the local population. The need for additional places in Tower Hamlets has been rising for some time and is projected to continue to rise. The Cabinet meeting on 3 September 2014 received a report on the 2014/15 Annual Review of School Places. The former Bromley Hall School and the former Bow Boys' School sites have been identified as opportunities within the Council's own assets to provide additional places. Decisions are required to adopt the projects into the capital programme and to proceed with implementation.
- 1.2 If these decisions are not taken or are deferred, the potential to open the extra school places will be delayed. This will mean that alternative, temporary classes will have to be provided to meet the expected number of children requiring school places. This type of provision is not good value for money and, whilst it can be managed by schools, is less satisfactory for the continuity of children's education.

2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 2.1 When projects are being considered for the capital programme, alternative options are considered. This is to ensure that the projects both meet value for money and address the needs identified. Projects are recommended following options appraisals and to select the options which best meet the location needs of the rising school age population. Potential alternative options for the sites are noted below. The sites are at present vacant and incurring costs to maintain security.
- 2.2 As above, if permanent school accommodation is not provided in time to meet the number of children requiring school places, alternative temporary provision has to be made.

3. DETAILS OF REPORT

Need for School Places

- 3.1 As reported to Cabinet in September 2014, the need for primary school places is continuing to rise. New capacity opened for the 2014/15 school year and there is a further planned expansion for September 2016 at Olga School (2FE expansion). However, this additional capacity does not meet the projected need. Taking account of the new capacity in 2014 and planned for 2016, the anticipated shortfall of places at Reception year is:

	Places available	Projected need	Shortfall places	Shortfall FE
2016/17	3730	3781	51	1.7
2017/18	3730	3869	139	4.6
2018/19	3730	3997	267	8.9

- 3.2 This projected shortfall requires decisions now in order to be sure that capital schemes, with long development periods, can be implemented in time to create the additional capacity. Short term contingency measures will be required (bulge classes) where we are not able to provide permanent places in time to meet the need.

Former Bromley Hall School site - background

- 3.3 The school site transferred to the Council by virtue of The Education (Inner London Education Authority) (Property Transfer) Order 1990. The former special school closed in 2002. The building was then used as part of the Pupil Referral Unit until July 2010. The school has been vacant since July 2010. It presents a particular security risk. It has been squatted on two separate occasions, leading to court action to obtain vacant possession. Security costs are currently in the order of £120,000 per annum and are an ongoing liability in view of the high risk of the building being squatted again. The building continues to deteriorate.
- 3.4 The site is within the Ailsa Street Masterplan area which is part of the proposed Housing Zone. The Ailsa Street area within that is projected to provide 1100 homes in the period 2015 – 2020. In the same period, 1100 homes are projected in the adjacent Leven Road area. Over 8,000 homes are projected for the whole Housing Zone which will require the associated social infrastructure, including schools, to be provided. In view of the likely scale of local housing development, it is preferable to develop the school ahead of new residents in the immediate vicinity. The school can be developed as a standalone site within the Council's ownership with no dependency relating to other sites or site assembly issues.
- 3.5 In 2012 the school was made a Grade II listed building. The Council appealed against the listing but was not successful. It is possible to appeal against a listing decision when it is first made but for a further appeal at a later date, there would have to be substantial new information about the history or interest of the building which was not previously available. Such information is not available to form the basis of a further appeal.
- 3.6 Whilst it would be possible to put forward a proposal for the site which involved demolition of the listed school building and replacement with a new school, and/or housing or other use, it is likely that this process would take considerable time and there is no guarantee of the outcome, with the risk of further deterioration and ongoing security costs in the meantime. It will be difficult to sustain a case for demolition on the grounds that the building could not be adapted for continued education use. Listed Building Consent is required for any alterations to a listed building or demolition of all or part of it. Listed Building Consent is not issued by the LA where it is the building owner.
- 3.7 Where the LA is using its own assets to provide school places and is still unable to meet the local need, this supports the case to be made for other development sites to contribute space for a school as part of wider redevelopment for residential use.

Risk of Secretary of State's intervention

- 3.8 LAs cannot dispose of school property without the prior consent of the Secretary of State for Education. The Secretary of State has powers to require a vacant school to be transferred at nil cost to a free school regardless of whether the LA has applied for consent to dispose. A free school could then open which would be outside the LA's programme for the provision of school places. This is a risk for this site which will increase the longer no proposals for its use are agreed.

Options for Bromley Hall School site for school use

- 3.9 As referred to above, the listed status presents some constraints in considering options for development. Proposals for school use have been considered which retain as much of the existing structure as is compatible with the needs of a modern primary school. Whilst no contact has been made with English Heritage about the proposals, retention of a significant part of the existing building is regarded as an option which is likely to be considered positively.
- 3.10 The existing school is single storey. The original school was subsequently added to with an extension. The current development proposal retains the majority of the main part of the building and replaces the extension. This allows the creation of accommodation to meet current mainstream school standards. The development proposals will retain it as a single storey building and as a result there are no rights of light impacts on neighbouring properties. The proposal will provide 2FE (420 places).
- 3.11 The existing school site has very limited external area. In order to meet the standards for external recreation area for the primary school, it is proposed to incorporate the adjoining land in Lochnagar Street into the school site (shown on the plan at Appendix A). If the proposal to retain the school building proceeds, the alternative development options for this plot are restricted due to the narrow width and the proximity to the school, taking account of both the existing building's height and its listing.
- 3.12 It is recommended that this land is incorporated into the school site and appropriated from the HRA to General Fund for this purpose. The land was originally acquired under housing powers but was never redeveloped for housing use and has been in commercial use for a significant number of years.

The Land to be Appropriated

- 3.13 The Council owns land at Lochnagar Street adjoining the school. It is proposed to incorporate this land within the school site to provide external play space as shown on the plan at Appendix A.

- 3.14 The land to be appropriated was acquired for Housing purposes by the Council under its CPO powers in 1980, and subsequently the houses were demolished and industrial use commenced.
- 3.15 The land is currently held under HRA powers, and therefore in order that it is utilised for Education purposes it should be appropriated to the General Fund.
- 3.16 The appropriation of dwellings from the HRA to the General Fund requires the consent of the Secretary of State under s19 (2) of the Housing Act 1985. Appropriation of other types of property can be effected under s122 of the Local Government Act 1972 without requiring consent. In this particular case, we are not appropriating dwellings so Secretary of State consent is not required.
- 3.17 When a property is appropriated from the HRA, the HRA account must be compensated, An appropriate assessment has to be made as to the market value of land transferred, and a corresponding adjustment is undertaken between the HRA Capital Financing Requirement (HRACFR) and the General Fund Capital Financing Requirement (GFCFR). The costs and any income relating to the property will subsequently fall to the General Fund, and the proportion of the Council's borrowing costs allocated to the HRA is reduced pro-rata. This is further detailed within the Comments of the Chief Finance Officer.
- 3.18 The land is partly vacant and partly occupied. The existing occupant will have his lease terminated by formal Notice under the Landlord and Tenant legislation and will be paid compensation in the event that the grounds for termination require a compensation payment to be made.

Procurement and Programme

- 3.19 An initial scheme has been developed at feasibility stage and it is proposed to use this as the basis for procurement. It is proposed to procure the works using an existing pre-tendered framework contract suitable for this size project and which is approved for use by the Council. Use of a pre-tendered framework avoids the longer EU timetable for tendering. Companies on the selected framework will enter into a mini-competition to confirm the appointment.
- 3.20 September 2018 appears at this stage to be the earliest opening date but this will be subject to the procurement process and programme.
- 3.21 If the framework approach to procurement is not pursued and the alternative of an EU compliant individual procurement is selected, this will add a minimum of 9 months to the programme and make the earliest opening date September 2019. This will place further pressure to create short term capacity where permanent capacity does not keep pace with the need for places as shown in the table in paragraph 3.1.

Capital cost

3.22 The estimated capital cost of the project is £9.0m. It is recommended that a capital estimate is adopted for £9.0m to allow the project to proceed. This will be funded from the Basic Need grant allocation for new school places.

Risks

3.23 The main risks to the development programme for the school are:

- The risk of increasing costs now being experienced in the construction sector
- Subject to the proposed appropriation referred to above, the risk of not being able to obtain vacant possession of the part of the land now occupied by a commercial use. Possession proceedings are in hand but there is no certainty about when possession will be achieved. If there is delay, there may be a need to redesign and reprogramme works to that area of the site forming the playground.
- The planning risk associated with Listed Building Consent. Early engagement with English Heritage will aim to mitigate this risk.
- Programme risks associated with the preferred procurement approach

Operation of the school

3.24 The proposed operation of the school will be subject to a separate process of reporting to Cabinet, consultation and decision-making.

Former Bow Boys' School site – background

3.25 The site is now vacant. The school is part of the Grouped Schools PFI contract and the Council remains liable for the ongoing contract charges even though the buildings are not in use. The annual charge of £238,000 has been rebated by £98,000 for the current reduction in services, but this still represents an ongoing cost for which the Council remains liable.

3.26 The site is in two parts divided by Paton Close – the south site, fronting Bow Road, and the north site with the locally listed Edwardian building, known as the Heritage Building. The north site is in a conservation area and is surrounded by locally listed terraced housing. This limits the potential for redevelopment to any significant height. Conservation advice has indicated that demolition of the Heritage Building would not be supported. The south site building, dating from 1960s and originally an office block, sits between a Grade II listed building and the DLR track.

Development options considered to date:

- i. North site – remodelling and extension to provide a 3FE primary school. This option is well-developed and a planning application could be ready to be submitted within a short time. This option includes alterations to the Heritage building, demolition of the science block and a new-build extension to provide

the nursery classes and hall with roof level MUGA to ensure sufficient external play area.

- ii. South site – primary school use by remodelling and extension. 2FE of capacity could be provided although with limited external area.
- iii. South site - potential for redevelopment for school and housing mixed use. This has not been developed in any detail.
- iv. Primary school use across the north and south sites – a complete rebuild option to provide 4FE across both sites was considered but not pursued in view of the conservation advice and the preferred maximum size for a primary school of 3FE.
- v. Temporary use – the option of “early opening” of the north site places has been considered by adaptation and use of temporary units at the south site whilst work is on site at the north site

Recommended Proposal

- 3.27 It is recommended that the proposal to provide 3FE primary capacity at the north site should now be progressed. Further consideration can be given to options for the south site.

Procurement

- 3.28 Because the site is included in the Grouped Schools PFI contract, we will work with THSL (Tower Hamlets Schools Ltd) to procure capital works. This is a model used for other sites in the contract, such as the works to rebuild Olga School. The contractor has a long term interest in the site (until 2027). The cooperation and consent of the PFI contractor and its funders is required in order to carry out the building works and so the PFI contractor will act as the Council’s agent to procure works and appoint a construction contractor following a competitive tender. This ensures that the scheme is jointly developed. Using an alternative contractor for the works would take more time and create additional costs for the Council in obtaining the relevant consents. It could also lead to potential contractual disputes during the works and in the subsequent delivery of ongoing facilities management services.
- 3.29 The Council and THSL will enter into a deed of variation to the contract for the terms of the works. The Council will assess the value for money of the construction works before completing the agreement. As part of the procurement process, the Council will set out local supply chain and local employment requirements comparable to the requirements of the Council’s own procurements.
- 3.30 Procurement of the capital works by this method includes agreement with THSL on any adjustment to the ongoing charges and services for the property. This takes account of the enhancement of the property as well as any increase or decrease in the overall floor area. The school pays the ongoing services charges from its budget.

Programme

- 3.31 September 2018 at this stage appears to be the earliest available opportunity. However, depending on phasing of the works, early opening could be investigated. If the recommended school development of the north site is pursued, early availability of places in September 2016 could be achieved if required by temporary use of the south site, subject to further investigation of costs.

Risks

- 3.32 The major risk is increasing construction costs. The Council continues to pay the ongoing contract costs whilst the site is vacant pending a decision. Any delay in a decision to proceed with implementation of the 3FE north site option will risk the supply of places to meet the need identified in 3.1 leading to costs for temporary provision.

Risk of Secretary of State's intervention

- 3.33 All or part of the site cannot be disposed of without the Secretary of State's consent, this includes proposed housing development. The Secretary of State has powers to require a vacant school to be transferred at nil cost to a free school regardless of whether the LA has applied for consent to dispose (referred to as a "scheme"). A free school could then open which would be outside the LA's programme for the provision of school places. This is a risk for this site which will increase the longer no proposals for its use are agreed.

Operating model

- 3.34 The proposed operation of the school will be subject to a separate process of reporting to Cabinet, consultation and decision-making.

Cost

- 3.35 For development of the 3FE option, it is recommended that a capital estimate is adopted for £11.0m, which will include furniture, equipment and ICT, to be funded from Basic Need capital grant

4. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

- 4.1. This report is proposing to bring back into use the former Bromley Hall Special School and the former site of Bow Boys' School for primary education. The estimated capital cost for Bromley Hall is £9.0m and for the Bow Boys' School site the capital estimate is £11.0m. Both of these schemes would be funded from the Basic Need capital grant allocation.
- 4.2. A report on the ESCW capital programme was agreed at Council in February 2015 and a revision to the capital programme is being considered elsewhere on this agenda.

- 4.3. It is proposed to incorporate the land at Lochnagar Street within the school site to provide external play space as shown on the plan at Appendix A. In order to do this the land needs to be appropriated from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) in to the General Fund.
- 4.4. The financial consequences of appropriation from the HRA are that the costs and any income relating to the property will subsequently fall on the General Fund, and that the value of the property is deducted from the total value of HRA assets (the “capital financing requirement” or “CFR”) and consequently that the proportion of the council’s borrowing costs allocated to the HRA pro rata to the HRA CFR is reduced.
- 4.5. Table 1 demonstrates the overall financial impact between the HRA and General Fund:

Table 1

		HRA	General
		£	Fund
			£
Capital Financing Requirement Adjustment (value of land):		(975,000)	975,000
Annual Revenue Charge:			
Principal (Minimum Revenue Provision – applies to General Fund only)		0	32,500
Interest (based on estimated CRI)	4.50%	(43,875)	43,875
Net Revenue Effect		(43,875)	76,375

- 4.6. It is expected that the additional General Fund debt costs will be contained within existing resources.
- 4.7. The reduction in the Housing Revenue Account Capital Financing Requirement will result in a corresponding increase in the HRA borrowing headroom that is available within the constraints of the HRA debt cap.

5. LEGAL COMMENTS

- 5.1. The Council, as a Local Education Authority, has a duty under Section 14(1) of the Education Act 1996 to secure that sufficient schools for providing primary education are available in its area. Section 14(2) clarifies that “sufficient” means that they must be sufficient in number, character and equipment to provide for all pupils the opportunity of appropriate education. The proposal to build additional primary school provision seems to be consistent with, and in pursuit of, that duty.

- 5.2. In deciding what provision to make in respect of primary and secondary schools, the Council is required to consider the need to secure diversity in the provision of schools and increasing opportunities for parental choice. This sits alongside the Council's general equality duty, which requires it to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who don't. Equalities analysis will need to be carried out alongside the development of proposals.
- 5.3. If the Council sees a need for a new school, then Part 2 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 will apply. There is a presumption that the new school will not be a new community school. Section 6A of the Education and Inspections Act has imposed a requirement on local authorities in England to seek proposals for the establishment of an Academy if they think a new school needs to be established in their area.
- 5.4. It is understood that the expanded school premises are proposed to be satellites of existing schools, rather than new schools. There is statutory guidance (School Organisation – Maintained Schools - Guidance for proposers and decision makers, January 2014) which states that where proposers seek to expand onto an additional site they will need to ensure that the new provision is genuinely a change to an existing school and not a new school.
- 5.5. It is proposed that capital estimates be adopted for the Bromley Hall and former Bow Boys' projects. The Council's chief finance officer, for the purposes of section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972, has put in place financial regulations and procedures for the proper administration of the Council's financial affairs. Pursuant to financial procedures FP 3.3(5) and 3.3(6), senior managers may only proceed with projects when there is a capital estimate adopted and adequate capital resources have been identified. Cabinet must approve capital estimates in excess of £250,000.
- 5.6. Before the capital estimates are agreed, the Cabinet should be satisfied that the projects are capable of being carried out within the Council's statutory functions. As the projects are concerned with provision of schools, this appears generally to be the case, having regard to the functions outlined above. However, each project should be subjected to scrutiny in respect of the Council's specific relevant powers prior to any tendering commencing.
- 5.7. The estimated value of the works exceeds the relevant threshold in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (the "Regulations"), requiring the Council to comply fully with the provisions of those Regulations.
- 5.8. The Council has an obligation as a best value authority under section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 to "make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness." Compliance by the Council with its own procurement procedures and the requirements of the

Regulations, where applicable, should help to meet these requirements, but ultimately the Council must be satisfied that the project and the engagement of any contractors will also provide best value.

- 5.9. For the former Bromley Hall School site, it is proposed to use a pre-tendered framework agreement to commission the works. There are a number of strict legal requirements which must be satisfied in order that the Council can lawfully use a framework agreement, which include being immediately identifiable from the OJEU notice and there being sufficient financial headroom. Evidence that demonstrates the proposed framework agreement was procured in accordance with the Regulations and may be used by the Council will need to be considered.
- 5.10. The process of calling-off the framework agreement will be governed by the requirements of the Regulations and the framework agreement itself. This is likely to include a mini-competition exercise in order to narrow the selection of a contractor down to the most economically advantageous tender in accordance with the prescribed criteria and weightings. Again, the process to be followed will need to meet the requirements of the Regulations and the framework.
- 5.11. The site of the former Bow Boys' School falls within the Grouped Schools PFI Contract entered into between the Council and Tower Hamlets Schools Limited (THSL) following a compliant procurement exercise in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006. Pursuant to that Contract, THSL have a level of control over the site until 2027 and their consent together with the consent of their funders is required in order to carry out works on it.
- 5.12. It is proposed therefore that a construction contractor will be procured by THSL, who will act as the Council's agent. This arrangement is within the scope of the original Grouped Schools PFI procurement exercise and, by adopting this process, the need to carry out an OJEU-level procurement to appoint a construction contractor is dispensed with. Even if the preferred option were to run a full procurement exercise in accordance with the Regulations, the consent and co-operation of THSL and their funders would be required.
- 5.13. THSL will be required to carry out a competitive tender exercise to ensure that best value is achieved and a value for money report will be commissioned by the Council before entering into the deed of variation with THSL.
- 5.14. It is proposed to incorporate adjoining land in Lochnagar Street, currently held as Housing land, into the Bromley Hall School site. This would require an appropriation from the HRA to the General Fund and the financial consequences of this are covered in section 4 above. Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that a Council may appropriate for any purpose for which it is authorised any land which belongs to the Council and is no longer required for the purpose for which it is held immediately before the appropriation.

- 5.15. The test to be taken to determine if appropriation is considered the correct approach is whether the land is no longer required for the purpose for which it was acquired. Although the land was originally acquired for housing use, it appears that it has never been developed for that purpose and has been in commercial use for a number of years. That the land is no longer required for the purpose it was acquired may be considered a reasonable view.
- 5.16. The general power under section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 must be read subject to section 19(2) of the Housing Act 1985 (the “1985 Act”) which states that where a local housing authority has acquired or appropriated land for the purposes of Part II of the 1985 Act, it will require the consent of the Secretary of State to appropriate any part of the land consisting of a house, or any part of a house, to any other purpose.
- 5.17. Circular 8/95 (the “Circular”) was issued by the then Department of the Environment in 1995 to provide guidance on the operation of the housing revenue account ring-fence, but it remains in force today. It provides that the Council should consider removing properties which have been proved under specified powers (including Part II of the 1985 Act) but which may no longer fulfil their original purpose. In these circumstances, the Council should consider their removal from the housing revenue account. Examples of properties which might fall into this category are commercial premises where there is no longer any connection with the Council’s housing. The decision is for the Council to take, although it should be able to explain the basis of the decision to the external auditor and tenants, if called upon to do so.
- 5.18. It should be noted that Government Circulars are not determinative of the law. Notwithstanding the advice of the Circular, further consideration of the particular circumstances may be needed in order to determine whether approval of the Secretary of State is required under section 19(2) of the 1985 Act or a direction of the Secretary of State under section 74(3)(d) as to whether the land falls within the scope of section 74 of the 1989 Act.
- 5.19. Section 9GB and paragraph 1 of Schedule A1 of the Local Government Act 2000 make provision in respect of Mayor and Cabinet executives. Sub-paragraph 1(8) of Schedule A1 specifies what happens if for any reason the both the elected mayor and deputy mayor are either unable to act or their offices are vacant. In that case, the executive must act in the elected mayor’s place or must arrange for a member of the executive to act in the elected mayor’s place. In Tower Hamlets, Cabinet is the executive, i.e. the elected mayor and two or more councillors appointed to the executive by the elected mayor.

6. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1. The provision of school places is necessary to ensure the Council meets its legal obligation to secure sufficient schools for Tower Hamlets, but will also promote equality of opportunity for children and young people (including within

the meaning of the Equality Act 2010). Equality considerations are taken into account in the planning, procurement and delivery of projects.

7. BEST VALUE (BV) IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The proposals in this report are based on best use of the Council's existing assets to retain the buildings in education use and help meet the Council's statutory duty to provide school places. For Bromley Hall School it is recommended that procurement should be via an approved pre-tendered framework which is the most time-efficient approach to ensure school places can be available to meet the need for places. This helps to mitigate the likelihood of expenditure on temporary provision where insufficient permanent capacity is available for the number of pupils starting school.
- 7.2 Both buildings referred to are vacant and are incurring costs whilst no beneficial use can be made of them. Bromley Hall School has deteriorated significantly and this report recommends action to address this.
- 7.3 The proposals to open primary school provision at these sites will be subject to further consultation both at planning application stage and as part of the required school organisation process.

8. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

- 8.1 The proposed capital works aim to improve and preserve the quality of existing buildings. Sustainability considerations are applied as far as possible to design and materials used. Major projects such as this are expected to obtain a minimum rating of Very Good in the BREEAM Assessment.

9. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The proposals to provide additional school places mitigate the risk of children being without the offer of a school place or short term measures having to be put in place to meet the need for places. The vacant sites remain an ongoing security and cost risk and these will be reduced by proposals to bring the site into use.
- 9.2 It should be noted that the construction sector is experiencing considerable cost inflation at present. Delays in proceeding with capital schemes such as these proposals will result in costs increasing.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 There are no implications arising from the recommendations of this report.

11. SAFEGUARDING IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 There are no specific implications arising from the recommendations of this report.
-

Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents

Linked Report

- NONE.

Appendices

- Appendix A – Land in Lochnagar Street

Background Documents – Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012

- NONE

Officer contact details for documents:

- Pat Watson, Building Development, ESCW extension 4328