

# **NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES PORTFOLIO DECISION RECORD**

20<sup>th</sup> December 2007

The meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m. at the Avondale Centre, Hartlepool

**Present:**

Councillor Peter Jackson (Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder)

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services  
Denise Ogden, Head of Neighbourhood Management  
Mike Blair, Transportation and Traffic Manager  
Catherine Frank, Principal Community Strategy Officer  
Steve Hilton, Public Relations Officer  
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

**46. Bruntoft Avenue – Traffic Calming** (*Head of Technical Services*)

**Type of decision**

Non-key.

**Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the proposed traffic calming scheme on Bruntoft Avenue

**Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

A number of concerns had been raised about the speed of traffic on Bruntoft Avenue. There had been two recorded accidents on the road in the last three years. The West View/King Oswy NAP Forum had requested a safety scheme be developed for this location, for which they had allocated funding from their 2007/078 budget.

The proposal would consist of a series of road humps along Bruntoft Avenue with SLOW markings on red bands provided at each entrance to the street and give way markings at all junctions to be renewed. Residents and ward Councillors had been consulted, no objections had been received

The scheme would be funded by the West View/King Oswy NAP Forum.

**Decision**

That the implementation of the traffic calming measures be approved.

## **47. Cameron Road / Belk Street – Request for One Way System** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To consider a request for a one way system to be introduced around the Cameron Road / Belk Street loop.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Furness Street/Cameron Road/Belk Street Residents Association had requested the introduction of a one-way system on Belk Street and Cameron Road. Their main concern was the tight bends where both roads meet Addison Road and the possibility of collisions occurring due to poor visibility.

Surveys had been undertaken at various times of the day to determine the level of parking as a one-way street could be justified where parked vehicles take up most of the street as there is limited space for motorists to pull in for oncoming traffic. However surveys showed that in this case there was ample space for vehicles to pull in at all times. The Emergency Services had consulted and indicated that while they had no formal objections to the scheme being taken forward they did not see any need for it. Records showed there had been no injury accidents in the last three years.

Funding would come from the Council's traffic management budget.

Ward Councillor Robbie Payne had been unable to attend the meeting but had submitted a letter for the Portfolio Holder's information. In it he referred to the difficulty drivers faced when the streets were full and the potential danger to children as they were unable to see cars being driven at excessive speed. Councillor Payne indicated that having seen first hand the potential danger he believed the one way system would be most beneficial to alleviate these problems for car drivers, residents and most importantly children.

A representative of the residents attended the meeting and spoke in favour of the measures. She acknowledged that there was not a massive parking problem, the problem was the top two corners. A suggestion had been made by Council officers to move the parking bays on these corners but the residents were opposed to this. She further advised that the surveys referred to within the report had been carried out during the day when there was minimal parked traffic. The problem became much worse on evenings when residents came home from work. She urged officers to undertake such surveys during the evening.

The Portfolio Holder indicated that when first reading the report he had been minded to refuse the request as it seemed unnecessary. However following submissions from the Ward Councillor and resident he would be happy to approve the introduction of a one-way system, subject to the necessary

consultation and monitoring by officers. The Traffic and Transportation Manager advised that any objections received would be brought back to a future meeting of the Portfolio

**Decision**

That the request be approved.

**48. Chatham Road – Safety Scheme** (*Head of Technical Services*)

**Type of decision**

Non-key.

**Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the implementation of a road safety scheme developed through a Neighbourhood Action Plan

**Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

Chatham Road is predominantly a residential road with a block of shops located mid way along its length and access to various other streets. The speed limit is 30mph and surveys showed most of the traffic travelled at an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 32mph, (the speed at which 85% of the traffic travels at or below). Residents were concerned about the speed of traffic and the lack of pedestrian facilities, particularly in the vicinity of the shops.

It was proposed to construct a raised platform between Helmsley Street and Acclom Street, raising the road surface to the height of the footway. Bollards would help differentiate between the footway and carriageway and protect the footway from parked vehicles while an advisory pedestrian crossing would be provided. Parking restrictions would be introduced around the Wynnstay Gardens and Chatham Gardens junctions.

Residents and Ward Councillors had been consulted and only one objection letter was received. The objections were on the basis that shop workers would be forced to park outside a residential property and positioning the pedestrian crossing behind the bus stop would potentially put pedestrians at risk. These concerns were addressed by officers. The Emergency Services had raised no concerns with the proposals.

Funding for the scheme, estimated at £50,000, would come from the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange Neighbourhood Action Plan budget.

**Decision**

That the implementation of the scheme be approved.

## **49. Hart Lane (Duke Street-Dunston Road) – Local Safety Scheme** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the implementation of various traffic measures on Hart Lane between Duke Street and Dunston Road.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

Hart Lane between Duke Street and Dunston Road is the no 1 priority for schemes awaiting Local Safety Scheme funding due to its poor traffic accident record (14 recorded injury accidents since 2004). The speed limit is 30mph but the majority of drivers travel at an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 24mph, (the speed at which 85% of the traffic travels at or below) . Parking and congestion are a major concern as parking is largely uncontrolled. School parking is especially problematic during the morning peak hour. In addition four accidents have been recorded at the Hart Lane / Serpentine Road signal controlled junction, two involving children.

Implementation of the following safety measures was proposed:

- Provision of a Puffin crossing outside Sacred Heart School
- Provision of a pedestrian phase on the western leg of the Serpentine/Hart Lane junction
- Provision of pedestrian phases on the Duke Street and Jesmond Road legs of the Hart Lane/Duke Street junction
- Provision of vehicle activated speed signs either side of the Hart Avenue junction
- Provision of parking restrictions either side of the Park Square junction
- Provision of parking restrictions on the South side of Hart Lane between Granville Avenue and Serpentine Road
- Provision of a hatched central reserve between Serpentine Road and Dunston Road
- Provision of 'keep clear' markings on the approach to the Serpentine Road traffic signals to facilitate vehicles turning right out of Thornhill Gardens.

Residents and Ward Councillors were consulted on the proposals. Of 160 letters sent out 56 responses were received. Details were given within the report of the objections received and officer responses to them. The Emergency Services had raised no concerns with the proposals.

The scheme, estimated at £84,000, would be funded through the Local

Transport Plan.

The Portfolio Holder expressed his approval for the scheme which he hoped would address safety issues around Sacred Heart School. He further requested that officers consider finding a solution to the problems faced by traffic turning right from Thomhill Gardens into Hart Lane. The Traffic and Transportation Manager reported there would be no easy solution as the motion sensors were too far from the traffic lights. The Portfolio Holder felt that moving the traffic lights to the front of the shop could be a possible solution and requested that officers look into this.

### **Decision**

That the implementation of the scheme be approved.

## **50. King Oswy Drive – (Nesbyt Road-Tempest Road) – School Safety Scheme** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the implementation of a school safety scheme developed through a Neighbourhood Action Plan.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

King Oswy Drive (Nesbyt Road-Tempest Road) is a mixture of residential properties, Schools, a Church and a Public House. An off road cycleway runs along the North side and there is a Toucan Crossing outside St Hilds School. The speed limit is 30mp and the majority of drivers travel at an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 34mph, (the speed at which 85% of the traffic travels at or below)

A 20mph speed limit was proposed, along with speed cushions, double yellow lines at the Nesbyt Road junction and the relocation of the bus stop to provide greater visibility for vehicles exiting Nesbyt Road. Resident and Ward Councillors were consulted, no objections were received. The Emergency Services had indicated no concerns with the proposals.

The scheme, estimate at £23,000, would be funded through the West View / King Oswy Neighbourhood Action Plan budget.

### **Decision**

That the implementation of the scheme be approved

## **51. Thornbury Close / Templeton Close Traffic Calming** (Head of Technical Services)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the implementation of a traffic calming scheme in Thornbury Close and Templeton Close.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

A petition had previously been submitted seeking the installation of traffic calming measures in Thornbury Close. Ian Wright MP had also raised concerns over the adjacent Templeton Close. An investigation showed there had been no accidents in the last three years and the majority of drivers travelled at an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 25mph, (the speed at which 85% of the traffic travels at or below). In view of this traffic calming was not recommended previously due to the number of roads with higher accident records and speeds across the town.

However community concern had remained, particularly as these were the only streets on the estate without traffic calming. As a result a low cost traffic calming scheme had been developed, consisting of two mini road humps in each street.

Residents and Ward Councillors had been consulted, 20 people were in favour with 17 against. The main objection had been that traffic calming was not necessary but other objections included parking problems and difficulty in icy conditions. The scheme, if approved, would be funded from within existing traffic management budgets.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services reported that a Thornbury Close resident had queried the timing of the meeting and advised that the meeting had been diared months in advance and was scheduled to fit in with the Portfolio Holder's work commitments. The Principal Community Strategy Officer commented that the letter advising residents that this issue was to be considered at this meeting had only been received the previous day. In light of this the Portfolio Holder requested that this item be deferred to the following meeting to enable any objectors to attend and make representations. He requested that the letter informing them that this item would be considered be sent out as soon as possible.

### **Decision**

That consideration of this scheme be deferred to the next Portfolio meeting.

## **52.. Proposed Residents Permit Cost Increases** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To consider representations made concerning the new increased charges in relation to resident's only permits.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

At Cabinet on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2007 consideration was given to reviewing the cost of the residents' parking scheme. The scheme had operated for eight years and since then the cost of a permit had remained at a nominal £1 charge whilst the administrative and enforcement costs had been subsidised from the pay and display income the service recovers. Cabinet felt this element of the service should be self-financing and that the anticipated £80,000 cost should be met by the residents themselves. A two-tier permit charge was proposed dependent on location. The cost of a permit should be increased to £20 per permit but properties within a designated central discount zone would be charged £5.

The publicity of the proposed permit cost increases and the formal advertising of the public notices had led to the receipt of many objections and several signed petitions from residents. In many cases the petitions indicated that residents would rather see permit controls removed than pay the higher charge. In light of this a consultation letter was sent to over 1,000 permit households in the proposed higher band. Detailed information on the response to the consultation was provided within the report and possible options which could now be considered.

The administrative and enforcement costs of the permit scheme were currently estimated at £80,000 per annum. At present revenue from permit holders equates to £6,000, with the balance being met from the pay and display revenue income which in recent years had shown a loss against budget. Any deviance from the costs proposed by Cabinet would need to be met from the parking services budget creating a budget pressure. The costs however were largely administration and enforcement costs so any withdrawal of locations from the controlled zones would reduce the operating costs of the service. The removal of locations would require further consultation with residents, preparation and advertising of legal orders. Each advert was estimated as costing £400 per location.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services advised that a similar scheme to increase the parking permit cost to £20 a year had been suggested 10 years ago and there had been similarly strong public opposition at that time. If charges were not raised on this occasion a loss of £75,000 annually on the

part of the Council to subsidise this scheme would continue to apply.

The Portfolio Holder recognised that this was a very emotive subject but felt the Council could not continue to subsidise the service in the way it had been. He questioned why no decision had been taken 10 years ago as this could have saved £800,000 from Neighbourhood Services Department budgets. Although it might seem unfair to levy such a large percentage increase other towns did not provide free permits and users had been subsidised for the last 10 years. £800,000 was the equivalent of 2.5 social workers or a branch library. However given the wealth of new information and figures which had been provided the Portfolio Holder felt consideration of this item should be diverted back to Cabinet as he did not want to make a decision which contradicted their previous recommendation.

Seaton Carew Ward Councillor Mike Turner attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of Seaton Carew residents. He acknowledged that £1 was a small amount but felt that the majority of users did not see it as providing a service. If residents were being asked to pay more consideration should be given to extending the hours the permit parking zones were valid from and the introduction of a Sunday service. He suggested that the possibility of using funding accrued from car parking charges in the town should also be considered but the Portfolio Holder advised that car parking charges were currently running at a loss which was estimated at £200,000 per year so this was not a source of subsidy.

### **Decision**

That the issue of proposed residents permit cost increases be referred back to a future meeting of Cabinet.

## **53. Town Wall Modelling and Scheme Design and Seaton Carew Coastal Strategy Study – Price/Performance Tender Evaluation** (*Head of Technical Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval to evaluate tenders for two coast protection consultancy contracts on a price/performance basis.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

Following a previous report to the Portfolio Holder in September 2007, approval had been given to advertise and compile a restricted list of tenderers and go to tender for consultancy services for coast protection in order to progress the Town Wall Scheme and Seaton Carew Strategy Study. These



studies are specialist activities of which performance is the primary consideration.

From April 2008 the Environment Agency take the lead role from DEFRA for coast protection. It was imperative that both studies were acceptable to Hartlepool Borough Council for submission to the Environment Agency and incorporated the latest requirements, predicted climate change and sea level rise and considered the new Environment Agency led Outcome Measures for defining policy and Operating Authority delivery in flood and coastal erosion risk management. For these reasons it was considered that evaluation of tenders should be on a price/performance ratio of 20/80.

100% grant approval had already been given for the Seaton Carew Strategy Study in principle. Discussions with the Environment Agency and DEFRA were ongoing with respect to the Town Wall Modelling and Scheme design. In respect of the Town Wall scheme funding might need to be committed by the Council and claimed back retrospectively. This was currently being discussed.

Councillor Mike Turner referred to the Shoreline Management Plan which mentioned £23 million-worth of damage. The Director of Neighbourhood Services advised that this was based on theory and anticipated damage to the North pier and Victorian defences should preventative measures not be taken. £23 million were the anticipated repair costs rather than the cost of damage to people or houses. The Seaton Carew Coastal Strategy Study would formalise these theories.

### **Decision**

That officers be authorised to evaluate tenders for the Town Wall Modelling and Scheme Design and Seaton Carew Coastal Strategy Study on a price/performance ratio of 20% price to 80% performance.

## **54. Central Estate Management Organisation (CEMO) Pilot Neighbourhood Study** *(Director of Neighbourhood Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To provide background and current information to the Portfolio Holder on Central Estate Management Organisation (CEMO) Pilot Neighbourhood Study

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

CEMO is a community owned company limited by guarantee, established to manage housing services for the then Council properties on the Central

Estate. When stock transferred to Housing Hartlepool CEMO continued to receive support from Housing Hartlepool and the Government to negotiate an agreement to manage homes. CEMO went on to become one of the five national pilot Housing Corporation funded Neighbourhood Studies. The aim was to promote a Neighbourhood Management approach to service delivery. The Steering Group comprises CEMO members and representatives of Housing Hartlepool and Hartlepool Borough Council. It was hoped to include representatives from other service providers as the project progresses.

Central Estate is part of the North Hartlepool NAP area which at present receives Neighbourhood Renewal Funding and Neighbourhood Element Funding.

CEMO hope to influence the management of street-level services that affect both tenants and home owners. The study would allow CEMO to work with organisations providing services beyond that of Housing Hartlepool, including the Local Authority and the Police.

### **Decision**

That the report be noted

## **55. Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) Discussion Paper** *(Head of Community Strategy)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To inform the Portfolio Holder of the Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) discussion paper and to seek comments.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy for Hartlepool was agreed in 2002 and Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) were developed for the seven identified priority neighbourhoods. The process was reviewed in October 2006 and since then there have been a number of developments which have led to the need the reassess the role, remit and function of NAPs. A discussion paper on this issue prepared by the Partnership Support Team with input from various partners involved in the NAP process was attached to the report as an appendix. Views of the partners on this discussion paper were currently being sought, the deadline for comments was 21<sup>st</sup> December 2007. A follow up paper would be brought to the Portfolio Holder and Hartlepool Partnership for consideration.

The Portfolio Holder praised NAPs as an opportunity for local community involvement. However he felt the actual documents were too bulky and

expressed a preference for a brief outline with bullet points indicating the work being done. The Principal Community Strategy Officer advised that a summary paper was already produced for each of the NAPs and officers were working on the production of summary leaflets for residents. The Portfolio Holder requested that his thanks be passed on to the team for their work.

**Decision**

That the contents of the NAP discussion paper be noted.

**J A BROWN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 15<sup>th</sup> January 2008**