PLEASE NOTE VENUE

SOUTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM AGENDA



Friday 20th June 2008

at 10.00 am

at Owton Manor Community Centre, Wynyard Road, Hartlepool

MEMBERS: SOUTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM:

Councillors S Cook, Flintoff, Gibbon, Hill, James, Johnson, A Lilley, G Lilley, A Marshall, Preece, Turner, Wistow and Young

Resident Representatives:

Mary Green, Rose Kennedy, Iris Ryder, Sally Vokes and Mike Ward

- 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
- 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
- 3. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS
- 4. MINUTES
 - 4.1 To confirm the minutes of the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum meeting held on 28th March 2008
 - 4.2 To receive the minutes of the South Area Police and Community Safety Consultative Forum held on 11th April 2007
 - 4.3 Matters arising
- 5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

6. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION

No items

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / INFORMATION

- 7.1 Affordable Housing Development Plan Document Issues and Options Discussion Paper Consultation *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*
- 7.2 Minor Works Budget 2008/2009 Director of Neighbourhood Services

8. ITEMS FOR DECISION

8.1 Minor Works Report – *Town Care Manager*

9. WARDISSUES

10. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum is to be held on Friday 15th August 2008 commencing at 6pm at Owton Manor Community Centre, Wynyard Road.

The next meeting of the South Area Police and Community Safety Consultative Forum is to be held on Friday 12th September 2008 commencing at 10am at Ow ton Manor Community Centre, Wynyard Road.

WARDS

Fens Greatham Owton Rossmere Seaton

SOUTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM

28 March 2008

MNUTES OF THE MEETING



The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. in the Owton Rossmere Resource Centre, Wynyard Road, Hartlepool

PRESENT:

Chair: Councillor Mick Johnson - Rossmere Ward

Vice Chair: Mary Green (Resident Representative)

Councillor Shaun Cook
Councillor Bob Flintoff
Councillor Geoff Lilley
Councillor Ann Marshall
Councillor Arthur Preece
Councillor Michael Turner
Councillor David Young

- Rossmere Ward
- Rossmere Ward
- Fens Ward
- Seaton Ward

Resident Representatives: Ann Butterfield, David Rowe, Iris Ryder, Michael Ward

Public: M Arnold, D Clark, H Oxley, S Quinn, J Smith, B Spowart, D Taylor, E Taylor,

J Taylor, M & J Unwin

Officers: Peter Frost, Traffic Team Leader

M Flounders, Traffic Enforcement Colin Kay, Dog Control Warden

David Frame, Neighbourhood Manager David Mitchell, Neighbourhood Co-ordinator

Sue McBride, Neighbourhood Development Officer Gemma Clough, Principal Regeneration Officer

Sarah Bird, Democratic Services Officer

Housing Hartlepool Representative: Helen Iveson

Fire Brigade Representative: Stuart Simpson

Police Representatives: Jonathan Wrigley, I Gray, M Adair

Connected Care Representative: Paul McGee

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gibbon, James and A Lilley

71. MINUTES

The minutes of the Forum held on 18 March 2008 were accepted as an accurate record with an amendment on Page 5:-

Resident Rep Iris Ryder questioned how much had been spent on the production of the leaflets as she was aware that some households were in receipt of more than one leaflet and some had received none at all.

72. MATTERS ARISING

Parking at Fens Shops – Councillor G Lilley asked whether there was any update regarding the problems there and was informed that the Neighbourhood Coordinator had written to the owners of the site but as yet there had been no reply.

Traffic Calming in M Block – Resident J W Taylor stated that he had received no response from the Chief Solicitor's Department and had submitted a petition objecting to the traffic calming measures already put in place in the M Block. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to liaise with the Chief Solicitor's Department to ensure a reply to Mr Taylor was forthcoming although he was informed at the meeting that because of time constraints a public notice was unable to be issued earlier. A consultation had taken place with 300 residents and only 103 had responded, 95 for the scheme and 8 against. The petition submitted was to be considered by the Portfolio Holder. Councillor G Lilley queried the cost and relevance of consultations by different departments

and asked which department's consultation would have legal relevance. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to confirm this with the Chief Solicitor.

Summer Playschemes – Resident Representative Mike Ward supported Dorothy Clark's concern regarding the lack of summer play scheme provision in Greatham.

73. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Litter Resident Dorothy Clarke expressed concern at the amount of litter in the town and suggested that those on community service be asked to litter pick. The Neighbourhood Manager said that community payback schemes do help but it is a matter of educating people not to drop litter. Enforcement does take place. Resident Representative Iris Ryder stated that certain areas are more problematic as litter is coming from the landfill sites. The Neighbourhood Manager agreed to the Environmental **Environmental** contact Manager to suggest enforcement. Resident Joan Unwin asked whether there was continual cleaning in the Shopping Centre. The Neighbourhood Manager agreed to elicit if this took place, as it did in high season in Seaton Carew.

Traffic Calming in M Block – Residents Mr and Mrs Taylor highlighted that because of the narrow width of the roads and cars parking on either side, then it was merely the centre of the speed humps which were used and the markings were not visible, especially at night. They queried whether the proposed 20 mile per hour speed limit would be enforced as there was minimal police presence. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to look into the problem of visibility of the speed humps.

74. DOG CONTROL ORDERS

The Dog Control Warden outlined the Dog Control Order Regulations which were scheduled to be in place by 1 June 2008 at the earliest and provided for the five offences as follows:-

- Failure to remove dog faeces
- Not keeping a dog on a lead
- Not putting, or keeping a dog on a lead with directed to do so by an authorised officer
- Permitting a dog to enter land from which dogs are excluded
- Taking more than the specified number of dogs (4) onto land

The areas to which these were pertinent were outlined to the Forum and details of fines for non compliance were outlined. It was stressed that the legislation would enable irresponsible owners to have action taken against them. Appropriate signage would be put in place approximately 7 days in advance. The Dog Control Warden said that details of the Act and areas affected had been published in the Hartbeat magazine which was circulated to all households.

The Chair expressed concern as there did not appear to be any sites within walking distance of the Owton Manor area. Clarification was sought regarding areas of Greatham Local Nature Reserve and land near B & Q. Resident Representative Iris Ryder expressed concern that dogs were able to roam freely in Seaton Dunes which housed a lot of wildlife. It was darified that a number of interested parties including English Heritage and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds had been consulted. Resident Michael Unwin confirmed that the sports fields in Greatham were rented from the Hospital of God who had confirmed that dogs were welcome on this area. The Dog Control

Warden agreed to pass this information onto the Environmental Action Manager.

Resident Representative Ann Butterfield stated that she had noticed that there was a problem with dogs fouling on the Headland at night. It was confirmed that there were two enforcement officers on the Headland who could work out of hours if necessary.

Resident Mr J Taylor asked why there were discrepancies in the control orders in Seaton and Greatham Local Nature Reserves and was informed that this was determined after the public consultation.

The Forum was informed that there were 247 dog fouling bins throughout Hartlepool although some were used more frequently than others. If these bins were full, normal bins could be used.

75. CONNECTED CARE

The Service Co-ordinator for Connected Care, Paul McGee gave details of the new Connected Care Service in Owton This was part of a national Manor. programme which was aimed to provide integrated health and social care services to address the 'whole person' meeting their complex needs in terms of range and severity. It would bring together care, health and social housing, education. employment, community safety and transport to meet the needs of local people.

Councillor Geoff Lilley asked how the service would be audited to see whether it was of value and Paul McGee said that he would like to return to the Forum to report back. There was a Steering Group which met quarterly and the service was being evaluated by Durham University.

Resident Representative Mike Ward said that other areas of the town would also benefit from Connected Care and was informed that it was hoped that if this pilot was successful, then it would be rolled out throughout the town.

Resident Representative Joan Smith asked what would happen when the budget had been used and was informed that the idea of the service was managing existing budgets in a better way.

Councillor David Young stated that this service appeared similar to another initiative which had been set up in 1998 but which had been let down by the Primary Care Team.

The Chair asked whether there was anything in this programme which would help combat the high level of young male substance misuse in the area and was informed that the services of the Jobcentreplus. Housing and counsellors would be brought together to enable support to be given. The Chair queried whether there would be enough support available given the high numbers of dependents in the Ward. Councillor Geoff Lilley pointed out that it was not merely a young male problem and had an effect on family life. Councillor Geoff Lilley suggested that this problem be referred to Scrutiny for the coming year.

Housing Hartlepool Representative Helen lveson informed the meeting that the Planning and Commissioning Manager had conducted a survey into drug and alcohol abuse and this had highlighted what support was available including voluntary organisations such as Developing Initiatives Supporting Communities (DISC).

76. ROSSMERE NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP) UPDATE (FINAL FOR ENDORSEMENT)

The Principal Regeneration Officer presented the Neighbourhood Action Plan update for the Rossmere area.

The strategy formed part of Community Strategy and the overall policy framework for the Borough and set out the long term vision for Hartlepool and approach to the continuous improvement of services. NAPs have been developed in line with government policy for each of the Hartlepool wards which fall within the 10% most deprived wards nationally. NAPs are important in local encouraging people organisations to work together to narrow the gap between the most deprived wards and the rest of the country and they should be influential in the future allocation of resources. The objective of the NAP is to integrate policies at the local level to improve the way that services are provided.

The Forum endorsed the NAP, subject to endorsement from the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder and the Hartlepool Partnership and the Principal Regeneration Officer was thanked by the Chair for the work undertaken to produce the plan.

77. WARD ISSUES

Disposal of Waste – Resident Representative Iris Ryder expressed concern that waste from dog fouling bins and normal waste bins were emptied into the same receptades. She was informed that this was not the case and they were disposed of separately.

Roads around Seaton Meadows — Councillor Shaun Cook highlighted the mud on the roads in this area which was of concern to the many cyclists who used this route. The Transportation Team leader would be informed of this.

Overgrown hedges in area of Mayfair Centre – Councillor Shaun Cook stated that there was an overgrown hedge causing problems for cyclists using this road and asked if this could be rectified.

Broken Windows in Rossmere Area – Councillor Ann Marshall highlighted a number of recent cases of residents having windows broken and was advised that these issues should be reported to the Police.

Parking on Grass Verges – Councillor Geoff Lilley asked what the policy was regarding enforcement of this and the Neighbourhood Manager said that this was currently being looked into townwide and he would report back when there was any update.

Repairs to Roads/Pavements – Councillor Geoff Lilley asked what the minimum requirement for repairs was and was informed that it was 40mm for repairs to roads and 20 mm for pavements.

Broken Bottles in Rossmere Park – Resident Representative Mary Green stated that on Saturday and Sunday momings there were broken bottles in the play area and asked whether these could be removed on a regular basis as young families used the facilities early in the momings. The Neighbourhood Manager said that he would inform Neighbourhood Services to see if this could be cleaned at these times.

Litter — Councillor Mike Turner highlighted the problem of litter on Coronation Drive and the Neighbourhood Manager agreed to ensure that this was monitored.

Grass Verges in Elgin Road – Councillor Marjorie James had sent a letter to the Forum stating that residents were concerned about the poor state of these. The Neighbourhood Manager agreed to respond regarding this.

Statistics regarding incidents of Anti-Social Behaviour – Councillor Geoff Lilley asked that the Forum could receive details of incidents in the area and Sgt Wrigley agreed to provide these to subsequent Forums.

MJOHNSON

CHAIR

WARDS

Fens Greatham Owton Rossmere Seaton

SOUTH POLICE & COMMUNITY SAFETY CONSULTATIVE FORUM

11 April 2008

MINUTES OF THE MEETING



The meeting commenced at 2.00pm at Owton Manor Community Centre, Hartlepool

PRESENT:

Vice Chair: Mary Green (Resident Representative) (In the Chair)

Councillors Councillor Bob Flintoff - Owton Ward

Councillor Steve Gibbon - Fens Ward
Councillor Marjorie James - Owton Ward
Councillor Geoff Lilley - Greatham Ward
Councillor Ann Marshall - Rossmere Ward
Councillor Mike Turner - Seaton Ward

Resident Representatives: Ann Butterfield, Rosemarie Kennedy and Iris Ryder

Residents: D Clark, H Oxley and J Smith

Officers: David Frame, Neighbourhood Manager (South)

Sally Forth, Anti-social Behaviour Co-ordinator

Sue McBride, Neighbourhood Development Officer (South)

Dave Mitchell, Neighbourhood Co-ordinator

Brian Neale, Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator for Hartlepool

Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

Cleveland Police Representatives: Chief Inspector Phil Veitch, Inspector Glen Ward,

Sergeant Dave Galloway, PC Dave Myers and

PCSO Ian Gray

Fire Brigade Representative: Stuart Simpson

Housing Hartlepool Representative: Andy Elvidge (Tenancy Enforcement Officer)

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Mick Johnson, Alison Lilley and Arthur Preece and Resident Representative Michael Ward.

33. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2008 were agreed.

34. MATTERS ARISING

"Matters arising – problem with off road bikes" – Councillor Lilley asked if there had been any further action on this. The Neighbourhood Manager advised that the group involved had not met since December 2007. Any further information would be reported directly to the Forum.

"What is problem solving? – Would it be possible to have a Ward by Ward breakdown of crime statistics?" – Councillor Lilley indicated he had requested anti-social behaviour statistics rather than crime. The Chief Inspector said these were now available within the documentation for this meeting.

Ongoing problem with an off-road motorbike – Resident Representative Ann Butterfield was advised to give the details to the police officers present.

35. UPDATE FROM THE POLICE / PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Chief Inspector Phil Veitch gave a brief presentation on crime figures for the South area between April 2007 and March 2008. These showed that the total amount of recorded crime had decreased by 3.8% over the last 12 months while the total detection rate had increased by 5.4%. In terms of individual types of crime all had decreased apart from vehicle crime (up 3.5%), other theft (up

15%) and drugs (up 17.6%). However the Chief Inspector qualified this by explaining that these increases were fairly small and in the case of drugs this increase was as a result of increased detection and seizures.

Details were also given of the performance by the neighbourhood police teams over the last 12 months, primary actions being taken by police and other items of interest. Crime prevention advice was also given to help protect property and cars.

The Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator for Hartlepool then gave a brief update on the current status of Ringmaster. This was a computer package which sent out advisory messages (via e-mail, sms, text and telephone call) to its members. Organisers were hoping to have 10 thousand Hartlepool members by the end of 2008. Those present were urged to give their support to this initiative. Councillor Steve Gibbon reported that he had been very impressed during his visit to the Ringmaster office was would be happy to promote the service.

The following issues were then raised

Resident Representative Ann Butterfield – A few weeks ago my neighbour was burgled but there was nothing on Ringmaster. It would have been nice to know what was happening – The Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator for Hartlepool indicated that that care was being taken not to increase the public fear of crime.

Councillor Geoff Lilley – The Ringmaster 12 days of Christmas campaign was seen as a nuisance call and I received a number of complaints. Also we recently ran out of information packs during a Ringmaster promotional event.

Resident Representative Iris Ryder – I was told that you cannot sign up to Ringmaster without disclosing your date of birth. Why? – The Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator for Hartlepool reported that applicants could put as much information as they wanted to on the form. Date of birth information was used to analyse the age range of those involved and formulate effective ways of getting the message across. However failing to disclose this information did not prohibit anyone from taking part.

Councillor Ann Marshall - Could we have additional contact details for neighbourhood police officers? Inspector Ward advised that Cleveland Police were considering republishing business-type cards containing information. The Chief Inspector acknowledged that leaflets had been beneficial in the past but there were cost implications. Councillor Marshall suggested that tear off cards could be provided within Hartbeat magazine.

Councillor Geoff Lilley – Could CCTV be used to catch scrap metal thieves when they try to sell it on to dealers? – Inspector Ward acknowledged that this was a good idea but businesses would need to agree to the provision of CCTV on their premises before it could be done.

Councillor Marjorie James - Could statistical breakdowns of violent crime be supplied periodically to show the number of domestic violence incidents? Concerned that victims are not being supported. - The Chief Inspector advised that domestic violence was a Police priority with dedicated teams and trained officers on hand. Councillor James expressed concerns that should the profile of this issue fall refuge funding could be reduced. However The Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator for Hartlepool commented that funding had already

been allocated to this area and emphasis would not be lost.

Councillor Bob Flintoff - Which are the appropriate police telephone numbers to contact? There are three contact for the Jutland numbers Road residents - The Chief Inspector advised that 999 should be used in the case of emergency and the neighbourhood policing numbers for the forwarding on of community information. The Ladgate Lane number was best to use to report an incident or crime, unless it was an emergency situation such as a crime in progress. Calls made to this number deployed the would be to most appropriate department via the switchboard.

Resident Dorothy Clark – High number of lead thefts in Greatham. Are the statistics included as part of Hartlepool or separated? These figures were included as part of Hartlepool but individual wards were analysed for trends.

Councillor Steve Gibbon – Could we have an update on the refurbishment of Hartlepool's police cells? Initially completion had been scheduled for October/November 08. Now had been brought forward to August/September 08.

Resident Representative Iris Ryder – Why were home owners advised to avoid stone or gravel drives? – This was generic advice designed to avoid items being used as missiles. However Councillor Marjorie James highlighted that drives of this type could help to alleviate flooding problems.

Councillor Mike Turner – Do officers give consideration to the issue of secured loads on lorries or vans? – The Chief Inspector indicated that they did have a pro-active department looking at issues of this kind.

The Chair thanked the Chief Inspector, Officers and the Crime and Disorder Coordinator for Hartlepool for attending the meeting and answering questions

36. UPDATE FROM THE FIRE SERVICE

Cleveland Fire Brigade representative Stuart Simpson gave a brief update on recent performance by the fire brigade. In the South area there had been a decrease in all categories of fire over the past 3 months, despite there being an increase in the district figures. There would be a number of initiatives taking place in the coming weeks, including "Play with a football not a fire", aimed at young people and "Operation Eggshell", a home fire safety and arson initiative. Members were also advised that fire brigade officers had recently undertaken a visit to the Cerebos site accompanied by Council enforcement officers. As a result of this the site owners had been given 4 weeks to clear the site up.

The following issues were then raised.

Resident – Are sealed glass jars classed as explosives? – This depended on what was contained within them. Fizzy drink cans were projectiles when dropped into fire.

Councillor Geoff Lilley – Could we have an update on the Bonne Bouche fire? – The details were not confirmed as yet but it was being dealt with.

The Chair thanked the Fire Brigade representative for attending the meeting and answering questions.

37. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR PERSPECTIVE

The Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator and a Housing Hartlepool Representative gave a brief presentation on the issue of working in partnership to tackle anti-social behaviour. Detailed statistical information was provided showing the number of anti-social behaviour cases in Hartlepool between January 08 and March 08. This was broken down between individual wards and category of cases. Further figures showed the amount of cases dealt with by the anti-social behaviour unit and by Housing Hartlepool.

Details were also given of a range of initiatives being carried out by the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit including Antisocial Behaviour Awareness Dav. a new Anti-social behaviour Action Plan and a Good Tenant Scheme. The latter would have three levels of membership and would speed moves through prereferencing. Over the coming year officers would be exploring options for colocation, developing a parenting Protocol and improving links with schools to ensure early intervention.

The Housing Hartlepool representative reported the results of their recent Audit Commission Inspection. Housing Hartlepool had been awarded 2 stars with promising prospects for improvement. Their anti-social behaviour service was seen as a particular strength, specifically their response to domestic violence, partnership working and prevention and Details were also given of recent activity over the part 3 months including the drafting of a statement of anti-social behaviour policy, the development of Good Neighbourhood Agreements, the securing of funding for a Drug and Alcohol Worker and plans to extend furnished tenancies.

The following issues were then raised

Councillor Mike Turner – Does antisocial behaviour increase at certain times of the year? – There tended to be fewer ant-social incidents during the Winter months. It started to build up around Easter holiday time although Summer was usually relatively quiet due to people taking holidays.

Councillor Geoff Lilley – Are all antisocial behaviour incidents which are reported to the police then passed on to the Anti-Social behaviour unit? – Not necessarily. Certain incidents did not fall within their remit. Following further queries the Anti-Social Behaviour coordinator advised that research officers were able to access both the Council and police records in order to gain an accurate picture of incidents.

Councillor Marjorie James referred to Housing Hartlepool's active role within the Financial Inclusion Partnership, specifically their recent decision to give anti-social families in rent arrears space to pull themselves together without immediate eviction.

Resident Representative Ann Butterfield – A cottage at Owton Manor has recently been vandalised and is covered in green paint – The Chief Inspector advised that the incident had been reported that morning.

The Chair thanked the Anti-Social Behaviour Co-ordinator and representative of Housing Hartlepool for attending the meeting and answering questions.

38. NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES / ANY ISSUES TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS AND RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Councillor Mike Turner – During the Easter holidays graffiti had been put on Seaton Carew fences. There had also been an incident on Warrior Park in the summer holidays. Where there

any increases in police patrols during the school holidays? – Inspector Ward advised that shift patterns were changed as a matter of course, specifically so there was a full complement of officers available on Fridays. However he highlighted the responsibilities of parents to ensure their children where not causing trouble. Police offered a number of activities for children during the holidays but they could not be forced to attend.

Councillor Geoff Lilley – There are still problems at the back of Fens shops. What progress is being made? - The Neighbourhood Manager and police officers present advised that there had been no great increase in incidents recently. Evidence was needed from residents before further action could be taken but despite officers' best efforts none had come forward so far. Councillor Gibbon reported that residents were reluctant to come forward on this issue but he would urge them to do so. Moving the stairwell would also help.

A resident referred to the practice of recording the name and address of those present, saying it would be easy for someone to give a false name. He also questioned the number of bags in the room, none of which had been checked for explosive devices.

39. ANY OTHER BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

None.

Councillor Marjorie James praised the Vice-Chair for her chairing of the meeting.

MARY GREEN

CHAIR

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: Affordable Housing Development Plan Document-

Issues and Options Discussion Paper Consultation

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform the Forum of the consultation arrangements for the Issues and Options discussion paper, comprising the first stage in the preparation of the Hartlepool Affordable Housing Development Plan Document.

2. BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Issues and Options paper represents the first stage in the production of the Affordable Housing Development Plan Document, one document within the suite of documents that make up the Local Development Framework.
- 2.2 The paper aims to address the issue of affordable housing provision in Hartlepool. It sets out for comment a range of issues concerned with the provision of affordable housing and suggests possible policy options to address them. The outcome of this consultation will provide a policy framework to secure affordable housing on new developments in Hartlepool. The main purpose of the Issues and Options paper is to stimulate debate and seek the views of the community and other stakeholders on how what size developments affordable housing should be provided and what type of affordable housing is required in Hartlepool.

3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 3.1 Public consultation is currently being carried out on the Issues and Options Discussions paper and this will allow communities, organisations and businesses to have their say on what options should be used in the Hartlepool to deal with affordable housing issues. The consultation will allow any further issues to be identified, and for options to be put forward for consideration on how to deal with such further issues.
- The consultation began on 31st March 2008 and will last for three months until June 30th 2008. The Issues and Options discussion paper its accompanying sustainability appraisal and a questionnaire are available from the Civic Centre, Central Library and branch libraries throughout Hartlepool and from Bryan Hanson House.

The Central Library will also have display boards during the consultation period and drop-in sessions have taken place throughout April and May. Further drop-in sessions will be arranged in Middleton Grange shopping centre within June. Officers are also available to speak to any community groups or interested parties on request.

- 3.3 There are various ways to submit comments. Either complete a questionnaire and return it to Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square Hartlepool TS24 7BT the questionnaires are available at Bryan Hanson House, the Civic Centre and the libraries, or can be requested by phoning 01429 523532 or emailing planningpolicy@hartlepool.gov.uk. The questionnaire can be completed on our online consultation website at http://planningpolicy.hartlepool.gov.uk. Users will need to register when visiting the site, and will then be kept informed by email of consultations on later stages of the Core Strategy and other planning documents that are being produced. Comments can also be sent by letter to the Planning Policy Team at Bryan Hanson House or by email to planningpolicy@hartlepool.gov.uk.
- Planning officers are available to discuss the issues throughout the consultation period and are happy to give a detailed presentation to any groups that would like to know more about the document and the new planning system. All opinions are extremely important to us and this discussion paper provides a valuable opportunity to help shape the future of affordable housing provision the town.

4 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 That the report be noted and that interested parties be encouraged view the document or attend the drop in sessions and make formal representations on the Issues and Options report.



HARTLEPOOL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

HARTLEPOOL AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

ISSUES AND OPTIONS DISCUSSION PAPER

March 2008

Hartlepool Borough Council
Affordable Housing Development Plan Document
Issues and Options Discussion Paper
March 2008

The Issues and Options Discussion Paper

This discussion paper represents the start of the process for determining how affordable housing will be delivered in Hartlepool in the future. It is important for you to get involved at this time to help shape the delivery of affordable housing in Hartlepool. This paper sets out a number of key is sues and suggests possible options for addressing these. To assist in the consultation process, these suggested options are assessed in terms of their possible economic, social and environmental impacts in a separate document (Initial Sustainability Appraisal).

There may be other issues and also alternative options, which you feel, should be considered. The purpose of this paper is to stimulate debate- not provide the answers.

The Consultation Process

This Affordable Housing Issues and Options Discussion Paper and accompanying Initial Sustainability Appraisal will be widely available for a period of three months until the end of June 2008. They will be available for inspection at Bryan Hanson House, the Civic Centre and the town's libraries. Anumber of copies will be available for borrowing at the Central Library. The documents are also available for downloading at the Council's website http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk or on the online consultation site at http://planningpolicy.hartlepool.gov.uk.

Officers from the Planning Policy team are available at Bryan Hanson House during normal office hours to expand on anything included in this paper and/or to discuss any other matters relating to the preparation of the Affordable Housing Development Plan Document. Officers can also visit you at home if you are unable to get to Bryan Hanson House. If you are a member of a group of residents of businesses and would like an officer to attend one of your meetings, please contact the planning policyteam on 01429 523539 or e-mail planningpolicy@hartlepool.gov.uk.

How to Comment

There are a number of ways, which you may make your views known:

 You can complete a questionnaire and return it to Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool TS24 7BT- the questionnaires are available from Bryan Hanson House, the Civic Centre and the libraries or can be

- requested by phoning 01429 523539 or emailing planningpolicy@hartlepool.gov.uk.
- You can complete the questionnaire on our online consultation website at http://planningpolicy.hartlepool.gov.uk. You will need to register when you visit the site, and you will be kept informed by email of consultations on later stages of the Affordable Housing Development Plan Document and other planning documents that are being produced.
- You can also send your comments by letter to the Planning Policy Team or by email to planningpolicy@hartlepool.gov.uk

All comments and questionnaires should be received by Monday June 30th 2008.

Introduction

The purpose of this Development Plan Document (DPD) is to provide clarity and detail about the amount and type of affordable housing provision that will be required on new housing developments in Hartlepool. Once adopted by the Council this DPD will carry considerable weight when making decisions on planning applications. The strategic aim of this document is to address the recently identified shortfall of affordable housing provision in the borough.

The Hartlepool Local Plan adopted in April 2006 has as its overall aim 'to continue to regenerate Hartlepool securing a better future for its people by seeking to meet economic, environmental and social needs in a sustainable manner. Specific objectives related to housing are

- To encourage the provision of high quality housing, and
- To ensure that there is throughout the plan period an adequate supply of suitable housing land which is capable of offering a range of house types to meet all needs.

However, housing studies carried out during the preparation of the plan highlighted at that time, the absence of unmet demand for affordable housing provision. As a result, the issue of affordable housing is not addressed within the Local Plan policies. Indeed although land was set aside for social housing provision in 1997 through the S106 agreement relating to the development of the major housing site at Middle Warren, it was many years before this was taken up.

Evidence collected through the recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Hartlepool (June 2007) has identified a significantshortfall of affordable units per annum, an issue exacerbated by the Right to Buy scheme. increased household formation, increased in-migration, stock reduction through housing market renewal and stock condition in Hartlepool. The issue of affordable housing has also been addressed through a recentscrutiny investigation, highlighting affordable housing provision as a key political priority in Hartlepool. The investigation focuses on the availability of good quality affordable rented social accommodation and recommended within the final report that through the Local Development Framework system planning policy should be updated to require the provision of affordable units on residential developments. This development plan document on affordable housing is therefore a response to the rapidly changing nature of the Hartlepool housing market and is intended to address increased problems with affordability of housing revealed in this latest assessment of housing need ensuring that the provision of affordable housing meets the needs of both current and future occupiers.

As part of the new Local Development Framework (LDF) the Council is currently preparing a Core Strategy, which will set out the spatial vision, spatial objectives and core strategic policies for Hartlepool. An Issues and Options Discussion

paper for the Core Strategy was published for consultation in October 2007. This paper highlights the need for affordable housing in Hartlepool to provide sustainable mixed communities. The suggested objectives in the paper that are relevant to this affordable housing DPD are

- To Improve the choice, quality and affordability of housing
- To strengthen social cohesion and reduce inequalities by protecting and encouraging access to local facilities.

The provision of affordable housing to help meet the needs of local people is a priority. Achieving these aims will contribute towards a balanced housing market in the Borough and maximise housing choices to develop sustainable mixed communities. The Affordable Housing DPD will be a key document within the Hartlepool LDF portfolio and will provide detailed advice and policy guidance on affordable housing provision initially in line with the overall aim and housing objectives of the Hartlepool Local Plan and in due course in accordance with the strategic objectives and policies of the Core Strategy.

Defining Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is housing designed for those whose income generally deny them opportunity to purchase houses on the open market as a result of the difference between income and the market cost of housing. The difference between the terms 'affordability' which is a measure of what housing is affordable to certain groups of households and 'affordable housing' which is a particular product outside the housing market is acknowledged. Affordable Housing includes both social rented and intermediate housing provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market, with the purpose of:

- Meeting the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local income and local house prices; and
- Including the provision of the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or, if these restrictions are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative housing provision.

The definition of social rented and intermediate housing will follow those set out in PPS3 as follows:

Social rented housing is:

'Rented housing owned and managed by local authorities and registered social landlords, for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. The proposals set out in the Three Year Review of Rent Restructuring (July 2004) were implemented as policy in April 2006. It may also include rented housing owned or managed by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Housing Corporation as a condition of grant.'

Intermediate affordable housing is:

'Housing at prices and rents above those of social rent, but below market price or rents, and which meet the criteria set out above. These can include shared equity products (e.g. HomeBuy), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent.' These definitions replace guidance given in *Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing (PPG3)* and *DETR Circular 6/98 Planning and Affordab le Housing*. The definition does not exclude homes provided by private sector bodies or provided without grant funding. Where such homes meet the definition above, they may be considered, for planning purposes, as affordable housing. Whereas, those homes that do not meet the definition, for example, 'low cost market' housing, may not be considered, for planning purposes, as affordable housing.

Delivering Affordable Housing

Traditionally affordable housing was delivered through the Local Authority or more recently Registered Social Landlords (RSL's) and funded through government grants. This is still occurring through the Housing Corporation and the National Affordable Homes Programme. Viable and deliverable affordable housing schemes must be submitted in order to bid for this funding and housing associations must participate in joint working in a partnering process. The constraints within this method of affordable housing delivery are driven by the cap on rents stipulated by the Housing Corporation as a requirement of the funding, land value therefore must be low to secure scheme viability. In addition to this supply of new affordable accommodation there is a growing demand for affordable accommodation to be delivered through the private sector on new housing developments, contributing to the delivery of sustainable mixed communities.

Policy Context

This DPD takes account of various Planning and Housing policy guidance, nationally, regionally and sub-regionally. It reflects the overall central government agenda to provide more affordable homes and to achieve sustainable mixed communities.

Housing Green Paper: 'Homes for the future, more affordable, more sustainable': This green paper sets out the Government's commitment to deliver affordable housing, highlighting a £8 billion Government investment in affordable homes and the aim of providing 70,000 affordable homes a year by 2010-11. Local Authorities' role in facilitating the supply of affordable housing is emphasised and a joined-up approach with alignment of housing plans and the planning framework suggested as a means of increasing affordable housing provision. The need is emphasised, for local authorities to identify enough land to deliver the homes required in their area over the next 15 years by rapidly implementing new planning policy for housing and undergoing an intensive assessment of housing land availability. (The suggested Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is currently being prepared by Hartlepool Borough Council as part of the evidence base for the various documents to be included in the Local Development Framework).

Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3, Housing: PPS3 Housing was published in December 2006 and has been developed in response to The Barker Review of Housing Supply in March 2004. It sets out the Governments vision, objectives and policies in relation to housing provision and delivery. The principle aim of PPS3 is to increase housing delivery through a more responsive approach to local land supply, supporting the government's goal to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. The requirement for a Strategic Housing Market As sessment is emphasised within this PPS, the findings of which should help develop policies on affordable housing within the Borough. (Hartlepool completed its SHMA in June 2007). Local Authorities are required to set an overall target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided and that target should reflect the new definition of affordable housing (see above), they are also required to ensure that provision of affordable housing meets the needs of both current and future occupiers by setting separate targets for social-rented and intermediate affordable housing, specifying the size and type of affordable housing and setting out a range of circumstances in which affordable housing would be required. This Affordable Housing DPD aims to set clear guidance in response to these requirements.

Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East (February 2008 consultation) The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the North East acknowledges the significant inequalities in demand and affordability in the Region's housing stock and that it is not meeting the housing needs of people on modest or low incomes. The RSS states that 'it will be for LDF's to determine the actual target for affordable housing provision and the range of housing requirements through up-to-date housing assessments, however, low level thresholds should be set to determine the size of developments above which affordable housing should be provided'. Although Hartlepool's affordable housing need is not specified within the RSS the up-to-date SHMA provides the appropriate robust evidence required to determine the affordable housing requirement in the Borough.

Regional Housing Strategy

The issue of affordable housing is addressed under strategic objective Two: to ensure the supply, type and mix of new housing for rent and for sale meets social and economic needs, provides choice and supports growth. This will reflect the diversity of urban and rural communities and the needs for affordable, family and executive housing.

Tees Valley Sub-Regional Housing Strategy

Affordability and an increase in homelessness is highlighted as a particular pressure within the Tees Valley and specifically within Urban Areas, this is due to the disparity between house prices and household income. The aim of the document is to provide advice for consumers whilst maintaining quality and

accessibility for all members of the community. It advises that all LDFs should include appropriate and specific affordable housing policies to address the affordable gap, these should be backed by section 106 agreements.

Hartlepool Community Strategy (Hartlepool's Ambition)

The provision of affordable housing will support Key Aim 6: Housing, within the community strategy and will help to ensure that there is access to good quality and affordable housing in sustainable neighbourhoods and communities where people want to live. This is one of the strategy's eight key aims for achieving its long-term vision for the Borough.

Housing Needs and Affordability in Hartlepool- The evidence base

David Cumberland Housing Regeneration Ltd was commissioned by Hartlepool Borough Council to undertake a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in December 2006. The completed assessment (June 2007) included a survey of all 39,271 households in Hartlepool, a 16.7% response rate allowed robust and defensible statistics for individual wards. An analysis of the current and future housing markets concluded that market demand was exceeding supply in most areas and that a degree of pressure in the current housing market was a result of considerable uplift in house prices across the Borough over the past five years. A shortfall of 393 affordable units a year was identified, this affordable need heightened by the limited capacity of the social rented sector with low vacancy rates and long waiting lists. This figure of 393 affordable units requirement is based on the evidence identified through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment process, it provides a clear indication of the extent of affordable housing need and identified a requirement for a affordable housing policy within the LDF, this discussion paper is the first stage in policy development however, other means of securing affordable housing provision are being pursued to breach the housing affordability gap.

On the basis of this evidence, the report suggested a target for affordable housing on new developments of 30% of which 80% should be social rented and 20% intermediate tenure. The PPS3 threshold of 15 dwellings or more on which such a requirement would apply was considered appropriate for Hartlepool. The report highlights that up to 2012 there are a number of significant supply side issues that will exacerbate the affordable housing situation, including, the lack of an affordable housing planning policy, the high number of extant planning permissions, significant number of planned demolitions (through HMR), continued Right-to-Buy activity and increasing house prices. The aim of this affordable housing DPD is to reduce this pressure by providing clear policy guidance for developers and providing the policy framework to secure affordable housing provision on housing sites.

Proposed DPD Objectives

The proposed objectives for this affordable housing DPD are as follows:

- 1. Provide good quality affordable accommodation to meet the need within the Borough.
- 2. Provide affordable dwellings that can help to deliver sustainable mixed communities

Key Issues and Possible Options

<u>Issue 1: When should Affordable Housing be Required?</u>

PPS3 indicates that development plan documents should set out a range of circumstances in which affordable housing would be required. It indicates that the national indicative minimum site threshold is 15 dwellings. It does however, allow local planning authorities to set lower minimum thresholds, where viable and practicable. PPS3 also allows local planning authorities, to set different proportions of affordable housing for different site-size thresholds across the plan area.

The SHMA suggests that the site threshold of 15 dwellings ormore could be appropriate for Hartlepool but the RSS encourages local authorities to be more ambitious if a clear affordable housing need is evident. Reducing the threshold would result in increased provision of affordable housing and would make a contribution to delivering more sustainable and inclusive communities, and in this respect would be in accordance with the advice in PPS3. As the viability of schemes must also be considered alongside other requirements on residential developments such as energy efficiency, design standards and developer contributions, the provision of affordable housing could still be negotiated on a site-by-site basis.

Due to the extent of the affordable housing problem in Hartlepool (393 dwellings per annum) and in the context of a high level of existing commitments for housing development, consideration should be given to a lower threshold for the provision of affordable housing. The SHMA states 'given the high level of housing need identified across the Borough, it is essential that the Council explore all opportunities to increase the supply of affordable homes'. Currently Hartlepool has limited availability of larger uncommitted housing sites (pending the completion in 2011 of the Housing Allocations DPD), therefore a lower threshold may be required to deliver affordable housing to meet the needs of local residents.

The proposed affordable housing policy will include a target for the proportion of housing on a site to be developed as affordable but the total number of affordable houses delivered will depend on the number of sites that come forward above the minimum site size threshold. The following options should be considered:

When should Affordable Housing be Required?

Option 1: Set the site threshold to 15 units or more in line with PPS3.

Option 2: All residential developments to contribute to the delivery of

affordable housing and no site threshold set.

Option 3: Reduce the thresholds for the provision of affordable housing in the areas highlighted as having the greatest need?

<u>Issue 2: How much Affordable Housing should be provided?</u>

The amount of affordable housing that would be sought as part of new housing developments is calculated as a percentage of the total number of units planned in the development. A higher percentage requirement will produce a higher number of on-site affordable units to meet the demonstrated need. The viability of housing schemes must also be considered. If it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional unforeseen costs associated with the development, that taken with the affordable housing requirement results in the scheme becoming unviable, the requirement may need to be reduced (this would be looked at on a site-by-site basis). The SHMA considered that a figure of 30% would be likely to produce sufficient affordable homes to contribute to the current demonstrated need of 393 affordable units per annum. However, the percentage of affordable housing provision may need to be varied depending on the site size to ensure greater affordable housing provision on larger sites.

Consideration should also be given to the current housing market renewal programme, which is moving forward with the first phases of clearance and redevelopment activity on several key housing sites in Central Hartlepool. On future sites loss of Housing Hartlepool stock would need to be replaced with a higher affordable requirement to retain overall stock numbers. The amount of affordable accommodation may need to differ on Housing Hartlepool and housing renewal sites to qualify for funding and to contribute to overall housing regeneration aims. The following options should be considered:

How much Affordable Housing should be provided?

Option 4: Set the affordable housing requirement to 30% on all sites in line with SHMA findings?

Option 5: Increase the percentage requirement of affordable housing to 40% across all eligible sites?

Option 6: Set a differing requirement depending on the number of units e.g.

1-2 units - financial contribution

2-15 units - 30% Affordable

15 or more units - 40% Affordable

Option 7: Negotiation based on the viability of schemes?

Issue 3: Where should the Affordable Housing be provided?

In line with the Government agenda of developing sustainable mixed communities, one way of achieving this is to integrate affordable housing provision into an overall scheme of market housing. However there may be circumstances where provision of affordable units on alternative sites or a financial contribution instead of providing affordable units, would be more appropriate for the development and more likely to develop sustainable mixed communities. The SHMA highlighted the wards within the Borough and their different affordable housing requirement. Areas such as Bum Valley, Grange and Seaton wards have a significantly higher affordable housing need. Should this difference in need be reflected within the policy?

Table 5.3 Overall annual shortfalls in affordable accommodation by sub-area, property size and designation

Ward	Genera	l Needs	Older Person	Total (gross)
	Smaller (1/2 Bed)	Larger		
Brus				
Burn Valley	33	24	3	60
Dyke House		4		4
Elwick	4	12		16
Fens	5	18	4	27
Foggy Furze		12	2	14
Grange	18	19	3	40
Greatham	7	7	2	16
Hart	7	26	3	36
Owton		9	2	11
Park		28	3	31
Rift House		15	6	21
Rossmere	1	15	12	28
Seaton	8	32		40
St. Hilda		13		13
Stranton	4	2	6	11
Throston	2	22		24
Gross Requirement	90	258	45	393
% distribution	22.9%	65.6%	11.5%	100%

(SHMA 2007)

However due to the limited number of uncommitted housing sites currently allocated within Hartlepool it may not be appropriate to allow off-site provision. Housing regeneration sites may also require a more detailed site-by-site analysis of where affordable housing should be required to ensure it contributes to the overall strategic housing market renewal aims and the delivery of sustainable mixed communities. The flexibility of the policy in terms of where affordable housing should be provided is a key issue within this DPD and could be addressed through the following options:

Where should the Affordable Housing be provided?

Option 8: All affordable provision to be provided on-site?

Option 9: Off-site provision to be allowed if it is demonstrated that off-site provision will make a better contribution towards achieving strategic housing objectives?

Option 10: Allow commuted sums for developments where it can be demonstrated that a scheme is unviable in terms of delivering on site affordable units?

Option 11: Allow off-site provision to be provided in an alternative area of greater affordable housing need?

Issue 4: What Type and Tenure of Affordable Housing should be provided? The recommendations within the SHMA suggest that a mix of social rented and intermediate tenure properties should be provided to meet the specific affordable housing need of local residents. The suggested requirements are 80% social rented and 20% intermediate tenure of the total amount of affordable units to be provided on-site. The first shared equity/ownership properties will soon be available in Hartlepool as part of the New Deal for Communities (NDC) housing regeneration scheme at Hart Lane. As knowledge about shared equity/shared ownership schemes develop across Hartlepool, there may be a greater demand for this type of affordable accommodation. It is currently untested in Hartlepool.

Agood balance of stock is also required. The SHMA found that across Hartlepool, the demand for bungalows exceeds supplyand there is strongest demand for two and three bedroom properties. The affordable housing policy may need to reflect this requirement by specifying a particular affordable housing type.

What Type and Tenure of Affordable Housing should be provided?

Option 12: 80% Social Rented and 20% intermediate tenure on each site, in line with SHMA findings?

Option 13: An 80/20% tenure split across all housing developments with the split on each individual site being negotiated having regard to the mix of tenures nearby?

Option 14: Amore even split of social rented and intermediate tenure properties?

Option 15: Should housing types be specified within the policy e.g. family homes/bungalows etc?

<u>Issue 5: How should the Affordable Units be Managed and Sustained in the Future?</u>

Traditionally affordable housing has been provided through the Council until the Council house stock was transferred to Housing Hartlepool in 2004, more recently affordable accommodation has been provided through Registered Social Landlords and retained as affordable housing in perpetuity. Schemes such as Right to Buy have reduced the amount of affordable housing stock therefore it is important to consider what measures can be put in place to retain affordable accommodation whilst it is needed in Hartlepool. Before the Council will grant planning permission for schemes including an element of affordable housing it will be necessary to ensure that the housing will be properly managed, retained as affordable units in perpetuity (whilst there is a demonstrated affordable housing need) and given to those with genuine affordable housing need. If affordable units could be then sold on the open market their affordability would not be secured and long-term solutions to the affordable housing problem would not be delivered. Due to RSL's legally binding Housing Corporation rules they must allocated accommodation to those people with genuine need and this must be retained as housing association stock. How to retain the affordable units provided through housing developments is a key area for discussion within this paper and could be achieved through the following options:

How should the Affordable Units be Managed and Sustained in the Future?

Option 16: Affordable units should be delivered in partnership with a registered social landlord (RSL) by means of a Section 106 agreement?

Option 17: Affordable units should be delivered in partnership with a registered social landlord (RSL) by means of a Section 106 agreement with right to buy for tenants removed?

Option 18: Affordable units to be delivered and managed by the developer and the Council by means of planning conditions setting out occupancy criteria and criteria to retain the units in perpetuity?

Conclusion

This Issues and Options paper sets out suggestions for how affordable housing could be delivered in Hartlepool through the planning system. Two objectives for the delivery of affordable housing and to contribute to achieving the Core Strategy vision have also been suggested.

- 1. Provide good quality affordable accommodation to meet the need within the Borough.
- 2. Provide affordable dwellings that can help to deliver sustainable mixed communities

The main part of this paper sets out a number of strategic issues which should be addressed to help achieve increased provision of affordable housing, and some options for tackling them. Please consider the options in relation to the following questions:

Question 1: Are these the right objectives for the delivery of affordable homes in Hartlepool?

Question 2: Are there any other issues, not discussed above, that relate to the provision of affordable housing in Hartlepool?

Question 3: Are there any alternative options to address the issues discussed above?

Question 4: Are there any other comments you would like to make?

The Next Stages in the Preparation the Affordable Housing DPD

The Council will consider the comments put forward during the current consultation and these comments and the Council's response to them will be made publicly available.

Then, taking account of the comments and any new issues or options raised, and in the context of a further sustainability appraisal report, the Council will determine its preferred options for the future development of the Borough. The Council will publish, at the end of July 2008 a document setting out its preferred options. This document will also set out the different options considered during the preparation process and how and why the preferred options were arrived at.

The consultation to be carried out on the Preferred Options Report will present the last opportunity for you to influence the content of the Affordable Housing DPD before a finalised document is submitted for public examination on its soundness.

Report: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: MINOR WORKS BUDGET 2008/2009

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To report to the Forum details of the Minor Works Budget allocation for 2008/2009 and the Forum's role with regard to the proposal and approval of schemes.

2. OUTLINE OF CONTENTS

- 2.1 In 2007/2008 the Forum was responsible for recommending and undertaking Minor Works for the general improvement of the South Area from a budget allocated by the Council.
- 2.2 The remit of the Forum for 2008/2009 will be to request approval for proposed Minor Works schemes from the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder. If approval is given, then these works will be progressed in the normal way.
- 2.3 The Forum has been delegated £52,000 for this financial year, 2008/2009, as a Minor Works Budget. As was the case in 2007/2008, an additional allocation of £20,000 has been made from Highways Budgets (£10,000 from the Local Transport Plan and £10,000 from the Highways Maintenance Budget). This money will address specific highways issues raised by the Forum in the South Area.
- 2.4 Further to this, an additional £15,000 has again been allocated to the Forum to address the common issue of the conversion of grass verges to hard standing, where the Forum considers this appropriate.
- 2.5 The framework, when considering proposed schemes, will continue as in previous years, as follows:
 - (i) Outline schemes to be proposed by Members, Residents, Residents' Representatives or Officers:
 - (ii) The Chair and Vice Chair of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forum will assess the proposal and where appropriate, instruct Officers to cost the works and report to the Forum;
 - (iii) Reports to the Forum will include estimated costs, alternative options where appropriate, residents' views and any other related information.

1

(iv) Minor Works Schemes are likely to include any works of improvement to the area which benefit the community or a number of individual residents and enhance the quality of life in the neighbourhood. Individual repairs and improvements would not normally be funded from this budget but would be referred to other departmental budgets.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The Forum is asked to note that:
 - (i) The Forum will submit recommendations regarding Minor Works proposals to the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities for final decision.
 - (ii) £52,000 is available for general Minor Works schemes.
 - (iii) £20,000 is available for highway related schemes.
 - (iv) A further £15,000 has been allocated to specifically address the issues concerning grass verge re-instatement.

Report of: Neighbourhood Manager (South)

Subject: MINOR WORKS PROPOSALS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To consider improvement schemes for potential funding from the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum Minor Works Budget.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Minor Works Budget available for the financial year to 31st March 2009 amounts to £87,000.
- 2.2 A number of schemes are detailed below to address concerns raised by Elected Members, Resident's Representatives and Residents of the South Forum Area.

3. PROPOSALS

3.1 Verge Re-instatement with Bitmac.

The following verges have been selected for re-instatement as a result of damage caused to the verges by cars parking on them. Replacing the grass verges with tarmac hard-standing will improve the aesthetics of the area while helping with parking congestion.

(i) Rossmere

Dundee Road	£4,100	(Appendix A)
Callander Road	£1,150	(Appendix B)

(ii) Fens

Inverness Road £1,150 (appendix C)

1

(iii) Greatham

Path near Hill View £6,3	320 (Appendix D)
--------------------------	------------------

(iv) Seaton

Darahy Craye	CO 450	/ / no no no no alibre [5]
Danby Grove	£2,150	(Appendix E)

(v) Owton

Wynyard Road	£1,450	(Appendix F)
Lanark Road	£5,400	(Appendix G)
Elgin Road	£4,600	(Appendix H)
Fordyce Road	£1,330	(Appendix I)
Monkton Road	£3,000	(Appendix J)
Maxwell Road	£4,100	(Appendix K)
Loch Grove	£2,450	(Appendix L)
Lindsay Road	£1,550	(Appendix M)

Total cost of above schemes £38,750

Contribution from Housing Hartlepool £10,000

Cost to Forum £28,750

3.2 Retford Grove Shrub replacement (Appendix N)

A gradual degeneration in the quality of the flowerbed in Retford Grove has led to a proposal to renovate the flowerbed by planting evergreen shrubs. The price includes:

- Removal of the existing plants
- Cultivating the area
- adding top soil
- application of tree and shrub planting compost
- laying of plant through geotextile plant membrane
- Supply and planting with evergreen low growing shrubs such as Hebe "Champagne" with and edging of Lavandula "Munstead" and two Phormium tenax "Variegata" as specimen "dot" plants

Total Cost to Forum

£1,225

3.3 Dropped Crossing Allocation

This scheme will continue to contribute to the programme of dropped crossing installation in the South Area. Anyone with specific locations, which may benefit from this programme, is requested to forward these to the Highways Section for consideration for the 2008/2009 batch of works.

Total Cost to Forum

£3,500

4 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 The Forum is asked to consider the above scheme. Approved schemes will need to be presented to the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio for final approval.



























