

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/2020 REPORT NO.

### MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

### REPORT OF:

Executive Director of Resources  
Fay Hammond

Agenda – Part: 1

Item:

**Subject:– Public sector pension system  
and support contract award**

**Key Decision No: KD 5005**

**Cabinet Member consulted: Cllr Maguire**

Contact officer and telephone number:

Julie Barker – Head of Exchequer Services

Tel: 0208 3794690

Email: [Julie.barker@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Julie.barker@enfield.gov.uk)

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 There is a statutory obligation to ensure employees, of eligible scheme employers have access to the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). The Enfield Pension Fund must operate within the framework of the LGPS Regulations, associated legislation and The Pension Regulator.
- 1.2 Currently the Council, who act as the Administering Authority for the Enfield Pension Fund uses a specialist public sector pension system supplied and supported by Heywood Ltd via a Sprint II Framework Agreement serviced by a Specialist Computer Centres (SCC). The Framework contract expires on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020.
- 1.3 The procurement of specialist pension software directly from the successful bidder will ensure full compliance to legal obligations as required by the Pension Regulator and LGPS Regulations.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Following the Council's procurement rules, agree to award the contract to provide a hosted pension software and support service to the successful bidder, from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020, for a duration of 36 months with the option of extending for a further 24 months on a year by year basis.

### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Council acting as the Administering Authority for Enfield Pension Fund has a statutory obligation to ensure eligible employees of the Council, as well as employees of admitted and schedule body employers within the Fund, have access to the LGPS.
- 3.2 The Enfield Pension Fund has 58 Fund Employers. Enfield Council is the largest employer in terms of membership numbers and acts as the Funds Administering Authority, as required by LGPS regulations. The Enfield Fund has 23,385 Members split between the following membership types:

<b>Membership Type</b>	<b>Numbers</b>
Active	7,505
Deferred	6,198
Pensioners	5,127
Pensioner Dependants	771
Frozen Refunds	1,461
Undecided Leavers	2,323

- 3.3 Currently the Pension Team uses specialist LGPS IT software called Altair which is provided, supported and hosted by Heywood Ltd via a Sprint II Framework Agreement serviced by Specialist Computer Centres (SCC). The Framework contract expires on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020.

### **4. PROCUREMENT EXERCISE**

- 4.1 On 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019, a contract notice ([2019/S 142-349806](#)) was placed in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU). The tender was also advertised through the Contract Finder and the Council's e-tendering system – the London Tenders Portal.
- 4.2 The final deadline for submission of tenders was 13<sup>th</sup> September 2019. Following tender submission, the proposals have been assessed by Council Officers from Exchequer Services, Procurement and IT.
- 4.3 Further information is provided in Part 2 Report.

## **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 A number of Administering Authorities have been working on a National LGPS Framework to assess the viability of setting up a pension administration software framework. Whilst the initiative has the support of central government and market engagement events are planned, it is anticipated that the framework will not be available to use until Autumn 2020 at the earliest.
- 5.2 There is no scope to extend the current SCC contract beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 or to procure a short-term contract with Heywood directly in order for the Authority to join the National Framework when it goes live later in the year.

## **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 To award the contract to the winning bidder of the Procurement. Information is provided in Part 2 Report.

## **7. COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **7.1 Financial Implications**

*Please refer to Part 2*

### **7.2 Legal Implications**

- 7.2.1 The Council as a Local authority and as an Administering Body is obliged by and must ensure compliance with the LGPS Regulations 2013 and any amendments thereof. As part of its statutory duties the Council must ensure access of eligible scheme employees to the LGPS. Furthermore, Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables local authorities to do anything, including incurring expenditure, borrowing, which facilitate or are conducive or incidental to the discharge of their functions. Furthermore, the Council has the power under section 1 (1) of the Localism act 2011 to do anything that individuals generally may do provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles. The procurement of a compliant and effective software system to incidental and ancillary the powers outlined above.
- 7.2.2 The value of the proposed contract exceeds the relevant EU threshold for services therefore, a fully compliant process must have been carried

out in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and as per the Council's Contract Procedure Rules (CPRs). The Procurement Department has confirmed that his has been fully complied with.

7.2.3 The Council must comply with its obligations with regards to obtaining Best Value under the Local Government (Best Value Principles) Act 1999. it is confirmed that this obligation has been complied with when choosing the successful bidder.

7.2.4 Due to the value of the contract, this report constitutes a Key Decision, and therefore, the Key Decision procedure must be followed.

7.2.5 All resulting contracts and ancillary documentation shall be prepared and agreed by Legal Services. Due to the value of the contract, the contract shall be sealed on behalf of the Council in compliance with the CPRs.

### **7.3 Procurement Implications**

7.3.1 Any procurement must be undertaken in accordance with the Councils Contract Procedure Rules (CPR's) and the Public Contracts Regulations (2015).

7.3.2 The award of the contract, including evidence of authority to award, promoting to the Councils Contract Register, and the uploading of executed contracts must be undertaken on the London Tenders Portal including future management of the contract.

7.3.3 All awarded projects must be promoted to Contracts Finder to comply with the Government's transparency requirements.

7.3.4 It is expected that this contract will be properly managed to ensure VFM, and that sufficient time will be allocated towards the end of the contract for any re-procurement.

## **5. KEY RISKS**

The Enfield Pension Fund can not operate a pension scheme to members of the Fund, as required by law without a suitable software and system support service.

## **6. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES – CREATING A LIFETIME OF OPPORTUNITIES IN ENFIELD**

### **6.1 Good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods**

None

**6.2 Sustain strong and healthy communities**

None

**6.3 Build our local economy to create a thriving place**

None

*olga*

**7. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

Local authorities have a responsibility to meet the Public Sector Duty of the Equality Act 2010. The Act gives people the right not to be treated less favourably because of any of the protected characteristics.

The software procured will not only satisfy statutory obligations, as set out in LGPS regulations it will also provide member self-service tools. Consideration will be made in terms of ensuring that the software procured enables easy access and use by all fund members.

**8. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Performance management functionality is an essential requirement in the tender documentation as performance measuring is a key Pension Regulator requirement.



## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/2020 REPORT NO.

### **ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

**PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:  
Cllr Mary Maguire Cabinet  
Member for Finance and  
Procurement**

Contact officer and telephone number:

Doug Ashworth: 020 8132 0957

Email: doug.ashworth@enfield.gov.uk

<b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>	<b>KD Number: n/a</b>
-------------------------	-----------------------

<b>Subject: Asset Management – Disposal of Council Owned Land and Property – Durants Road Chapel</b>
--

<b>Wards: Enfield Highway</b>
-------------------------------

### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report seeks approval to the sale of the Durants Road Chapel which is surplus to operational requirements and therefore considered in the Council's overall best interests to sell.

This sale will assist in funding capital spending and will reduce the Council's ongoing revenue liabilities including but not limited to business rates, insurance, reactive maintenance and repair and security costs.

### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That approval is given to the disposal of this property to the trustees of the Greek Orthodox Church of St Raphael, Nicholas and Irene.
- 2.2 To incorporate the agreed Heads of Terms set out in Appendix 1 (of the Part 2 report) into a contract for sale in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Property Procedure Rules) and otherwise in accordance with the requirements of the Council's legal advisers.

### **3. BACKGROUND**

The general principles for the retention, re-use or disposal of surplus property has been set out in previous Asset Management Reports (Disposal Tranche Reports 1-9) and the underlying rationale incorporated within the Strategic Asset Management Plan 2019.

Consideration has also been given as to whether the asset is capable of generating an acceptable revenue return in lieu of a capital receipt however due to the poor condition of the property, it is not a viable proposition in this instance.

## **The Property**

The subject property comprises a vacant Victorian chapel originally constructed pre-1900 which has been vacant for many years. The property is of solid brickwork construction under a pitched timber frame roof with a slate roof covering.

Internally, the property is in a very poor state of repair and is currently not suitable for occupation. However, externally the property appears in a reasonable state of repair. The building totals 851 sq.ft (Gross internal Area) based on a Gross External Area of 946 sq.ft.

The valuation report attached at Appendix 2 (of the Part 2 report) contain further details of the property together with photographs and Appendix 3 shows the land/buildings to be disposed.

## **Proposal**

The Durants road chapel has been unused for many years and is surplus to the operational requirements of the cemetery service. Following consultation with stakeholders it is considered appropriate to bring this asset back into beneficial occupation.

The chapel is surrounded on three sides by graves and therefore a sensitive solution is required for its re-use.

The Greek Orthodox Church of St Raphael, Nicholas and Irene own the former semi-detached houses located directly opposite, (now demolished) having purchased the site in early 2019 and now wish to purchase the unused chapel and bring back into beneficial use for church services. The combination of the two assets is considered by both the church and the Council to be synergistic, enabling the church to conduct religious services in the chapel whilst also serving the wider community through construction of a community centre on their own land opposite.

They currently share premises elsewhere in the borough with another Christian denomination however they have been given notice to vacate their current premises and therefore need to move urgently.

The Greek Orthodox congregation would also naturally prefer to own their own premises.

They have been engaged in a site search for alternative premises since 2017 and have approached the Council with a view to combining the site in their ownership, with the Chapel currently owned by the Council directly opposite.

In view of the Council's need for a sensitive re-use of the current chapel building, and the Greek Orthodox communities' requirement for new premises, in principle, this proposal is considered satisfactory in principle.

Property Procedure Rules state that ordinarily the asset should be offered to the market and competitive bids received. In this instance this approach is not deemed satisfactory because:

- The asset is located in a sensitive location and the use needs to be compatible with a cemetery use adjacent.
- The Church have offered a sum significantly in excess of market value as evidenced by a formal valuation undertaken by the Council's external valuer – Avison Young.
- As an adjacent owner the Church may therefore be considered to be a "Special Purchaser" within the meaning described within the Property Procedure Rules.
- The following non – financial (community) benefits have been put forward by the Church in support of their application to purchase this asset from the Council.
  - The church intends to bring the adjacent derelict and demolished (formerly pair of semi-detached houses) back into use in the medium term as a community centre to be used in association with the Chapel. It is currently an "eyesore" within the park setting. In the short term the site's appearance will be improved.
  - The community building will be used for functions associated with the Church including rooms for educational purposes, christenings, weddings and other community related activities including uses not necessarily related to church activity.
  - Potential opportunity for dual use arrangement on parking in the future on adjacent land used by the bowls club subject to the agreement on terms may be possible.

For the reasons noted above it is therefore recommended that the Council dispose of the Durants Road, former Chapel to the Greek Orthodox Church of St Raphael, Nicholas and Irene.

The access road to the Chapel is long and narrow and therefore commentary from the Highway's team has been sought as follows:

- The access from Hertford Road is narrow and does not appear to allow for two vehicles to enter and exit at the same time, in addition there are limited opportunities to pass. This potentially creates an issue with vehicles queuing on or reversing onto a busy, classified road. One solution could be the use of some of the land to the right of the access (appears to be related to Durants Park bowls club) to be used to widen the current road. Alternatively, there would need to be marshalling to avoid conflicts.
- There is no separate pedestrian access and the access road does not have a footway. If there is to be an increase in people walking and cycling to the site consideration would need to be given to marking out a clear route for pedestrians and cyclists.
- With some reconfiguration there could be around 10 parking spaces provided to the front of the existing building. Other parking demand will need to be accommodated although the exact level will depend on the number of visitors and the likely modal share (as a rule of thumb we would assume at least 50% of people will be driving).

- Given plans for this section of Hertford Road to be improved via the Cycle Enfield programme, it is likely that on-street parking will be reconfigured so this could impact on its availability for the proposed use.
- There will need to be secure cycle parking provided in line with regional and local policies.

Overall, given the extant use, the principle of the proposed development is acceptable subject to access and parking requirements being fulfilled.

Heads of Terms have provisionally been agreed with the Church and these are detailed in Appendix 1 to the Part 2 report.

A proposed sale plan (agreed with the Cemetery Service) is attached.

#### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Retention of property without regular review is clearly not in the Council's business interests. If property is not disposed of, it would cause a reduction in capital spending or increased borrowing. However, evaluation of individual cases may result in retention being the better option.

#### **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

Potential disposal of the properties is recommended as being in the Council's best financial interests balanced against service and community needs.

#### **6. COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

##### **6.1 Financial Implications**

6.1.1 The proceeds from disposal will be one off and used to fund the existing capital programme. The alternative method for funding the programme would be to borrow from the PWLB.

6.1.2 Eligible costs associated with disposals can be offset against the receipt up to a maximum of 4% of the sale price for each disposal. The expenditure will be closely monitored to ensure that all appropriate costs are offset against the capital receipts.

6.1.3 The sale of this asset will also be a cost avoidance measure with reduced revenue expenditure on reactive maintenance, security, business rates and other costs of a re-occurring or periodic nature.

##### **6.2 Legal Implications**

6.2.1 By Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 ("S.123 LGA") and/or Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 the Council has the power to dispose of land in any manner it wishes, subject to certain provisions.

6.2.2 The Council has a statutory duty to obtain the best price reasonably obtainable, subject to certain exemptions.

- 6.2.3 All disposals should be made on a competitive basis, unless justified and approved otherwise, as required by the Property Procedure Rules. Justification for an "off market sale" has been made in the body of this report.
- 6.2.4 Some disposals may be subject to conditions such as the grant of planning permission which will be a pre-requisite to the completion of the disposal and the receipt of the sale proceeds. This is not the case in this instance as this is a wholly unconditional sale with no conditions attached.
- 6.2.5 Contracts for sale will be in a form approved by the Assistant Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (Legal Services).

### **6.3 Property Implications**

These are explicitly stated within the report.

## **7. KEY RISKS**

The risk of property disposals not providing the necessary proceeds to fund the approved Capital Programme will be mitigated as far as possible by prudent budget setting and processes for review and monitoring of progress and assessment of market conditions.

There is a risk that by not offering the property to the market we would have received a higher amount, however, the price proposed by the purchaser is above the market rate and therefore given the other non-financial community benefits it represents "Best Value". Valuations have been provided at Appendix 3 to justify the sale to the purchaser.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES – CREATING A LIFETIME OF OPPORTUNITIES IN ENFIELD**

### **8.1 Good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods**

Not applicable.

### **8.2 Sustain strong and healthy communities**

The disposal of this property for community use builds social cohesion and addresses the needs of the population for a place of worship. The range of community uses on offer on adjacent land (to be developed as a community centre) will also assist local people. The capital receipt will also help fund capital projects that assist the Council in building strong communities.

### **8.3 Build our local economy to create a thriving place**

Not applicable.

**9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

Corporate advice has been sought with regard to equalities and an agreement has been reached that an equalities impact assessment is neither relevant nor proportionate for the approval of this report.

**10. PERFORMANCE AND DATA IMPLICATIONS**

Rationalisation and more efficient use of property will contribute to improving service delivery to assist in meeting the Council's objectives.

**11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

The provision of a chapel and in the medium term, a community centre on linked adjacent land will contribute towards well-being in the neighbourhood (through a range of community uses, potentially related to exercise and other community led initiatives providing public health benefits) and will also encourage social cohesion by permitting lettings to non-affiliated organisations and groups.

**Background Papers**

Appendix 1: Proposed Sale Plan

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/20 REPORT NO.**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Law and  
Governance

**Agenda – Part:1**

**Item:**

**Subject: Police S92 Contract**

**Wards: All**

**Key Decision No: 4994**

Contact officer and telephone number:  
Andrea Clemons  
Email: [andrea.clemons@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:andrea.clemons@enfield.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Member consulted; Community  
Safety and Cohesion**

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The current Community Policing contract expires at the end of August 2019 and we have been advised that the price will increase compared with the current contract, due to the end of a reduced cost offer by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime across London.
- 1.2 This report seeks authority to increase funding for the provision of 16 police officers to work on Council Housing Estates for a further 2 years. The funding is provided from the Housing Revenue Account and will require approval for an additional budget in year 2019-20, although this increase will be gradual due to existing vacancies in the team.
- 1.3 This is an important and valued service to residents on the targeted estates and contributes to reduced crime levels and increased feelings of resident safety.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**To approve additional funding from the Housing Revenue Account for 2019/20 and for two subsequent years to facilitate the continuation of the policing service on prioritised housing estates.**

## BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Community Safety Team has delivered a community policing service on 5 high crime council housing estates since September 2016. The current contract allows for the provision of 16 police officers on a "buy one, get one free" basis and expired at the end of August 2019. The funding model is now changing and to secure the same level of resource we need to increase our funding. Following a discussion at EMT it was agreed that the report could be signed by the Director.
- 3.2 Regular contact between the Community Safety Team and the Dedicated Policing Unit has ensured that the team is tasked to high crime areas on council housing estates and provide fortnightly reports to indicate the outcome of those taskings.
- 3.3 The contract has been successful and can demonstrate positive outcomes in the areas where the work has been prioritised. Listed below are some of the key beneficial outcomes from analysis of the current contract to the end of January 2019

Since September 2016, the Safer Estates Team have made **767** arrests in total and have carried out **2132** stop and searches.

The number of crimes in the 5 Priority Estates (The Shires, Ayley Croft, Joyce Avenue and Snells Park, Moree Way and Lytchet) has increased by **11.5%** when comparing the period before and after the Safer Estates contract started. However, in the same period, Enfield on average and including lower crime areas, experienced a greater increase of **14.7%**.

Drug offences have decreased in Enfield by 24.9% but have **increased in the 5 Priority Estates** by 18.2%. **This suggests that the Safer Estates Teams are proactively apprehending more offenders in these areas whilst on patrol.**

Violence against the person offences **decreased in the 5 priority estates** by **4.2%**. In the same period, Enfield experienced an increase of 15.6%.

Burglary offences in the 5 priority estates have **decreased by 18.9%** in the length of the project. In Enfield, in the same time burglaries have increased slightly by 1.2%

Criminal Damage offences in the 5 priority estates have **decreased by 10.4%**. In the same period Enfield experienced an increase of 4.6%.

- 3.4 The cost of services to be provided is detailed in the Part 2 of this report
- 3.5 There is no requirement to tender for this contract as the Metropolitan Police via MOPAC are a unique provider of for policing in the Capital.

## 4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

### 4.1 Option 1- Do nothing

Crime is a major concern in London and there is recognition that the MPS have been forced to make savings by selling buildings etc to protect the front line of services. Even then the demand for police outstrips supply and crime numbers in areas outside where the Council funded teams have been working are increasing, demonstrating the value of the additional Council funded resource.

## **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 To ensure that Enfield Communities feel safer. Through the provision of additional officers, improvements have been made in targeted areas. We know that people value the scheme through direct input at public meetings and other feedback. The team have been able to support other additional support at community events within the limitations of the HRA requirements

## **6. COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

The cost outlined in the report Part 2 will be managed within the HRA

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

6.2.1 Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 permits local authorities to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of their functions.

6.2.2 In addition the Council has a general power of competence under Section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything that individuals may do, provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles.

6.2.3 Section 92 (2) of The Police Act 1996 provides that the Council of a London Borough, County, or District which falls wholly or partly within the Metropolitan Police district may make grants for the police purposes to the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District. This includes the Mayor's Office. Grants can be made as a gift or there is an arrangement for contract of services. Section 92 (3) of the 1996 Act provides Grants under this section may be made unconditionally, or with the agreement of the chief officer of the police for the police area concerned subject to conditions. It is noted the grant will be made subject to an agreement as set out in the body of the report. The performance of officers will have to be managed in accordance with the terms of the agreement. Once the scheme has been implemented the Council must ensure that no part of the funds represents a 'profit' to any of the recipients in order to avoid any indication of a procurement activity.

### **6.3 Property Implications**

There are no direct property implications in this report

### **7. KEY RISKS**

### **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES – CREATING A LIFETIME OF OPPORTUNITIES IN ENFIELD**

**Good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods**

**Sustain strong and healthy communities**

**Build our local economy to create a thriving place**

### **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

### **10. PERFORMANCE AND DATA IMPLICATIONS**

*10.1* Regular meetings between the Community Safety Manager and the contractor ensure that performance measures and quality work is consistently delivered.

There is an Information Sharing Protocol compliant with GDPR, recently signed off at the Safer and Stronger Community Board.

### **11. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

### **12. HR IMPLICATIONS**

No HR implications

### **13. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**