

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO

DECISION SCHEDULE



Thursday 19th July 2007

at 10.00 am

in The Mayor's Office (Committee Room A),
Civic Centre, Hartlepool

The Mayor Stuart Drummond responsible for Regeneration and Liveability will consider the following items.

1. **KEY DECISIONS**

No items

2. **OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**

2.1 Heritage Protection for the 21st Century – White Paper – *Director of Regeneration and Planning*

2.2 Tees Valley Single Programme – Progress Report – *The Head of Regeneration*

2.3 Pride in Hartlepool Proposals – *Head of Public Protection*

3. **REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS**

No items

**REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO
REPORT TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER
19th July 2007**



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning

Subject: HERITAGE PROTECTION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY
- WHITE PAPER

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To provide further information on the Heritage Protection for the 21st Century White Paper produced by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), and details of the response by officers.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

2.1 The report outlines the background to the paper and the Officers response.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

3.1 Conservation policy falls within the Portfolio.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

4.1 Non-key.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

5.1 Portfolio Holder only.

6. DECISION (S) REQUIRED

6.1 That the Portfolio Holder notes the paper and the response.

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning

Subject: HERITAGE PROTECTION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY
- WHITE PAPER

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide further information on the Heritage Protection for the 21st Century White Paper produced by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), and details of the response by officers.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The proposals in the Heritage Protections for the 21st Century are based on three core principles:
- The need to develop a unified approach to the historic environment
 - Maximising opportunities for inclusion and involvement
 - Supporting sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system.
- 2.2 The paper sets out a vision of a unified and simpler heritage protection system, which will have more opportunities for public involvement and community engagement. The proposed system will be more open, accountable and transparent. It will offer a clear record of what is protected and why in the historic environment.

3. CHANGES TO CURRENT SYSTEMS

- 3.1 A summary of the main changes proposed are provided in Appendix 1 however two key issues include;
- The creation of a single system for national designation to replace listing, scheduling and registering.
 - The streamlining of regulations by merging Listed Building Consent and Scheduled Monument Consent, and by consultation on the merging of Conservation Area Consent with planning permission.
- 3.2 Attached in Appendix 2 are copies of officer comments to DCMS. These comments are based around three questions posed within the White Paper. In addition officers also forwarded comments of Tees Archaeology, the Archaeology Service for Councils on Teesside; these are also attached in Appendix 1.
- 3.3 In summary officers welcomed the proposals within the paper however urged further consideration on the proposal to merge conservation area consent with planning permission.

4 RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 That the Portfolio Holder notes the paper and the response.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

We will promote a new holistic approach towards the historic environment by creating a single designation regime that is simple and easy to understand. To do this:

- We will create a single system for national designation to replace listing, scheduling and registering.
- All national designation decisions will be made on the basis of special architectural, historic or archaeological interest.
- We will make designation decisions easier to understand by publishing new detailed selection criteria for national and local designation.
- We will devolve responsibility for national designation in England to English Heritage.

We will improve designation by involving the public in decisions about what is protected and how, and by making the process simpler and quicker. To do this:

- We will involve the public in shaping a new programme of national designation.
- We will create new Registers of Historic Buildings and Sites of England and Wales to replace existing lists and schedules.
- We will introduce simpler and clearer designation records and improve public access to these records through new internet portals.
- We will open up the system by introducing new consultation and appeal processes.
- We will introduce interim protection for historic assets
- We will speed up the system and deliver designation decisions faster.

We will support sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system. To do this:

- We will streamline regulation by merging Listed Building Consent and Scheduled Monument Consent, and by consulting on the merging of Conservation Area Consent with planning permission.
- We will introduce greater flexibility into the system through new statutory management agreements for historic sites.
- We will consult on the scope to reduce uncertainty and ensure early consideration of heritage issues through a greater role for pre-application discussion.
- We will clarify and strengthen protections for World Heritage Sites.
- We will enhance protection for archaeological remains on cultivated land.
- We will provide local planning authorities with new tools to protect locally designated buildings

We will improve the heritage protection system by raising the profile of the historic environment, promoting a more joined-up approach, and increasing capacity at local level. To do this:

- We will underpin new legislation with new policy guidance.
- English Heritage will implement a new programme of training, support and capacity building for English local authorities and local heritage organisations.
- We will improve access to information about the historic environment by introducing a statutory duty for local authorities to maintain or have access to Historic Environment Records.

DCMS, along with Ministers in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, will develop an improved UK-wide system of marine heritage protection that can work effectively alongside national systems.

To do this:

- • We will broaden the range of marine historic assets that can be protected.
- • Designation decisions will be made on the basis of special archaeological or historic interest.
- • We will make designation decisions easier to understand by publishing new selection criteria for marine designation.
- • We will introduce simpler and clearer designation records.
- • We will introduce interim protection for marine historic assets.
- • We will consider the scope for a new, flexible consents system, including provision for management agreements.
- • We will introduce a new statutory duty on the Receiver of Wreck to inform heritage bodies about marine historic assets.

APPENDIX 2

Response of officers from Hartlepool Borough Council

General Comments

Hartlepool Borough Council welcomes the White Paper and agrees with the need for a more streamlined and transparent system. In providing such a system there will be a pressure on local authorities to take on further responsibilities in its existing role. Support, in the form of additional resources, should be provided for local authorities to enable them to fully fulfil the new role which is being proposed.

Question 1

Should conservation area consent be removed as a specific consent and merged with planning permission?

The suggestion of the introduction of greater protection against demolition of properties located within conservation areas is welcomed. However Hartlepool BC has concerns that by merging planning permission with conservation area consent this would diminish the importance of conservation area consent and the effects that demolition can have on conservation areas.

Question 2

As a means of promoting early consideration of heritage issues in large scale developments, should there be new statutory guidance promoting pre-application assessment and discussion for all major planning applications which may affect historic assets?

The proposal for promoting pre-application assessment and discussion would be supported.

Question 3

As a means of providing greater certainty to developers should the current operation of Certificates of Immunity be expanded to enable an application to be made at any time, and for a site as well as an individual building?

There would be no objections to the proposal to introduce certificates of immunity at any time.

Response of officers of Tees Archaeology

Introduction

Tees Archaeology are the archaeology service for Teesside and provide archaeological advice and information to the four unitary authorities of Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees. Tees Archaeology holds the HER for this area.

The views below are those of Tees Archaeology and not necessarily of the four authorities which fund the service.

General Comments

Tees Archaeology welcomes the White Paper and agrees with the need for a more streamlined and transparent system. We are however concerned about achieving the necessary weight for Historic Environment considerations in the planning system and about the availability of the resources required to implement the proposed changes.

CH 1 Protecting the Historic Environment in England

Designation

We would welcome a new, single system for designation and also the intention to provide interim protection whilst designation is being considered (paras 30 – 31).

Heritage Protection and Planning

We are concerned that the proposed devolution of consents for ‘Scheduled Ancient Monuments’ brings with it additional casework for archaeological advisors to planning authorities and the resources for this would need to be made available.

While understanding the usefulness of Certificates of Immunity we are concerned about the implications of their extension to sites as well as buildings. In such cases Certificates can only be provided if a full programme of assessment and evaluation of the site has taken place, resourced by the prospective developer. It should also be clear that the Certificate would then only guarantee against Designation, not against the need for further archaeological works. The White Paper is moreover not clear as to who would issue these certificates. Presumably it would be the Designating bodies e.g. English Heritage. Unless there was extensive consultation with the HER this may lead to a conflict of approach with the HER and Local Authority in dealing with granting immunity to sites.

Heritage Environment Services at Local level

We welcome the proposal that English Heritage should bring forward guidance on Historic Environment services. In order for this to be effective it should however be a statutory requirement that Local Authorities have access to such services.

The proposal to create statutory HERs is welcome but unless this is backed up by a full range of Historic Environment Services, as suggested above, then the beneficial impact of this will be limited.

Ch 3 Protecting the Marine Historic Environment in the UK

Tees Archaeology regrets that there has been no consideration of the role of local authorities in relation to the marine historic environment. Local Authorities have a legitimate concern for their coastal zone and respond to a wide range of initiatives in this area.

Indeed Local Authorities might have a significant role to play in the management of designated marine historic assets through their foreshore activities.

In order to make a contribution to the protection of marine historic assets it is essential that the HER should be extended to 6 miles offshore and it is suggested that this might be included in the proposed guidance from English Heritage on HERs and Historic Environment Services.

We are also concerned that no effort has been made to resolve the potential conflicts between salvage rights and the historic environment and we believe that this is a major issue which should be addressed.

Conclusion

In conclusion we support the broad aims and approaches of the White Paper but have real concerns about the implementation of the new systems. Particularly in regard to the resources which will be required to make the system a success.

R Daniels 21.05.07

REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO
Report To Portfolio Holder
19th July 2007



Report of: The Head of Regeneration

Subject: TEES VALLEY SINGLE PROGRAMME- PROGRESS REPORT

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide an update of progress on the Hartlepool Single Programme Package for 2006/07 and to seek endorsement to the proposals for 2007/08. The report also contains a request to release £25,000 from the Major Regeneration Project Budget to contribute towards the Central Area Development Framework.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report provides information on progress and expenditure on the Hartlepool Package in 2006/07 and proposals for 2007/08 together with background information relating to the Central Area Development Framework.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Management of the Single Programme falls within the remit of the Portfolio Holder.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non-Key

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder Meeting

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is requested to:-

- i) Note progress on the schemes included in the 2006/07 programme.
- ii) Endorse the proposals included in the 2007/08 programme.

iii) Approve £25,000 from the Major Regeneration Project budget to contribute towards the Central Area Development Framework.

Report of: The Head of Regeneration

Subject: TEES VALLEY SINGLE PROGRAMME- PROGRESS REPORT

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To provide an update of progress on the Hartlepool Single Programme Package for 2006/07 and to seek endorsement of the proposals for 2007/08. The report also contains a request to release £25,000 from the Major Regeneration Project Budget to contribute towards the Central Area Development Framework.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Single Programme is one of the Governments main strategic economic development and regeneration programmes. Regional responsibility for the Programme lies with One North East but under devolved arrangements, most of its programme is managed by the Tees Valley Partnership which comprises representatives of the five local authorities and key economic development, support and regeneration agencies such as Business Link, the Learning and Skills Council, Tees Valley Regeneration and the University of Teesside.

3.0 SINGLE PROGRAMME DELIVERY PLAN 2006/07

3.1 Table 3.1, below gives details of the approved projects together with out-turn expenditure for 2006/07.

Table 3.1

CAPITAL PROJECT	APPROVED AMOUNT	OUTTURN EXPENDITURE
Central Area Attractors	£310,130	£310,130
Brougham Enterprise Centre	£402,000	£402,000
SEA PORT	£12,601	£12,601
Seaton Tourism*	£26,034	£26,034
Coastal Walkway Phase 1*	£32,200	£9,361

REVENUE PROJECT	APPROVED AMOUNT	OUTTURN EXPENDITURE
Building Futures	£753,010	£742,141
Management and Admin	£60,000	£60,000
Marketing and Training	£59,865	£59,865
Hartlepool Events	£5,000	£5,000
Redcar Events	£4,500	£4,500
Coastal Arc Co-ordinator	£38,919	£38,433
Culture 10	£20,000	£20,000

*Additional 'in year' approvals

- 3.2 In terms of scheme progress, a major achievement was secured through the successful completion of refurbishments at Brougham Enterprise Centre using a combination of Single Programme and NRF funds. This has resulted in the creation of nine new business units and a much improved operating environment for existing businesses.
- 3.3 Work commenced on Phase Two of the Central Area Attractors project involving works to the Wingfield Castle Education Suite, Deck Restoration on the Wingfield Castle, Hartlepool Maritime Experience Joint Workshop, Trincomalee Exhibition Room and Balcony, Trincomalee Exhibition and the Maritime Activity Centre.
- 3.4 Due to delays in securing ERDF funding (which was only approved in June), Phase Two of the project has been merged with Phase Three in order to reduce the project timescales and to meet the funding deadlines. Phase Three of the project involves the Quayside Reception Building, Marine Barracks, Marine Barracks Display and Trincomalee Ship Interpretation.
- 3.5 A number of projects approved in previous financial years continued to be supported by the Single Programme in 2006/07. These included Building Futures, a collaborative Intermediate Labour Market project which is operated on a Tees Valley-wide level but managed through the Hartlepool Package; the Coastal Arc Co-ordinator who is responsible for the overall promotion and delivery of the Coastal Arc in line with the Coastal Arc Strategy, and the Coastal Arc Marketing and Events project, a joint project with Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council which delivers the Marketing and Events element of the Coastal Arc Strategy.
- 3.6 In addition to the above, 'in-year' approvals were received in relation to two projects. One was for the first phase of the Coastal Walkway which will eventually provide a direct link between the Headland, Victoria Harbour and the Marina. Phase One which will see the main expenditure take place in 2007/08 covers a stretch of the Town Wall on the Headland leading up to the proposed footbridge landing area. The

second approval related to a small sum covering retention payments on the previously completed environmental works at Seaton Carew.

4.0 **SINGLE PROGRAMME DELIVERY PLAN 2007/08 (APPROVED PROJECTS)**

- 4.1 Within the current Single Programme Business Plan for approved projects, the resource allocation for the Hartlepool Package is limited compared to previous years. This in some measure is a reflection of previous success in bringing forward and delivering schemes, but also a result of One North East's increasing prioritisation of resources towards larger scale, strategic, economic regeneration schemes and Tees Valley Regeneration projects, which includes Victoria Harbour.
- 4.2 Current approvals for 2007/08 are set out in Table 4.2

Table 4.2

REVENUE PROJECT	APPROVED AMOUNT
Management and Admin	£60,000
Coastal Arc Co-ordinator	£40,314
Building Futures	£935,570

CAPITAL PROJECT	APPROVED AMOUNT
Central Area Attractor	£375,000
Coastal Walkway Phase 1	£155,229*

*£22,839 carried over from 2006/07

- 4.3 In addition to these schemes, there are several projects which have been approved in principle within the Tees Valley Investment Plan for 2007/08 and are currently progressing through the Business Case approval process. Two of these relate to preliminary expenditure aimed at identifying future investment opportunities within key areas of the town – the Southern Business Zone and the Central Area. As mentioned above, One North East is increasingly targeting resources at strategic economic investment opportunities, at the expense of smaller scale interventions and pure environmental works. The preliminary expenditure is intended to look strategically at these two areas and to identify how public sector interventions can encourage and support direct private investment within an overall master-planning approach, which in turn will increase the economic performance of the town and generate broader public benefits.
- 4.4 In relation to the Central Area project One North East have accepted the urgent need to progress with preliminary expenditure to prepare a development framework, through jointly managed consultancy work, to

identify and define further development opportunities, building on current commitments and plans. One NorthEast are looking for the Council to contribute towards the cost of the study. The Portfolio Holder is therefore requested to approve £25,000 from the Major Regeneration Project Budget as the Council's contribution towards the study, which is likely to have a budget of £100,000-£150,000.

- 4.5 For the Southern Business Zone, the requisite match funding for Single Programme is envisaged to be provided from a combination of Economic Development budget and private sector contributions.
- 4.6 The other scheme included in the Tees Valley Investment Plan is the Heugh Battery/Friarage Manor House Project. This scheme seeks to support the tourism and investment objectives of the Headland Revival programme, by supporting the provision of improved infrastructure in this part of the Headland and facilitating the refurbishment of the Manor House, including the development of the adjacent land.
- 4.7 Finally, the Rivergreen development on Queens Meadow which was initially approved in 2006/07 has recently commenced with Single Programme support and will provide 80,000 sq. ft. of high quality move-on accommodation for small businesses in order to support the incubation strategy. This is a £6.2 million development comprising of a £1.7 million contribution from Single Programme.

5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Projects within the Single Programme package are subject to individual appraisal and approval. There is an increasing requirement for public/private funding to be provided alongside Single Programme resources and the Council is normally expected to contribute. For example, on the Coastal Walkway Phase One scheme a contribution of around 20% amounting to £40,000 has been approved. In relation to schemes that are currently being developed, Council contributions will be identified on an individual basis as part of the appraisal process and specific budgets identified at that time.
- 5.2 One NorthEast are looking for the Council to contribute towards the cost of the Central Area study. The Portfolio Holder is therefore requested to approve £25,000 from the Major Regeneration Project Budget as the Council's contribution towards the scheme.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The Portfolio Holder is requested to:-
- i) Note progress on schemes included in the 2006/07 programme
 - ii) Endorse the proposals included in the 2007/08 programme.
 - iii) Approve £25,000 from the Major Regeneration Project Budget to contribute towards the Central Area Development Framework.

REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY

Report to Portfolio Holder
Thursday 19th July 2007



Report of: Head of Public Protection

Subject: PRIDE IN HARTLEPOOL PROPOSALS

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider a recommendation of the Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group in respect of proposals for community projects.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report contains details of a request for funding (£808) from the Pride in Hartlepool budget towards the cost of replacing a shrub border at Stranton Primary School.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The Portfolio Holder is responsible for environmental initiatives.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non key decision.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Recommendation of Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group to Regeneration and Liveability Portfolio Holder.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

To agree the recommendation of the Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group in respect of community environmental projects.

Report of: Head of Public Protection

Subject: PRIDE IN HARTLEPOOL PROPOSALS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To consider a recommendation of the Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group in respect of a proposal for a community project.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group met on Friday 6th July and recommended the following for approval:

2.2 Stranton Primary School Shrub Border
Stranton Primary School are requesting funding of £808.00 from Pride in Hartlepool towards the removal of an existing shrub border and creating of a new border. Children will be involved in planting and maintenance of the new border which is at the school entrance.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The funding for the above projects is available within the Pride in Hartlepool budget.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 That the recommendation of the Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group be approved.