

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Friday 3rd March 2006

at 3.00 pm

in Committee Room B

MEMBERS: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Cook, Coward, Fleet, Hargreaves, Iseley, Johnson, Kaiser, London, A Marshall, Rayner and Wright

Resident Representatives:

James Atkinson, Mary Power and Iris Ryder

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd February 2006 (*to follow*)

4. ISSUES RAISED AT NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

No items

5. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM

No items

6. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

No items

7. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

No items

8. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

8.1 Community Involvement in Partnerships

- a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- b) Verbal Discussion with Community Network

8.2 LSP Theme Partnerships – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

i) Date of Next Meeting Thursday 30th March, commencing at 9.15 am in Committee Room B

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

3rd February 2006

Present:

Councillor: Pamela Hargreaves (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob Cook, John Coward, Mary Fleet, Bill Iseley, Frances London, Ann Marshall and Edna Wright

Resident

Reps: James Atkinson, Mary Power and Iris Ryder

Officers:

Joanne Smithson, Head of Community Strategy
Sajda Banaras, Scrutiny Support Officer
Jonathan Wistow, Scrutiny Support Officer
Joan Wilkins, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also

Present: Iain Wright, MP
The Mayor, Stuart Drummond

37. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Patricia Rayner, Robbie Payne (Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder), Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder) and Ray Waller (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder)

38. Declarations of Interest by Members

None.

39. Minutes of the meeting held on 26th January 2006

The minutes were confirmed subject to the inclusion of emphasis in minute number 33 (v) of the Forums wish that developers should be required to use local labour as part of schemes.

40. Issues Raised at Neighbourhood Forums

No Items.

41. Responses from the Council, the Executive to Committees of the Council to Reports of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

No Items.

42. Consideration of Request for Scrutiny Reviews Referred Via the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

No Items.

43. Consideration of Progress Reports/Budget and Policy Framework Documents

No Items.

44. Scrutiny Inquiry into Partnerships – Hartlepool Partnership *(Head of Community Strategy)*

As part of the Forum's ongoing inquiry into partnerships the Chairman welcomed the Head of Community Strategy, the Mayor and the towns MP (Iain Wright). The Mayor thanked the Forum for the opportunity to participate and indicated that he would unfortunately, as a result of a prior commitment, be unable to stay for the duration of the meeting.

To assist the Forum in its enquiry the Head of Community Strategy gave a presentation, assisted in part by MP (Iain Wright) outlining in detail:

- The role of the LSP's.
- Key Challenges
- The role of the Audit Commission in enhancing governance and accountability.

- The background and composition of the Partnership.
- The role and responsibilities of elected members and officers within the Partnership.
- Key principles.
- The performance of Hartlepool Partnership.

Following completion of the presentation the Chairman highlighted that as part of the Forum's inquiry a number of other partnerships had been looked at and representatives from each asked:-

- i) How they reported back to/communicated with, their organisations,
- ii) How they were consulted and supported,
- iii) How often they attended partnership meetings.
- iv) What personal pressures their involvement in the partnerships created for them?

The same questions were put to the Mayor and the MP as members of the Hartlepool Partnership and the following comments made:-

i) Communication/feeding back of information - The Mayor highlighted his dual role as Vice Chair of the Hartlepool Partnership Board (HP) and Chair of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership (SHP). As a member of these bodies he was involved in the feeding back of community safety information/issues from one Board to the other and onto the LSP. Information was also fed back by the Head of Community Safety and Prevention as a member of the HP.

In relation to the transmission of information to other Councillors the Mayor indicated that the SHP published details of issues in the Hartlepool Mail and Hartbeat and that community safety issues were discussed through the Portfolio and column in the Hartlepool Mail. Attention was also drawn to the transmission of information/issues to and from the Partnerships, an example of which was the recent request from Council for consideration by the SHP of issues relating to motorcycle nuisance across the town.

The MP highlighted his dual role as Hartlepool's Parliamentary representative and Chairman of the Hartlepool Partnership Board (HP) and emphasised the importance of his role as Chairman in helping to deliver the Community Strategy and identify the way forward in relation to Local Area Agreements.

In relation to the Community Strategy Members queried what they could do to assist in its formulation. It was highlighted that it was not just for Councillor's to assist and emphasis was placed upon the

Local Authority's role as the Accountable Body for the LSP and in ensuring democratic accountability. With the Mayor and MP serving as democratically elected representatives on the HP attention was drawn to the importance of the Councillors role, particularly in terms of leading neighbourhood engagement.

In relation to support and communication the MP commended the HP Support Team on the support provided and indicated that the transmission of information occurred in both directions. In relation to the feedback of information from each of the themed partnerships to the main HP Board attention was drawn to the introduction of 'Chairs' Chat' sessions on a quarterly basis to discuss concerns and up and coming issues. Issues were then finalised by each of the themed partnerships and fed back to the main Partnership Board.

Some concern was expressed by the Forum regarding the dissemination of information back to Council and issues reiterated regarding the LSP decision making process and its removal from the democratic process. Whilst it was not possible for those present to comment on the feedback of information from Councillors on the HP it was suggested that the situation should be pursued and perhaps an element included in the State of the Borough Debate to promote the work and success of the HP. The Chair supported this view and suggested the following inclusion of the following recommendations in the Forum's final report:

- That the development of a 'Tool Kit' be supported.
- That a section be included in the State of the Borough Debate to feedback the work and success of the HP and SHP.
- That where possible Councillors when attending events across the town take the opportunity to feedback the work and success of the HP and SHP.

ii) Members queried what impact the Mayor's presence on the SHP had made. The Mayor indicated that every member of the SHP brought something to the table and that in his role he had been instrumental in driving forward the SHP in its work to reduce crime. Work already undertaken by the Partnership had assisted in the reduction this year's figures for domestic burglary and car crime by 40% and 60% respectively, with an overall reduction in crime of 20%.

iii) Members raised issues regarding help for communities outside Community Warden areas that suffer from anti social behaviour and problems getting hold of the police when needed. In relation to help for communities outside Community Warden areas the Mayor drew attention to the establishment of the Anti Social

Behaviour Unit and the positive outcome of the recent blitz of problem areas. It was noted that three Dispersal Orders had been issued in the last year and that the Neighbourhood Policing Scheme was to be implemented from the April 2006.

iv) Neighbourhood Policing Scheme. Members were advised that the Neighbourhood Policing Scheme was to be a completely new way of policing for the town with each ward to have its own dedicated Police Officer and Police Community Support Officer (PCSO). With a total of 37 new officers this represented a commitment from the Police and the LSP, who were to fund the scheme.

During the course of discussions on this concerns were raised regarding:

- The movement of dedicated Police Officers in the past (i.e. from the Park to the Stranton Ward). An assurance was given that officers wouldn't be moved unless they themselves wished to take time off or take advantage of promotion opportunities.
- The effect on the Neighbourhood Policing Scheme of proposals for a regionalised police force. Members were assured that there would be no effect. Each police force was required to have a pilot area and for Cleveland this was Hartlepool.
- The possible regionalisation of police forces by the back door. Emphasis was placed upon the importance of local area agreements to keep services local. Attention was also drawn to the effectiveness of the Local Authority, the Basic Command Unit and the Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the way in which they work together. It was felt that it was important to maintain co-terminus working between services and an assurance given by the MP that he would do all he could to protect this. The Chair suggested that as the Forum was looking to identify ways of improving partnerships a possible recommendation could be the need for continued partnerships, and co-terminus working between the Council, Police and PCT. It was also suggested that with consultations on the reconfiguration of the PCT due to end in March a letter should be written to the Strategic Health Authority outlining the Forum's views. The Scrutiny Support Officer indicated that the views of scrutiny were to be passed onto the Strategic Health Authority through the Adult and Community Services and Health Scrutiny Forum. A meeting of this Forum to discuss the reconfiguration of the PCT was to be held on the 14th February 2006.

v) Police response times. In relation to concerns regarding police response times it was highlighted that this was an issue raised

regularly at each of the three Neighbourhood Police and Community Safety Forum meetings. Members were assured that the Anti Social Behaviour Unit would do all it could to help when advised of a problem and that the police were trying to address response time concerns.

vi) The allocation of resources. Concern was expressed regarding the organisation of resources through the LSP and how it would be determined through the local area agreement (LAA). There was concern that the bulk of funding would go to organisations that already receive core funding and it was hoped that allocation through LAA would be more democratic.

- In response to a request for an assurance from the Mayor and MP that consideration would be given to funding for voluntary organisations no direct assurance was given but attention was drawn to the recent request from the Grants Committee. The Committee requested that scrutiny examine the withdrawal of European Regional Development Funding and the impact it would have across the voluntary sector in Hartlepool during 2006/7.

vii) Transparency of decision making and funding streams through the LAA. Emphasis was placed upon the importance of the provision of a transparent strategy for the allocation of resources and clear funding streams. It was also felt that there was a lot of misinformation regarding services that affect local residents and that people needed to be provided with clear/accurate information. They also needed to be made aware of the restrictions that apply to the use of resources i.e. ring fencing.

In relation to transparency of Hartlepool Partnership (HP) decision making the Head of Community Strategy confirmed that all papers and records of decisions were available on the web site and that all meetings were in fact public meetings. Regarding the allocation of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding funding (NRF) it was noted that each themed group decided what it wanted to achieve and had a clear framework in place in terms of how it wanted to achieve it. It was, however, noted that community involvement in decision making was to be looked at further by scrutiny as part of its examination of LSP and SHP decision making/resource allocation.

viii) Public knowledge about the work of the HP. Concern was expressed that the majority of residents were unaware of the work of the HP and it was felt that this was a real shame. Issues were raised about the perception of the local paper in terms of the value of reporting the work of the Council, Hartlepool Partnership and Safer

Hartlepool Partnership and it was suggested that a place on the Partnership Board should be offered to the Editor of the Hartlepool Mail. The Head of Community Strategy confirmed that the Editor had been invited to attend as a non-voting member and had not taken up the place. Regular press releases were, however, done in an attempt to publicise the work of the Partnership.

ix) The need for the HP to look at crosscutting issues. Attention was drawn to the issue of access to health facilities and the absence of transport facilities in certain areas. It was acknowledged that this was the type of issue the HP should be looking at and that it needed to be looked at to ascertain if this was what residents want and to make the voluntary sector and residents feel included in local decision making.

x) What could be done to help the HP connect with residents? It was suggested that the following could be done:

- Make sure residents were aware that they could attend HP Board meetings. Residents could then attend meetings at which issues of interest were to be discussed. It was noted that this was already done.
- Greater publicity in relation to the issues being discussed. It was suggested that a full page in Hartbeat should be looked into and that As this was already done it was suggested that quick presentations should be given to each of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums outlining the work and success of the HP.

xi) Members requested that the Council's thanks be passed on to the MP and Hartlepool Partnership (HP) for its help in acquiring permission to go ahead with the Victoria Harbour development. The Office of the Deputy prime Minister had now referred the application back to the Council for determination of the planning application. Emphasis was, however, placed on the need for consideration of how the Victoria Harbour was to look at the need for the attraction of business and leisure with the aim of creating a microcosm of the Community Strategy. It was felt that the HP role in this was to be crucial in the coming years.

Following completion of discussions the Chair thanked the MP for his attendance and requested that the Forum's congratulations and thanks be passed on to the Partnership Support Team through the Head of Community Strategy.

Decision

- i) The issues discussed at today's meeting were noted for consideration during formulation of the Forums Final Report.
- ii) The following additions to the Forum's recommendations were proposed:
 - In looking to identify ways of improving partnerships emphasis was placed upon the importance of continued partnerships, and co-terminus working between the Council, Police and PCT.
 - That in relation to communication and information dissemination an internal and external communication protocol should be developed, including the further development of a 'Tool Kit' for resident's use.
 - That a section be included in the State of the Borough Debate to feedback the work and success of the HP and SHP.
 - That where possible Councillors when attending events across the town take the opportunity to feedback the work and success of the HP and SHP and a measure to facilitate this be considered.

PAMELA HARGREAVES

CHAIRMAN

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM REPORT

3rd March 2006



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: Community Involvement in Partnerships – Covering Report

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide a brief introduction to, and outline of, the presentation from the Community Network in relation to Community Involvement in Partnership Working.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Members of the Forum will recall that on 4th November 2005 they approved the Project Plan for this Forum's Partnerships Inquiry. As part of this plan it was agreed that evidence would be gathered in relation to Community Involvement and Empowering Communities. At today's meeting a representative of the Community Network will present a report in relation to this item.
- 2.2 The presentation from the Community Network will focus on the following areas:
- The role of the Community and Voluntary Sector in partnerships generally;
 - The role of the Community and Voluntary Sector in: regional partnerships, sub-regional partnerships, the LSP, and Theme Partnerships.
 - Whether encouragement needs to be given to maintain and strengthen the links with the community and voluntary sector in relation to partnership working.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members note the content of the report.

1. THE ROLE OF THE VOLUNTARY/COMMUNITY SECTOR (VCS)

1.1 Why Involve the VCS

The need to involve the VCS in partnership working is highlighted in nearly all aspects of public policy. This is for a number of reasons:

- The VCS can deliver services.
- The VCS is a source of information.
- The VCS contributes to community cohesion.

1.2 Range of the VCS and Characteristics

- From Oxfam, Save the Children, RSPCA to a local Mother and Toddler Group.
- Every type of human endeavour is covered.
- Groups come together in response to a common concern, cause or unmet need.
- The management is volunteer led.
- Groups may have paid staff to deliver services.

1.3 Strengths of the VCS

- Local control and community involvement.
- Flexibility.
- Go beyond boundaries.
- Volunteer contribution:
 - Self confidence
 - Skill development
 - Active citizens
- Community cohesion/builds communities.
- Ability to access external funding e.g. Charitable Trusts and Foundations.

1.4 The VCS Locally

Numbers

- 550 groups
- 40 faith groups
- 60 with paid staff (but declining)
- 5000 volunteers
- 400 in paid work (but declining)

Main Areas of Activity

- Culture/leisure/sport/arts
- Health/disability/care
- Children and young people
- Residents and community groups

1.5 HVDA's Work

- Advice/project development support both to new and existing groups.
- Volunteers – placement, support and good practice.
- Community Chests – administration of funds.
- Funding advice and Straight Through Money.
- Community involvement through the Community Network.

1.6 Where are the interactions between the VCS and the Public Sector:

- Funding agreements/contracts.
- Users of Local Authority premises/school premises.
- Consultees/sources of expertise.
- Formal mechanisms of consultation:
 - Hartlepool Community Network
 - Neighbourhood Action Plans
 - Neighbourhood Consultative Fora
 - Specialist Fora, All Ability Forum, 50+ Forum
- Representatives on Partnerships.

2.0 THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY NETWORK IN HARTLEPOOL

2.1 The Government expects the wider community to play a full part in Local Strategic Partnerships. For this to be achieved, the Government has encouraged the formation of Community Networks. Such networks are seen as the means by which the community is brought together to influence the work of the Hartlepool Partnership and those partnerships, which feed into it. The Community Network is required to elect a Steering Group from within its members. The Steering Group is responsible for overseeing the work of the Network.

2.2 The Network is responsible for:

- Producing an annual action plan.
- Measuring its work through a Performance Management Framework.
- Making regular reports to the Community Network.
- A Skills and Knowledge Programme.
- Involving “hard to reach communities”.
- Ensuring representation through elected representatives and making sure there is effective feedback to and from the Hartlepool Partnership through these representatives.
- Commissioning research on the VCS contribution.

2.3 The Community Network has three constituencies:

- Residents living in neighbourhoods.
- Communities of interest.

- The interests of the VCS.

The above are not always the same, they can be different or overlap. The Community Network seeks to ensure that all three have their voice heard.

2.4 How to make involvement work in practice

- Improve levels of resident, community and voluntary sector representation throughout the Hartlepool Partnership and other Partnerships in Hartlepool.
- Improve methods of consultation on issues affecting local neighbourhoods and communities of interest.
- The support and development of skills, knowledge and confidence to the individuals so that they can participate effectively.

2.5 There are many ways for the people of Hartlepool can influence decision making in the Hartlepool Partnership. However, the Hartlepool Community Network focuses on four key areas of involvement:

1. Co-ordinating a network and forum of voluntary organisations and community groups.
2. Support to forums of communities based on area “where people live”. (Neighbourhood Action Plan Forums).
3. Supporting forums of communities based on specific interests e.g. disability.
4. Commissioning work, which highlights the value of the VCS.

2.6 How are the VCS involved in partnership working?

The assessment of whether a Community Network is being successful includes the following criteria:

- That there is a sufficient and influential level and range of voluntary/community sector representation on the Local Strategic Partnerships.
- That there is an agreed protocol covering working arrangements between the Community Network and the Local Strategic Partnership.
- Ensures Local Strategic partnership decision-making processes have included the voluntary/community sector representatives in a way that has enabled them to contribute and have real influence.
- That Community Empowerment Network representatives are fully involved in the Local Strategic Partnership Performance Management Framework.

2.7 Community Network Representation on Themed Partnerships

Representatives are elected from these Forums to take up issues raised to the relevant parts of Hartlepool Partnership and influence decisions made about local services.

- Housing Partnership (3 places).
- Community Safety Theme/Safer Hartlepool Partnership (6 places).
- Environment Partnership (3 places).
- The Health & Care Strategy Group (2 places). HVDA is also represented on the Partnership separately.
- Culture and Leisure (6 places).
- Jobs and Economy Theme: (4 places).
- Lifelong learning (1 place).
- Children and Young People's Partnership (1 place). HVDA is also represented on the Partnership separately.

Representatives agree to a job description and a code of conduct. Elections take place at an open meeting of the Community Network. For Themed Partnerships, representatives on the Neighbourhood Consultative Forum and the Hartlepool Partnership, the term of office is 2 years.

The current proposals for assisting representatives and exchanging information with Community Network Members includes meetings every three months which allow representatives to discuss their work subsequently identify issues to be taken back to the relevant Partnership.

Representative can meet before a Partnership meeting with, if necessary with the support of the Network to discuss agenda items. This happens regularly with the Hartlepool Partnership and the Neighbourhood Consultative Forum Representatives.

Members of Community Network meet at least four times a year to promote the interests of communities and the voluntary/community sector.

2.8 Examples of work with communities of interest

- All Ability Forum (Disability Forum) – funding for the development worker was secured by the Network.
- Development work with young people, including production of a video outlining the needs of young people, which was presented to Hartlepool Partnership and to a Council's Scrutiny Forum.
- Publication of newspaper by and for young people (HYPE).
- Work with the 50+ Forum.
- Production of a strategy to involve young people in decision-making.
- A Young People's Citizenship Programme.

8.1

- Patient and Public Involvement Forums – assisting with recruitment of representatives.
- Hart Gables working with lesbian, gay bisexual and transgendered people. Funding for a development worker was secured.
- A feasibility study into the development of a skateboard park.

2.9 Examples of work with communities based on area

- Support for residents working through the Council's three Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.
- Capacity building with Residents' Associations.
- Support and development of Neighbourhood Forums such as Burbank Residents Forum.
- Development of resident and community involvement with Neighbourhood Actions Plans.

3.0 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

- 3.1 Is the Community network achieving its purpose? In Hartlepool there has been a good level of resident involvement in Neighbourhood Action Plans. The Community Network has played an important role of articulating the views of communities of interest e.g. people with disabilities, young people. However, the VCS feels that it has had less success in getting the services it provides on the mainstream agenda of the public sector.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 Best Value reviews and Budgetary reviews could more seriously consider the VCS as a potential provider of services.
- 4.2 There is a support specialist Forums, which seeks the views of difficult to reach groups e.g. the All Ability Forum the 50+ Forum, the need for a Youth Council.
- 4.3 Recognise HVDA role in its support it gives to the VCS.
- 4.4 Adequate support at a neighbourhood level for capacity building and capacity building with communities of interest.

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM REPORT

3rd March 2006



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: LSP THEME PARTNERSHIPS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to introduce the supporting papers in the relation to the Theme Partnerships of the LSP, as requested by Members at the last meeting.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Hartlepool Partnership is the Local Strategic Partnership for Hartlepool. It consists of a network of partnerships linked together. Most of these cluster around the seven aims or themes of the Community Strategy, which are:

- Jobs and the Economy;
- Lifelong Learning and Skills;
- Health and Care;
- Community Safety;
- Environment and Housing;
- Culture and Leisure; and
- Strengthening Communities.

- 2.2 The main partnerships under each theme are known as Theme Partnerships. A number of theme partnerships are divided within the Community Strategy themes, for example the Environment and Housing theme has two theme partnerships. The Theme Partnerships are:

- Culture and Learning (**Appendix A**);
- Community Safety (**Appendix B** to be circulated in the meeting);
- The Economic Forum (**Appendix C**);
- Environment (**Appendix D**);
- Health and Care (**Appendix E**);
- Housing (**Appendix F**);
- Lifelong Learning and Skills (**Appendix G**);
- Strengthening Communities (**Appendix H** to be circulated in the meeting); and

- Sure Start (**Appendix I** to be circulated in the meeting).

2.3 As part of this Forum's ongoing inquiry into Partnerships the Forum requested further information about the membership and feedback / accountability mechanisms of the LSP's Theme Partnerships. Consequently, each of the appendices attached to this report provides an outline of each of the Theme Partnerships in terms of their:

- Aim;
- Membership; and
- Feedback / Accountability Mechanisms.

3. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 That Members note the content of the report and the appendices.

THEME PARTNERSHIP: Culture and Leisure

AIM: *Ensure a wide range of good quality, affordable and accessible leisure and cultural opportunities.*

MEMBERSHIP:

- **Councillors**

None

- **Officers**

One Rep from Assistant Director Cultural Services
One Rep from Children's Services (Education Officer)
One Rep from Press and PR
One Rep from Culture and Heritage and Grants Officer

- **Representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector**

Community Sector (5 Places):

One Rep from West Hartlepool NDC
One Rep from Churches Together
One Rep from North Hartlepool Partnership Community Representative
One Rep from Salaam Centre
One Rep from Sportability.

Voluntary Sector (5 Places):

One Rep from Footlights
Community Empowerment Network (three representatives)
One Rep from Belle Vue Centre.

- **Representatives from the Private Sector**

One Rep from The Studio
One Rep from Old School Studios
One Rep from Soundswright
One Rep from HMS Trimcomalee
One Rep from Hartlepool United

- **Representatives from 'other' public bodies**

One Rep from Hartlepool PCT

Appendix A

- **Additional Officers in Attendance**

Additional officers attend meetings when they are presenting reports to the Theme Partnership. For example, in October 2005 the Sport and Recreation Manager attended to present a report.

FEEDBACK/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

The Theme Partnership provides minutes and actions to the LSP via the Community Strategy team, any major items of strategic significance are placed before the Hartlepool Partnership meeting.

In terms of the statutory sectors individual members are representative of the cultural services areas. The voluntary and community sector members tend to be recruited by a selection process undertaken by the Community Network. Specific representatives from bodies such as the North Hartlepool Partnership tend to be selected within these bodies.

THEME PARTNERSHIP: Economic Forum

AIM: *Develop a more enterprising and, vigorous and diverse local economy that will attract investment, be globally competitive and create more employment opportunities for local people.*

MEMBERSHIP:

- **Councillors**

Stuart Drummond - Mayor

- **Officers**

None

- **Representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector**

Four Reps from the Community Empowerment Network
One Rep from HMS Trincomalee

- **Representatives from the Private Sector**

One Rep from PD Ports
Editor Hartlepool Mail
One Rep from Horwath Clark Whitehill
One Rep from Gillens
One Rep from Flex-ability
One Rep from Personnel Managers Group
One Rep from Middleton Grange Shopping Centre
One Rep from Vantis Walker (Chair)
One Rep from Huntsman Tioxide
One Rep from Trade Unions

- **Representatives from ‘other’ public bodies**

One Rep from Job Centre Plus
One Rep from Business Link Tees Valley
One Rep from Learning & Skills Council
One Rep from Hartlepool College of Further Education

Officers in attendance

Appendix C

Assistance Director, Planning & Economic Development
Economic Development Manager
Urban Policy Manager
Two Principal Economic Development Officers
Economic Development Officer

FEEDBACK/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

The Chair of the Economic Forum represents the Partnership on the Hartlepool Partnership LSP and approves the development of Working Groups to deliver specific items of work on behalf of the Economic Forum.

The Economic Forum Steering Group will elect three ‘Champions’ for a year, each will be responsible for the Three Strategic Objectives outlined in the Economic Forum Action Plan. The Champions will act as ‘demanding customers’ reviewing the delivery of services by public, private and voluntary sector agencies. They will also chair appropriate working groups of the Economic Forum.

There will be three ‘Lead Partners’ drawn from the public sector. Their role will be to deliver one of the three Strategic Objectives outlined in the Economic Forum Action Plan. They must regularly report to the Champions on actions and activities that will assist in the delivery of Strategic targets.

The Economic Forum Protocol states that members must, “represent the views of the Economic Forum in external networks and meetings as appropriate.”

THEME PARTNERSHIP: Environment

AIM:

To secure a more attractive and sustainable environment that is safe, clean and tidy.

MEMBERSHIP:

- **Councillors**

Stuart Drummond – Elected Mayor

- **Officers**

Environmental Standards Manager
Head of Environmental Management
Principal Policy Officer – Community Strategy

- **Representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector**

One Rep from North East Civic Trust
One Rep from Hartlepool Civic Society
Four Community Empowerment Network representatives
One Rep from Headland Local History Group
One Rep from Hartlepool Natural History Society
One Rep from Hartlepool NDC

- **Representatives from non-satutory environmental organisations**

One Rep from Friends of the Earth
One Rep from Teesmouth Field Centre
One Rep from Tees Forest
One Rep from Tees Valley Wildlife Trust
One Rep from English Nature
One Rep from English Heritage
One Rep from Sustrans (A leading sustainable transport charity)
One Rep from TADEA (Tees and Durham Energy Advice)

- **Representatives from the Private Sector**

One Rep from Hydro Chemicals
One Rep from SCA Packaging Ltd
One Rep from Huntsman Tioxide Europe
One Rep from Hartlepool Water Company

Appendix D

One Rep from C J Garland
One Rep from Hereema
One Rep from Able UK
One Rep from Expanded Metal Company
One Rep from Hartlepool Power Station
One Rep from INCA

- **Representatives from ‘other’ public bodies**

One Rep from Countryside Agency
One Rep from Tees & Hartlepool Port Authority
One Rep from Environment Agency
One Rep from N. Tees and Hartlepool NHS Trust

- **Officers occasionally in attendance**

Approximately three officers in attendance each meeting who are not members

FEEDBACK/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

The feedback mechanism is by the theme group to the LSP and via Community Empowerment Network representatives to the wider community.

THEME PARTNERSHIP: Health and Care

AIM: *Ensure access to the highest quality health, social care, and support services, and improve the health, life expectancy and well-being of the community.*

MEMBERSHIP:

- **Councillors – N/A**
- **Officers**

Hartlepool PCT
Chief Executive
Dir Public Health & Wellbeing
Dir Partnerships/Vision for Care
Dir of Finance & Performance Management
Ass. Dir of Care Programmes
Dir of Planning
Dir of Primary Care & Modernisation
Dir of Nursing & Operations
Head of Mental Health
Hartlepool Borough Council
Dir of Adult & Community Services
Dir of Children's Services
Head of Business Unit (Disability)
Head of Community & Strategy Division
Ass Dir of Safeguarding & Specialist Services
Housing Strategy Manager
Acting Senior Assist Dir Adults
Ass Dir (Support Services)
Strategy & Resource Manager

- **Representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector**

Chairman HPCT PPI Forum
Hartlepool Families First
HVDA Manager
Project Manager Endeavour Home Improvement Agency

- **Representatives from the Private Sector**

N/A

- **Representatives from 'other' public bodies**

Appendix E

Acting Gen Mgr Mental Health Services
Ass Dir Community Health & Elderly Care
Housing Hartlepool

- **Officers Occasionally in Attendance**

N/A

FEEDBACK/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

Feedback via Performance Management Framework reports.

Chair attends Chair meetings.

Chair member of LSP.

Table relevant reports as appropriate at LSP meetings

Example of reports:

Tees Review

Commissioning a Patient Led NHS

THEME PARTNERSHIP: Housing

AIM: *To secure access to good quality and affordable housing.*

MEMBERSHIP:

- **Councillors**

- **Officers**

Director of Regeneration and Planning, HBC
Head of Public Protection and Housing, HBC
Head of Housing Strategy, HBC
Principal Housing and Regeneration Officer, HBC
Housing and Regeneration Co-ordinator, HBC
Chief Executive, Housing Hartlepool
Director of Regeneration, Housing Hartlepool

- **Representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector**

Chair of the Housing Hartlepool Tenants Consultation Panel
Community Network Officer, Hartlepool Voluntary Development Agency
Representative from Hartlepool Access Group
Representative from 'Communities Acting Together' (CAT)

- **Representatives from the Private Sector**

Representatives from three Hartlepool Estate Agents

- **Representatives from 'other' public bodies**

Group Director of Operations, Tees Valley Housing
Housing Manager, Home Housing
Business Development Manager, Three Rivers Housing
Senior Development Manager, Three Rivers Housing
Chief Executive, Endeavour Housing
Housing Services Director, Endeavour Housing
Regeneration and Investment Manager, Guinness Trust
2 x Housing Managers, Accent North-East
Housing Regeneration Director, Hartlepool Revival
Programme Director, New Deal for Communities
Housing Theme Resident Co-Chair, New Deal for Communities
Senior Regional Officer from the National Housing Federation

- **Council Officers who are not members of the theme partnership**

Occasional representation from Housing Advice Manager or Supporting People Officer, HBC, or others depending on subject

FEEDBACK/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

Further information to follow

THEME PARTNERSHIP: Lifelong Learning and Skills

AIM: *Help all individuals, groups and organisations to realise their full potential, ensure the highest quality opportunities in education, lifelong learning and training, and raise standards of attainment.*

MEMBERSHIP:

- **Councillors**

No Reps

- **Officers**

One Rep from Children's Services, HBC

One Rep from Adult Education, HBC

- **Representatives from the Community and Voluntary Sector**

One Rep from the Community Network (Substitute)

- **Representatives from the Private Sector**

No Reps

- **Representatives from 'other' public bodies**

One Rep from Secondary Schools' Rep

One Rep from Learning and Skills Council Tees Valley

One Rep from NACRO (a crime reduction charity)

Head Teacher Hartlepool College of FE (Chair)

One Rep from Hartlepool College of FE (Administrator)

One Rep from Hartlepool College of FE, Partnership Co-ordinator

One Rep from English Martyrs School & SFC

One Rep from Cleveland College of Art and Design

One Rep from University of Teesside

One Rep from Connexions

One Rep from Hartlepool Sixth Form College

- **Additional Officers in Attendance**

None

FEEDBACK/ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

Feedback is via the Partnership's performance monitoring mechanism.

Appendix G

Funded projects are monitored and evaluated by the Lifelong Learning Partnership, with reports going to partnership officers at HBC and the full Hartlepool Partnership. Feedback is also given at community consultation events organised by partnership officers.