

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO DECISION SCHEDULE



Tuesday 20th November 2007

at 10.00 am

in the Mayor's Office,
Civic Centre, Victoria Road, 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**

No items

3. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

3.1 Update on current outbreaks of foot and mouth and bluetongue diseases –
Head of Public Protection

3.2 Headland Conservation Area Appraisal – *Director of Regeneration and
Planning Services*

3.3 North Hartlepool Partnership – Single Regeneration Budget Final Evaluation –
Head of Regeneration

3.4 Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan 2007/08 – Quarter 2
Monitoring Report – *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*

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

No items

REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO
Report to Portfolio Holder
20 November 2007



Report of: Head of Public Protection

Subject: UPDATE ON CURRENT OUTBREAKS OF FOOT AND MOUTH AND BLUETONGUE DISEASES

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the Portfolio Holder in relation to the local authority's role in relation to the management of the current outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Disease and Bluetongue.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report gives details of the local authority's role in relation to the management of Foot and Mouth Disease and Bluetongue.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration & Liveability has responsibility for Trading Standards Services.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder.

6. DECISIONS(S) REQUIRED

To note the contents of the report.

REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY
Report to Portfolio Holder



Report of: Head of Public Protection

Subject: UPDATE ON CURRENT OUTBREAKS OF FOOT AND MOUTH AND BLUETONGUE DISEASES

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To update the Portfolio Holder in relation to the latest situation concerning the local authority's role in relation to the ongoing outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Disease and Bluetongue.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 County councils, unitary authorities, metropolitan borough councils and London boroughs are responsible for enforcing the Animal Health Act 1981 and the Bluetongue Order 2003.

2.2 There is a clear range of specific functions that must be performed by a local authority in the event of a notifiable disease situation such as an outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) or Bluetongue. These include: - enforcing movement restrictions, tracing and issuing movement licences, overseeing cleansing and disinfection, inputting data onto the Animal Health and Welfare Management and Enforcement System (AMES) and communicating with the local farming community.

2.3 FMD is an acute infectious disease caused by a virus, of which there are seven types. It is probably the most infectious disease affecting animals and can spread rapidly if uncontrolled. Among farmed animals; cattle, sheep, pigs, goats and deer are susceptible. Hedgehogs, rats and wild cloven-footed animals can also contract it. It causes fever, followed by development of vesicle blisters – chiefly in the mouth and on the feet.

2.4 Bluetongue is a disease that is caused by a virus that is transmitted by midges. Bluetongue virus naturally infects domestic and wild ruminants (such as sheep, cattle, goats and deer) and camelids (such as llama and alpaca) but not pigs or horses. It can be spread by the movement of infected midges that

go on to bite susceptible animals in a new area, or by movements of infected animals that are subsequently bitten by midges. Unlike FMD it does not affect humans and there are no public health implications.

- 2.5 Foot and Mouth Disease and Bluetongue can have significant economic impacts in terms of on farm losses due to death, sickness and reduced productivity, and losses to export revenue.

3. CURRENT DISEASE SITUATION

- 3.1 Since 3 August 2007 there have been eight confirmed cases of Foot and Mouth Disease in Surrey, Windsor and Maidenhead.
- 3.2 Following the initial confirmation of FMD a three kilometre Protection Zone was put in place around the infected premises and a ten kilometre Surveillance Zone beyond that to control livestock movements. A Restricted Zone was declared, with a Risk Area and a Low Risk Area being established covering various parts of the UK. These zones have been subject to a number of amendments; with the South East of England being subject to the strictest controls.
- 3.3 The FMD controls appear to have been effective as the spread of disease has so far been confined to a small area in the South East of England and the risk of new cases is receding. Whilst most of the movement restrictions were lifted on 17 October Defra confirmed that the FMD Surveillance Zone and FMD Risk Area remain in place and movement restrictions apply in these areas. The earliest date the Surveillance Zone can be lifted is 5 November.
- 3.4 On 28 September Defra confirmed that Bluetongue disease was circulating in East Anglia. This disease has not previously been seen in the UK. Investigations led to the conclusion that the virus is circulating between the local animal and midge population and that it is the same strain as the one circulating in parts of northern Europe. Since August 2006 there have been nearly 3,000 cases.
- 3.5 Following declaration of the outbreak in this country a number of control measures were immediately put into place. This included putting in place Bluetongue movement controls which in some cases overlapped with FMD restrictions. Despite these controls the number of cases of Bluetongue is continuing to increase.
- 3.6 Bluetongue disease controls aim to minimise spread from notified outbreaks by putting in place movement controls over a large area around the infected premises. The vector-borne nature of the disease (and hence a widespread distribution of vectors) ensures that the risk of disease spread can only be mitigated against to a limited degree. Given Bluetongue is not spread directly from animal to animal, bluetongue controls concentrate on zones not premises and compulsory slaughter of ruminants infected with Bluetongue

would not normally form part of the control strategy once it's in circulation in vectors.

- 3.7 Following confirmation that Bluetongue was circulating in East Anglia, Defra established a Bluetongue Control Zone and a Bluetongue Protection Zone where controls on the movements of animals apply. These zones were adjusted on 17 October following confirmation of two new cases, one near Peterborough, Cambridgeshire and one near Ashford, Kent and again on 19 October following confirmation of a case near Rye.
- 3.8 Substantial proportions of the UK are currently within the Restricted Zone (which comprises a 20km Zone around the infected premises, a Protection Zone at least 100km around the outbreak and a Surveillance Zone of at least 50km). The Protection zone currently extends as far North as Leeds and York.
- 3.9 To date there have been 50 confirmed cases of Bluetongue and the number may yet increase further if the recent warm weather continues as biting midges are expected to thrive in mild temperatures.

4. ISSUES

- 4.1 At the time of writing this report the movement controls imposed as a result of the recent Foot and Mouth Disease and Bluetongue outbreaks have not significantly impacted upon the work of the department. This is mainly because we do not have a mart or slaughterhouse.
- 4.2 Following the declaration of the FMD outbreak a decision was taken to postpone planned visits to farms for the purpose of undertaking animal welfare, feed and food hygiene inspections so as not to compromise bio-security and minimise the risk of spreading disease. This will have had some adverse effect on the inspection programme.
- 4.3 If as expected new cases of Bluetongue are confirmed it is possible that the Bluetongue Control Zones may be extended further to include Hartlepool. This will place some additional demands upon the service as additional movement restrictions would be introduced and have to be enforced.
- 4.4 Compliance with the disease control measures is essential and the Authority is expected to strictly enforce the Bluetongue (England) Order 2003 (as amended) (i.e., The Bluetongue (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order 2007). Detection of non-compliance would require authorised officers to take appropriate action, given the Enforcement Concordat principles and local enforcement policy. Since confirmation of the Bluetongue outbreak, movement restrictions have been in place since 29 September 2007, and any cases of illegal moves may justify enforcement action as by now animal keepers should be aware of such restrictions.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 That the Portfolio Holder notes the contents of the report.

**REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO
REPORT TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER
20TH November 2007**



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: HEADLAND CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 An appraisal of the Headland Conservation Area has recently been carried out. This report will provide details of the findings of the appraisal.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

2.1 The report outlines the background to the appraisal and summarises the findings.

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 report.

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: HEADLAND CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 An appraisal of the Headland Conservation Area has recently been carried out. This report will provide details of the findings of the appraisal.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Appraisals are a means of assessing the key factors contributing to the appearance and character of existing and potential conservation areas, local authorities are encouraged to undertake periodically conservation area appraisals. There is no formal requirement for the form and content of appraisals, or the methodology to be used, but typically appraisals cover such subjects as historical development of the area, archaeological significance, prevalent building materials, the character of open spaces, the quality and relationships of buildings and also of trees.
- 2.2 Given that much of the recent and current debate in Hartlepool has focussed on the Headland Conservation Area, it was felt that undertaking an appraisal of this area was a priority. Such an appraisal would provide an opportunity to review the condition, appearance and character of the conservation area and its constituent parts, to assess the extent to which traditional materials and features remain intact and to refine policy priorities. It would be an important part of such processes to include consultations with local residents and other interested parties.
- 2.3 Consultants Scott Wilson (formerly Ferguson McIlveen) were commissioned to carry out the appraisal of the conservation area. Their work was informed by a steering group which comprised local groups, Ward Members and officers. The group guided the appraisal process and fed advice and local knowledge into the project.

3. APPRAISAL PROCESS

- 3.1 The aims of the appraisal were to:
- To demonstrate how the history of the area is reflected in its present day character and linked to the broader heritage context of the town of Hartlepool.
 - To identify the nature and extent of the special character of the conservation area.

- To identify those areas where the special character retains its integrity and those where loss has occurred.
 - To make recommendations for policies to improve and enhance the conservation area.
 - To identify the need, if any, for further assessment and recording of the conservation area.
- 3.2 The appraisal process included an initial photographic survey of the conservation area. This was carried out by the Council's photographer and included photographs of all residential listed buildings and properties covered by an Article 4 Direction. An analysis of this survey was carried out as part of the appraisal to assess the level of change in houses within the conservation area.
- 3.3 Scott Wilson carried out their own assessment of the conservation area. This included considering the historic development of the area and an assessment of the area including open spaces, public realm and defining areas of individual character in 'character zones'.
- 3.4 Three rounds of public consultation were carried out to feed into the process. Initially questionnaires were sent out to all properties in the St Hilda's Ward with drop off boxes through out the area. Of the 805 questionnaires that were sent out in the conservation area as part of the first round of consultation 10% residents responded with a further 4% living outside the area replying from the 2,195 questionnaires that were delivered. Further to this residents were invited to drop into the Borough Hall to take part in focus groups looking at what residents thought about the conservation area including possible boundary amendments. 58 residents attended this event.
- 3.5 The second round of consultation took the form of leaflets to all properties outlining feedback from the first consultation. Residents were invited to two meetings at the Borough Hall to outline the information received in the first consultation and further investigate how residents would like to see some of the issues raised resolved. 40 residents attended this event with 36 complete questionnaires, 25 of these were from residents who lived in the conservation area.
- 3.6 The third consultation took place in a bus in various locations across the conservation area. The purpose of the event was to feedback to residents the information from the previous two consultations and put forward recommendations. 51 residents dropped into the consultation and 34 questionnaires were eventually returned.
- 3.7 Scott Wilson has produced a document based on their surveys of the area, the analysis of the photographic survey and the feedback from the residents. Alongside this document a companion document detailing the consultation which has been carried out has been produced. Both documents can be viewed on the Council's website and copies have been left in the Members Room.

4 SUMMARY OF THE DOCUMENT

- 4.1 The document considers the location and setting of the Headland and looks at the local context. In particular it examines how the area sits within the wider Tees Valley area, and its current physical character. Following on from this is a review of the historic development of the Headland and an examination of the area's archaeology.
- 4.2 Further to this a spatial analysis of the area is carried out. This considers characteristics such as the spaces within the area, focal points, strong edges and corners, and views. Alongside this a character analysis has been carried out considering prevalent building materials in properties and public realm, street furniture, and biodiversity. In addition non-tangible contributions are considered such as public events.
- 4.3 The area is analysed in detailed character areas. These seven distinct areas include a central zone around the Borough Hall, promenade Terraces, the Town Moor and Modern Infill Housing. Also fed into these character areas is an analysis of the photographic survey that was carried out. This indicates which areas have been subject to change and where the original character of the area may be lost.
- 4.4 The report provides suggestions for future actions within the area. These include the following.

Boundary changes

There was much public support for the proposed inclusion of the Heugh Breakwater in the Conservation Area. It was considered that the Breakwater is one of the main landmarks of the Headland and there is concern amongst residents who responded that it is being left to fall into disrepair. Although conservation area status would not offer a great level of protection, the report indicates that the Breakwater's inclusion would reinforce the importance of the structure to the character of the area.

Use of Modern Materials

The most debated issue throughout the consultation exercises has been the use of modern materials on building within the conservation area. The views received through consultations have been diverse with some believing they should be able to do what they want to their properties while others wish traditional materials within the Conservation Area to be strictly preserved; there was a significant majority of respondents supporting the use of modern materials. It was concluded however that it is important that the character of the Headland is not lost through inappropriate alterations, so any modern materials used must replicate traditional solutions, as closely as possible, in the design, dimensions, detailing and method of window opening. The report suggests that before any Council policy is amended it will be necessary to thoroughly research the types of windows and doors available in modern materials, and investigate whether the design and quality are suitable for the Headland.

More Information

It was a common concern that residents and businesses on the Headland have not received sufficient information about the Conservation Area, Listed Buildings or the Article 4 Direction and the implications each of these has on property owners. The report recommends that a suite of leaflets should be put together on the area and should policy be amended in the future residents should receive information on this. Alongside this, dialogue should be set up with estate agents and solicitors to provide them with information to pass on to prospective buyers.

Derelict Buildings

A number of derelict and empty listed buildings in the conservation area have a detrimental impact on the character of the Headland. The report recommends that the Council continue to work on the derelict buildings on the Headland and where viable uses cannot be found consider recommending demolition. It also proposes that the Council explores ways of communicating to the residents of the Headland any progress regarding these buildings.

Street Furniture

The report recommends that the work in investment in street furniture is continued.

Traffic

A common cause for concern amongst residents is parking and traffic flow on the Headland. The report recommends that the Council explores options for easing traffic problems within the area.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

A Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) currently operates borough – wide to debate strategic policy issues regarding the eight conservation areas in Hartlepool. The Mayor has previously agreed to the formation of a Headland CAAC focusing on issues affecting the Headland but discussion about its precise remit and composition has not been finalised. The report recommends that such a committee is established in the Headland as soon as possible.

Management

The report acknowledges that change is an inevitable component of most conservation areas; the challenge is to manage change in ways which maintain and, if possible, strengthen an area's special qualities. The character of conservation areas is rarely static and is susceptible to incremental, as well as dramatic, change. Positive management is essential if such pressure for change, which tends to alter the very character that made the area attractive in the first place, is to be limited. It is suggested that proactively managing the Headland Conservation Area will be an essential way of preserving and enhancing its character and appearance in the future. Management topics to be addressed include enforcement and monitoring changes, buildings at risk and thematic policy guidance e.g. on windows and / or doors.

5 NEXT STEPS

- 5.1 The recommendations within the report outlined above will be dealt with by various parties. The next steps to be taken in each case are outlined below.

Boundary Change

The proposed boundary amendment to include the Heugh Breakwater within the conservation area requires further formal consultation with residents, stakeholders and the Port Authority for their views on the proposal. In addition the Planning Committee would be invited to comment on the amendment. Once these comments have been received they will be brought back to the Portfolio Holder with a final recommendation. Should the amendment be agreed this would then be advertised in the local press and London Gazette to formally extend the area.

Modern Materials

The use of modern materials within conservation areas is currently being considered by the Planning Working Party. It is proposed that this work would continue incorporating the comments that have been received in response to the consultation that has been carried out. With regard to this it is suggested that a report is presented to the Portfolio Holder for comment when a clear indication of a proposed policy guidelines have been developed. This can then be reported to Planning Committee who would finally agree any proposals.

More information

The provision of further information for residents of the area will be pursued. In particular this would be linked to any new policy guidelines that are introduced through the Planning Working Party. This would be brought to the Portfolio Holder for comment and finally the Planning Committee for agreement.

Derelict buildings

This recommendation is relevant to both the Planning Committee and the Portfolio Holder depending on the circumstances of each building therefore it will be reported back to the relevant decision parties when necessary.

Street Furniture and Traffic

Future work in line with the recommendations in the report will be brought back to the Portfolio Holder for agreement.

Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee

As outlined above further discussion regarding the precise remit and composition of a Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee has yet to be finalised. This will be pursued with the relevant local interests, in the context of the established Borough-wide CAAC, and brought back to the Portfolio Holder in due course for agreement.

Management

Management of the conservation area is relevant to both the Portfolio Holder and the Planning Committee and can be influenced by the decisions made on issues such as derelict buildings, street furniture, and planning applications. This recommendation encapsulates many of the issues outlined above and is relevant to both the Planning Committee and the Portfolio Holder.

- 5.2 With regard to the particular issues relevant to the Portfolio Holder the first recommendation to be addressed is the proposed amendment to the boundary of the conservation area. Therefore this report requests permission to carry out formal consultation with a view to extending the Headland Conservation Area to include the Heugh Breakwater.

6 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 That the Portfolio Holder notes the report and recommendations of the final Headland Conservation Area Appraisal document.
- 6.2 The Portfolio Holder agrees formal consultation on the proposed boundary amendment to the Headland Conservation Area to include the Heugh Breakwater.

REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder

20TH November 2007



Report of: Head of Regeneration

Subject: NORTH HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP –
SINGLE REGENERATION BUDGET FINAL
EVALUATION.

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform the Portfolio Holder of the key findings and outcomes of the final Evaluation Report of the North Hartlepool Partnership Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) programme.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

2.1 The report provides a brief background to the North Hartlepool SRB programme, refers to an interim evaluation carried out in 2003 and sets out the key achievements, issues and recommendations highlighted in the final Evaluation Report.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

3.1 The SRB regeneration programme falls within the remit of the Portfolio Holder.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

4.1 Non key (for information).

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

5.1 Regeneration and Liveability Portfolio meeting 20th November 2007

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

6.1 The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the report.

Report of: Head of Regeneration

Subject: NORTH HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP –
SINGLE REGENERATION BUDGET FINAL
EVALUATION.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Portfolio Holder of the key findings and outcomes of the final Evaluation Report of the North Hartlepool Partnership Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) programme

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The North Hartlepool SRB programme has over the last ten years involved extensive economic and social regeneration of the West View, Central Estate and Headland communities. With successful bids under Rounds 3, 5 and 6 a total of £25.4 million of SRB funds was secured. The initial focus was on West View and Central Estate but from 1999 onwards the main focus of the programme was on the Headland.
- 2.2 The programme covered a broad range of regeneration issues including housing improvements, community safety, economic development and training, environmental enhancement, health and community support and development. Under later phases of the programme, particularly SRB 6, the main investment was on delivering a major environmental programme and developing the tourism economy based around the natural and historic assets of the Headland.
- 2.3 In April 2003, an independent mid-term evaluation was carried out in accordance with SRB requirements which focussed largely on Rounds 3 and 5 but also highlighted emerging issues associated with SRB 6. At that stage the programme was found to be largely on target in terms of financial performance. Outputs were also in line with delivery projections, and the programme was being effectively managed with overall performance being positive despite operating in a challenging economic and social climate. Responses to a household survey, however, provided little evidence to suggest that conditions had changed significantly or that people were appreciating the benefits. This was considered not surprising given the timeframe required in economic development and regeneration for intervention activity to

feed through to community level. The evaluation recommended no significant change to the programme, but recommended more publicity on achievements, a review of the roles and activities of the Advisory Groups, consideration of forward strategies, funding and leverage and a watching brief on emerging development opportunities.

3 THE FINAL EVALUATION

- 3.1 The final evaluation report was produced by the Tourism and Planning Practice. A copy of the report is available in the Members Room. The evaluation looks at the performance of the SRB programme at a number of levels. Firstly in terms of achieving the desired outputs and outcomes set out in the original contracts of agreement with government. Secondly it looked in detail at a number of key projects and programmes (ones which were not subject to detailed scrutiny in the mid – term evaluation) assessing their impact and commenting on a range of issues such as benefits, barriers to success, community involvement and legacy. Thirdly, the evaluation identifies a range of ‘cross-cutting’ issues identified by members of the SRB Board who were in place in the final year of the programme. These related in particular to programme management and delivery and community involvement. Fourthly, the evaluation included a specific focus on tourism and in particular successes and future opportunities to develop sustainable tourism on the Headland.
- 3.2 The evaluation notes that the programme delivered 129 individual projects over its 10 year lifetime. The £25.4 million SRB fund helped to lever in a further £33.5 million from private and public sector sources. Headline achievements included:-
- 937 jobs created - 390 more than originally forecast
 - 2,070 people trained to a qualification – 757 more than forecast
 - 101 people entering self-employment
 - 100 new businesses set up and 248 businesses given help and advice
 - 3,917 houses improved
 - 2,591 houses given improved security
 - 25,781 people benefiting from NHP-funded community safety initiatives
 - 4,203 young people attending crime prevention initiatives
 - 21,170 people accessing new sports opportunities
 - 343 community and voluntary organisations supported.
- 3.3 A number of major physical developments were achieved including:-
- The creation of the £1.6m Town Square - providing a central heart for the Headland combining a formal square, history garden and information point for visitors
 - A range of environmental improvements and public art works including the upgrading of the promenade key access routes and

local squares and art features including the Andy Capp statue, the Cod Railings, 'Force 10' and the 'Big Catch'

- New visitor facilities such as St.Hilda's , Heugh Gun Battery, the restored Princess Royal Lifeboat and the Headland History Trail
- Major community facilities including the Headland Sports Hall, the Borough Building Community Resource Centre and the Early Years Centre at St. John Vianney's School
- Refurbished and restored buildings such as the Carnegie Building, the Abbey Street Youth Centre and the former Tile Warehouse on Northgate.

3.4 In terms of outcomes, the report acknowledges that the success of the programme must be balanced against the ratio of investment inputs by the SRB programme and a range of external factors beyond the control of the Partnership. The evaluation reports on a significant number of successes alongside substantial areas which require further intervention. Some of the main findings of the evaluation include:-

- Despite numerous successes, overall levels of deprivation remain high with St Hilda's ranked 124th and Brus 135th out of 8,424 wards nationally (IMD 2006)
- Though still above the Hartlepool average, the claimant unemployment rate has dropped by over 10% for Brus and 13% for St Hilda's in the 10 years of the Partnership's programme
- The success rate for pupils achieving GCSE passes at grade A-C has more than doubled, although still below the borough average, twice the number of people are achieving higher qualifications such as degrees than before and school leavers not in education, training or employment (NEET) are now comparable to the town's average.
- Significant improvements on crime with rates per 1,000 down by an average of 62 since 1997 – a greater reduction than for the town as a whole
- Improved levels of resident satisfaction with their living accommodation, living environment, quality of open space and parks and sports facilities

3.5 In relation to tourism, the report notes that significant headway has been made in repositioning the Headland as a tourist destination with noteworthy upgrading in the quality of the urban environment and provision of visitor attractions. The evaluation recognises the potential benefit likely to be derived from the development of Victoria Harbour, the importance of the proposed bridge link and the Tall Ships event in 2010. However a key challenge is to build on the low level of awareness of the Headland's assets within its target markets. Recommendations include the continuance of an integrated approach to tourism regeneration through continued investment in key areas; the development of an attractive year round events programme complementing the wider efforts of the town and sub-region and supporting the regional Festivals and Events strategy; the development of an investment portfolio of development opportunities; innovative marketing through low cost social media networks; a Headland-wide

adoption of a 'Destination Visitor Charter' recognising how the visitor will be managed and to act as a catalyst to unite the various community based groups with an interest in tourism, and; the establishment of a community partnership that will focus its energy on lobbying, organising and delivering the above.

- 3.6 In terms of responding to the ongoing challenges of the Headland, this is being addressed at a number of levels. In particular, the Headland is included within the Coastal Arc Programme as part of the Hartlepool Quays. This is acknowledged within the Regional Economic Strategy, Regional Spatial Strategy and the Tees Valley City Region Business Case and Investment Plan as a priority for investment. Through the Single Programme, which is the main funding source for economic and physical regeneration, resources have been secured for the upgrading of a stretch of the Town Wall which forms part of the Coastal Walkway. Future schemes which seek to improve the physical integration between the Headland and Victoria Harbour/Kafiga Landing, and which support infrastructure improvements in the vicinity of the Heugh Battery and the Friarage Manor House have also been highlighted for potential investment.
- 3.7 As one of the priority wards under the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy a Neighbourhood Action Plan was prepared for the Headland in 2006. This identified residents and service providers priorities for community investment, and resources have been made available through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and the Stronger Communities Fund to address some of these priorities.
- 3.8 In terms of supporting future tourism activities and events, the Headland Marketing Steering Group established through the SRB programme, continues to meet. This involves most of the key groups involved in the development and promotion of tourism activities on the Headland. The Council's Tourism Team provide support to this group in terms of advice and guidance and links to external agencies including the Tees Valley Area Tourism Partnership.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the report.

REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder

20 November 2007



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES
DEPARTMENTAL PLAN 2007/08 – QUARTER 2
MONITORING REPORT

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Portfolio Holder of the progress made against Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan 2007/08 in the second quarter of the year.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report shows details of progress against actions contained in the Departmental Plan and the first half year outturn of key performance indicators. Several key departmental achievements so far during the year are also highlighted.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The Portfolio Holder has responsibility for performance management issues in relation to the Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder only.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Progress against actions and indicators be noted.

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES
DEPARTMENTAL PLAN 2007/08 – QUARTER 2
MONITORING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Portfolio Holder of the progress made against the key actions identified in the Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2007/08 and the progress of key performance indicators for the period up to 30 September 2007.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability has responsibility for the Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan which was agreed in May 2007.
- 2.2 The Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2007/08 sets out the key tasks and issues along with an Action Plan to show what is to be achieved by the department in the coming year.
- 2.3 The Council's electronic performance management database is used for collecting and analysing performance in relation to both the Corporate Plan and the five Departmental Plans.
- 2.4 Where appropriate more detailed service plans are also produced detailing how each individual section contributes to the key tasks and priorities contained within the Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan and ultimately those of the Corporate Plan. These plans are managed within the department.

3. SECOND QUARTER PERFORMANCE

- 3.1 This section looks in detail at how Regeneration and Planning Services has performed in relation to the key actions and performance indicators that were included within the Departmental Plan for 2007/08.
- 3.2 On a quarterly basis, officers from across the department are asked, via the Performance Management database, to provide an update on

progress against every action contained in the performance plan and where appropriate, every performance indicator.

- 3.3 Officers are asked to provide a short commentary explaining progress made to date and asked to 'traffic light' each section based on whether or not the action will be, or has been, completed by the target date set out in the plans. The traffic light system is:-

RED	Action / PI not expected to meet target
AMBER	Action / PI expected to meet target
GREEN	Action / PI target achieved

- 3.4 Within Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan, there are a total of 169 actions and 52 performance indicators assigned to this portfolio. Table 1 below summarises the progress made at 30 September 2007 towards achieving these actions and performance indicators:-

Table 1 – Regeneration and Planning progress summary

	Departmental Plan	
	Actions	PIs
Green	51 (30.2%)	2 (3.9%)
Amber	103 (60.9%)	28 (53.8%)
Red	9 (5.3%)	3 (5.8%)
Annual	6 (3.6%)	19 (36.5%)
Total	169	52

- 3.5 A total of 51 actions have been achieved and a further 103 are assessed as being on target for completion by the milestone date. However 9 of the actions are described as not being on target, the details of which are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Actions not completed on target/not on target

Ref	Action	Milestone	Comment
CST011	Conclude a review of Partnership Governance	Oct 07	Following the resignation of the Chair of the LSP, Iain Wright on 17 September, a report on future governance arrangements will be prepared for discussion by Cabinet and the Hartlepool Partnership in the coming months.
CST021	Coordinate a review of the Community Strategy – Prepare Environmental Report	Aug 07	A draft Environmental Report, part of the Sustainability Appraisal is available, however the report will not be published until the 3 rd draft of the Community Strategy is available. This is expected to be later in the year.

Ref	Action	Milestone	Comment
CST022	Coordinate a review of the Community Strategy – Publish 3 rd Draft	Sep 07	Following a request from CMT the publication of the 3 rd draft of the Community Strategy is delayed to give further consideration to the way in which Children and Young People's issues are covered.
CST023	Adoption of final Community Strategy by Council and Hartlepool Partnership	Mar 08	
CST044	Develop and deliver a Neighbourhood Database to enable service providers and residents more easily determine their neighbourhood	Jul 07	Draft version of the database received but amendments required therefore final version expected in Q3.
CSP021	Carry out consultation and implementation of Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places Orders in shopping parades/ centres in Hartlepool	Sep 07	Consultation carried out for all shopping parades and evidence of anti social behaviour collected. Public notification now required. Large scale evidence gathering has taken longer than expected however it is anticipated this action will be completed in 07/08.
CSP022	Carry out consultation and implementation of Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places Orders in specified residential locations as requested	Dec 07	Locations have been identified based on consultation with residents relating to shopping areas and information received from Police and attendance at public meetings. As above, the evidence gathering has taken longer than expected and it is now likely that this action will not be achieved until Q4.
PED042	Achieve planning permission for Gladman Developments at Queens Meadow	Jul 07	Minor amendments required. Planning Committee has agreed delegated powers in consultation with Chair. Approval likely Oct/Nov 07.
REG071	Complete PPG17 Open Space Assessment	Aug 07	Consultants completed draft report by the August milestone date and have presented findings and suggestions. Several issues on standards and shortfalls in certain types of open space do however need to be resolved. Final report expected Nov 07.

3.6 From Table 1 it can be seen that most of the PI targets set are currently expected to be achieved, however three indicators are assessed to be a 'red risk' of which two have not previously been reported to the Portfolio Holder. The details are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Performance Indicators not completed on target/not on target

Ref	Action	Target	Outturn	Comment
LAA CS23	Number of first time entrants to Youth Justice System	223	172	This PI measures the number of young people being arrested by Police and charged with an offence for the first time. Hartlepool's performance is well above its half year target, which was set using a standard formula required by the Youth Justice Board of 5% reduction on the number achieved in 05/6. The high level of first time entrants is a problem nationally, and is mainly attributed to the conflict between this target and a police target for 'offences brought to justice' (ie the police must reach a certain level of 'arrest and charge' for crimes committed however minor). The government has indicated it may change the police target to overcome this conflict but in mean- time, we need to place more emphasis on preventative work, to stop young people getting arrested. It is highly unlikely this target can be met in 07/08
BVPI 204	% of planning appeals allowed against authority's decision to refuse planning application	33%	50%	It is possible that four current contentious appeals will be allowed meaning that this target is not achieved. There is also some concern about the consistency of the Planning Inspectorate decisions.

3.7 Portfolio Holder's attention is drawn to progress and achievements of the department in the first part of the year which include:

- Number of houses cleared in HMR intervention area has exceeded the 550 target for the year as a result of demolitions at Mildred, Mayfair, Thornton and Moore Street sites.
- The new DIP/PPO alignment model has been introduced and all actions on the alignment checklist are complete.
- Parenting provision targeted at families involved in anti social behaviour has been developed in conjunction with HBC parenting commissioner. A process is now in place for referral to a range of parenting provision.
- A new Worksmart seminar programme is being delivered with six events completed by the half year and which is showing increasing popularity and demand within the business and voluntary/community sectors.

4. RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 That the progress against key actions and first half year outturn of performance indicators is noted.