

# **JOINT REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY, NEIGHBOURHOODS & COMMUNITIES AND FINANCE & EFFICIENCY PORTFOLIO DECISION SCHEDULE**



**Thursday 26 July 2007**

**at 8.30 am**

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

The Mayor Stuart Drummond, Cabinet Member responsible for Regeneration and Liveability, Councillor Peter Jackson, Cabinet Member responsible for Neighbourhoods and Communities and Councillor Robbie Payne, Cabinet Member responsible for Finance and Efficiency will consider the following item.

**1. KEY DECISIONS**

No items

**2. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**

2.1 Warren Road Development – *Head of Procurement and Property Services and Director of Regeneration and Planning*

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

No items

# **JOINT REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY, NEIGHBOURHOOD AND COMMUNITIES AND FINANCE AND EFFICIENCY PORTFOLIOS**

Report To Portfolio Holders

**26<sup>th</sup> July 2007**



**Report of:** Head of Procurement and Property Services and  
Director of Regeneration and Planning

**Subject:** WARREN ROAD DEVELOPMENT

---

## **SUMMARY**

### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To obtain further Portfolio Holders' views on the proposals for development at Warren Road.

### **2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

The contents include copies of previous reports which outline the proposals and consultation results. The report highlights a discrepancy in the consultation that needs to be considered by Members.

### **3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBERS**

Portfolio Holders are responsible for Asset Management, Regeneration and Housing and Neighbourhood and the Community respectively.

### **4.0 TYPE OF DECISION**

Non Key

### **5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holders

### **6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

The Portfolio Holders' views on the way forward are sought.

**Report of:** Head of Procurement and Property Services  
Director of Regeneration and Planning

**Subject:** WARREN ROAD DEVELOPMENT

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To obtain further Portfolio Holders' views on the proposals for development at Warren Road.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Joint Regeneration and Liveability, Neighbourhoods and Communities and Finance and Efficiency Portfolio meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> July (report attached as **Appendix 1**) the Portfolio Holders considered the consultation results on the potential development at Warren Road. This report also includes a copy of a previous report to the Joint Regeneration, Liveability and Housing and Performance Management Portfolio meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2007. The report is attached at Confidential **Appendix 2. This item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information)(Variation) Order 2006) namely, Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).**

## **3. CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 Since the Portfolio Holders' meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2007 a discrepancy in a plan submitted by one of the developers for the consultation exercise has been highlighted. The plan did not relate directly to the last proposal considered by the Portfolio Holders at the meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> March 2007.
- 3.2 Portfolio Holders need to review the decision reached at the meeting of the 16<sup>th</sup> July 2007 in the light of this information.
- 3.3 The relevant plans will be on display at the meeting.

## **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 The Portfolio Holders' views on the way forward are sought.

**JOINT FINANCE AND EFFICIENCY,  
REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY AND  
NEIGHBOURHOOD AND COMMUNITIES  
PORTFOLIOS**

Report To Portfolio Holders  
**16<sup>th</sup> July 2007**



**Report of:** Head of Procurement and Property Services and  
Director of Regeneration and Planning

**Subject:** WARREN ROAD DEVELOPMENT

---

**SUMMARY**

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To obtain Portfolio Holders' views on the proposals for development at Warren Road.

**2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

Background, including reference to previous portfolio report, to the market testing exercise for the potential development at Warren Road, and the outcome of the public consultation on the proposals received.

**4.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

Portfolio Holders are responsible for Regeneration and Housing and Neighbourhood and the Community respectively.

**5.0 TYPE OF DECISION**

Non Key

**5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holders

**6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

The Portfolio Holders' views on the way forward are sought.

**Report of:** Head of Procurement and Property Services  
Director of Regeneration and Planning

**Subject:** WARREN ROAD DEVELOPMENT

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To obtain Portfolio Holders' views on the proposals for development at Warren Road.

### 2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Joint Regeneration, Liveability and Housing and Performance Management Portfolio meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2007 considered proposals for two developers for land at Warren Road. The report is attached at Confidential **Appendix 1. This item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information)(Variation) Order 2006) namely, Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).**
- 2.2 Before deciding on the form of development and the selection of any preferred developer it was agreed by the two portfolio holders that the community in the immediate area be asked for views as to
- Whether development could bring benefits to the area
  - If so what improvements are needed in the area?
- 2.3 It was agreed that the Public Consultation Exercise would outline the proposals anonymously.
- 2.4 A short consultation event was held in West View Library between 23<sup>rd</sup> & 26<sup>th</sup> May 2007 to enable some feed back on the principles of development and the range of community benefits which could be obtained from such development.
- 2.5 The consultation event gave a brief explanation of the proposals. Un-attributed sketches showing layouts and elevations which had been supplied by the tenderers were displayed to illustrate what could be developed on the site and to generate discussion on what community benefits might be preferred should development proceed.
- 2.6 A questionnaire on the opportunity for development was also made available.

### 3. CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 3.1 A total of 1391 households were contacted together with other consultees including West View Primary School, the Davison Drive and the Warren Road shops, together with West View Advice & Resource Centre, West View Project and Holy Trinity Church.
- 3.2 Over the three sessions at the library about 100 residents engaged in conversation with officers.
- 3.3 In addition at the West View Residents' Local Neighbourhood Action Plan Forum meeting held at the library on 24<sup>th</sup> May an officer was present to explain the proposals to the group.
- 3.4 36 questionnaires have been analysed. There was no clear indication as to whether development was supported. 16 were supportive of development, 15 wished to retain the open space and one was undecided seeing benefits but unclear as to loss of space. Other respondents were not clear about whether development was beneficial. At the display there was no general overall consensus as to whether development is supported in principle.
- 3.5 Those in favour of development cited the lack of use of the grassed area which is only used only by dog walkers. They saw benefits in securing additional houses.
- 3.6 Those who wished to retain the open space emphasised that whilst it had been untidy some years ago it had recently been tidied up and the trees have just got established. Several pointed out that the area has been well cared for and were not subject to vandalism.
- 3.7 The most important issue for residents appears to the protection of Green Spaces followed by provision of a safe environment. The provision of more car parking (particularly for the shops) was the least important issue for residents.
- 3.8 The facilities offered by the shops were appreciated by residents (particularly the butchers). Improvements to the shop facades were favoured by some residents.
- 3.9 Traffic issues were raised by a significant number, some citing the congestion at the Davison Road shops with double parking whilst the car park was largely unused. The problems at the Warren Road shops was cited with the lay-by being of an insufficient length. The problem of buses using both roads were considered important especially at the Winterbottom/Warren Road junction where parking for the shops and surgery caused problems. The problems of Holy Trinity Church parking for funerals and weddings was also mentioned.
- 3.10 There was a feeling that additional housing would exacerbate the problem.

- 3.11 Where there was a consensus was on the need for bungalows (especially for the elderly). There was a feeling that apartments were not appropriate in the area either because of their scale or because of a perception about tenants.
- 3.12 Benefits which could flow from the development include provision of children's play away from the site. It was accepted that the site itself is too narrow a shape to accommodate safely such a provision. Sites in Garside Drive or King George V area could be improved.

## 4. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRES

### 4.1 Important Issues

	Preferred Choice	Number of respondents
To protect green spaces	1st	23
To provide a safe environment	2nd=	19
To protect the environment	2nd=	19
To increase highway safety	4th	17
To provide more car parking	5th	9
Other Suggestions		
- Facilities to entertain youths		
- Safety of Children		

### 4.2 Improvements Required in the Area

	Preferred Choice	Number of respondents
Improved security measures	1st	19
Improved parking	2nd	16
Improved highway measures	3rd	12
Improvements to shops	4th	11
Other improvements suggested		
- Control speeding cars in Jones Road		
- Provision of Cycleway to town centre		
- Pedestrian Crossing at Davison Rd		
Shops		
- Traffic Calming measures		

### 4.3 Would housing development at Warren Road & Davison Drive benefit the area?

<b>YES Approx 50%</b> Would prevent misuse of open space
<b>NO Approx 49%</b> Loss of green Space Area just planted and maturing Tidy up rear of hospital instead Additional traffic more congestion No need for housing

## 4.4 Preferred type of housing

	Preferred Choice	Number of respondents
A mixture of units		3
2/3 bed roomed houses		4
Bungalows	1 <sup>st</sup>	16
Apartments		1
Other		

16 respondents favoured the provision of bungalows especially for the elderly. 8 respondents stated that were not in favour of apartments.

## 4.5 Preferred housing tenure

	Preferred Choice	Number of respondents
Social rented	1 <sup>st</sup> =	7
Private owner occupation		3
Shared ownership for affordable homes		6
Hartlepool BC nominated rights	1 <sup>st</sup> =	7

Whilst social rented tenure was the most favoured option a total of 5 respondents stated that did not favour social rented housing. Most of those not wishing to social housing were mainly those respondents who were against any housing on the site.

## 4.6 General Comments on Improvements to the Area

Make use of the area by building on it  
 More dog bins  
 Discourage private developers  
 Control sub letting & bulk buying  
 Need for bungalows  
 Face lift to shops  
 Car Parking for Warren Road shops  
 Leave land as it is  
 Problem of building around school boundary (encouraging unsavoury characters to hide)  
 Protect green space  
 Traffic congestion around the shops  
 Apartments would be too dominant  
 Alternative is to consider Oakesway as spare land is a better size with room for children's play

## 4.7 Other Comments

During the West View Neighbourhood Residents' Action Plan Forum one representative commented that if the land were sold he would like to see the money ploughed back into the area or if payment in kind he

would like to the funds to be used for the benefit of the local community.

### 5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 On the basis of the analysis of the questionnaires and from general impressions at the consultation event the following conclusions are made:
- 5.2 There was no clear indication as to whether development was supported.
- 5.3 The consultation exercise was not designed to identify a preference for one or other of the schemes displayed. Not surprisingly therefore there was not a clear preference for either of the two development proposals.
- 5.4 There was however, a clear preference for bungalows and very little support for apartments. The preferred housing tenures were “social rented” and “Council nomination Rights” although these were only slightly more favoured than “Shared ownership for affordable homes”.
- 5.5 Since the Joint Portfolio Holder’s meeting in March 2007, a Local Housing Assessment has been undertaken which indicates very strongly that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Hartlepool. This need for affordable housing is primarily for social rented with an emphasis on bungalows for the elderly. As a consequence the opportunities created by land becoming available for disposal need to be seriously considered in this context.
- 5.6 Details of the bids are included as Confidential **Appendix 1** for further consideration.
- 5.7 This report has been circulated to Ward Members to consider and their comments will be reported at the meeting.

### 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The Portfolio Holders’ views on the way forward are sought.

**JOINT REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY AND  
HOUSING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT  
PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holders  
**16<sup>th</sup> March 2007**



**Report of:** Head of Procurement and Property Services /  
Director of Regeneration and Planning

**Subject:** WARREN ROAD DEVELOPMENT

**This item contains exempt information under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information)(Variation) Order 2006) namely, Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).**

---

## SUMMARY

### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To obtain Portfolio Holders views on the proposals for development at Warren Road.

### 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Background, including reference to previous portfolio report, to the market testing exercise for the potential development at Warren Road, and the outcome of the proposals received.

### 5.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBERS

Portfolio Holders are responsible for Regeneration and Housing and Council land and Property assets respectively.

### 6.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key

### 5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holders

### 6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Portfolio Holders' views are sought.

**Report of:** Head of Procurement and Property Services /  
Director of Regeneration and Planning

**Subject:** WARREN ROAD DEVELOPMENT

---

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To obtain Portfolio Holders views on the proposals for development at Warren Road.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Council was approached by a developer, Parkside Developers.Com Limited, in 2006 with regard to a proposal to develop several areas of open land within the Warren Road and Davison Drive areas.
- 2.2 Due to the requirement for Council to obtain best consideration in respect of land disposals. The Performance Management Portfolio gave approval to a selective tendering process to test the market.
- 2.3 The Estates Manager sent out marketing particulars to 3 developers, including Parkside Developments.Com. It was decided that the bids received should contain an element of social benefit in addition to or instead of a capital receipt to provide justification of the disposal of this land which is not allocated in the Local Plan.
- 2.4 Of the 3 developers approached, 2 submitted bids, Parkside Developers.Com and Housing Hartlepool. The developers were invited to present their proposals to a Panel which included relevant officers, the Mayor and the Performance Management Portfolio Holder. Ward Councillors for the Brus Ward were invited to give their comments on behalf of residents.
- 2.5 After these presentations, a meeting was held by the Panel Members and it was decided that a report should be submitted to a joint Mayor's and Performance Management Portfolio, for a decision to be made on how the proposals should be taken forward.
- 2.6 It is also considered that a third option may be to leave the land in an undeveloped state. This land formerly accommodated 'Tarran' style bungalows which were demolished and the land landscaped using Single Regeneration Budget funding. Ward Members are of the opinion that some local people enjoy the land in its current state. In addition,

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

### APPENDIX 2

local residents and Ward Members have made it clear that they would not wish flats / apartments to be appropriate for any part of the site. It is accepted that if the option of leaving the land undeveloped was chosen, there would be a loss of any proposed social or environmental enhancements which have been offered by the developers, and as outlined in the next section.

### 3. DETAILS OF PROPOSALS

3.1 The 2 bids received can be compared as follows:

	<b>PARKSIDE DEVELOPMENTS.COM</b>	<b>HOUSING HARTLEPOOL</b>
<b>Proposed Development</b>	94 units as follows: 38 no. 2 & 3 bed town houses 26 no. apartments 18 no. bungalows 12 no. semi-detached properties	52 units – 36 houses for sale and 16 bungalows for social renting.
<b>Consideration</b>	£1.3 million as a capital receipt or equivalent social benefits or a combination of the 2.	£2,242,000 in social benefits plus £300,000 as a capital receipt
<b>Social Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council to receive ownership of 5 bungalows</li> <li>• Landscaping, CCTV and pedestrian crossing</li> <li>• New shop fronts (properties not owned by the Council)</li> <li>• Alterations/extensions to the school</li> <li>• 4 modern apprentices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council to receive 100% nomination rights over bungalows</li> <li>• Improved parking to shops</li> <li>• 4 modern apprentices</li> <li>• Facelift to shops (not owned by the Council)</li> <li>• Improvements to green spaces</li> </ul>
<b>Quality and Design of Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bungalows to contain carer's accommodation in roofspace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bungalows to contain carer's accommodation in roofspace</li> <li>• Eco homes minimum very good standard</li> <li>• Level 4 of sustainable homes standard</li> </ul>
<b>Tenure of Housing</b>	Homes will be owner occupied or private rented. Willing to covenant only to sell to individual investors.	Social rented and homes for sale for owner occupation only. Shared ownership also a possibility.
<b>Contribution to Housing Market Renewal Initiatives</b>	£100,000	£52,000
<b>Public Consultation</b>	Would need to be undertaken and led by the developer. Perception from Ward Councillors that apartments would be resisted	Would need to be undertaken and led by the developer. No apartments within scheme.
<b>Risk to Council</b>	Company Search undertaken showing no sign of a company risk to the Council although it has been advised that should the developer be chosen a more advanced search should be undertaken.	Social Landlord and major partner of the Council. Further checks would be undertaken if chosen as preferred developer. Transaction would grant Council capital receipt and commencement of development. Funding currently in place for scheme.

<b>Experience</b>	Queens Public House developed as apartments 2005	Social housing provider with plans to develop housing with partner organisation. Not yet experienced in new build but this is an important part of their future development.
-------------------	--	--

#### 4. CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 Although the bid from Parkside Developments.Com still contains 26 apartments, this is substantially lower than the number of apartments contained within their initial bid, due to Ward Councillors voicing their concerns in this regard. Furthermore, both developers have stated that they are willing to be flexible in terms of their development content. It is not clear whether if Parkside Developments.Com reduced their number of apartments to nil this would lead to a change in the level of consideration which would be payable to the Council, and also whether this would lead to a lower contribution to Housing Market Renewal initiatives.
- 4.2 The bid by Parkside Developments.Com, gives the Council ownership of 5 bungalows. Due to the Council no longer having a function as a housing provider, these bungalows would need to be transferred on to a Social Housing Partner who would own or manage these.
- 4.3 The bid from Housing Hartlepool appears to have a benefit with £1.6 million being placed within the bid for the social housing over which the Council would have 100% nomination rights. This is considered to be slightly misleading as this is the build cost of these homes, not the actual value of these properties in terms of nomination rights to the Council. It is difficult to attribute an actual value to nomination rights but this would be lower than the £1.6 million stated by Housing Hartlepool.
- 4.4 Tenure of properties in the respective bids is also a relevant factor. Housing Hartlepool are offering homes for social renting and homes for equity share, which would assist first time buyers or those on lower incomes. Housing Hartlepool has stated that they will covenant with the Council that their homes are for owner occupation only. Parkside Developments.Com have affirmed their commitment to providing 'affordable' housing for private ownership, but it may be that some of these are sold to the private rented sector. Parkside Developments.Com have stated that they will be prepared to covenant to sell only to individual private investors, but this still might impact on the number of void units.
- 4.5 Any decision to proceed with a preferred developer, or indeed both developers, would need to be subject to the developer(s) undertaking a public consultation process. Ward Councillors have stated that they would be happy to provide advice about the area and those groups to target. Should the decision be taken to propose a preferred developer(s)

to progress with this public consultation exercise, a further report will be presented after this has been undertaken to report the findings.

**5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 Portfolio Holders' views are sought.