

# REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO

## DECISION SCHEDULE



**Friday, 29 August 2008**

**at 10.00 am**

**in Committee Room A**

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond responsible for Regeneration and Liveability will consider the following items.

**1. KEY DECISIONS**

None

**2. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**

- 2.1 Invitation to Speak at Conference in Germany – *Head of Emergency Planning*
- 2.2 Proposed Extension to Headland Conservation Area Boundary - *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*
- 2.3 Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan 2008/09 – Quarter 1 Monitoring Report - *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*

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

None

**REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO**  
Report to Portfolio Holder  
29 August 2008



**Report of:** Head of Emergency Planning

**Subject:** INVITATION TO SPEAK AT CONFERENCE IN GERMANY

---

**SUMMARY**

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To report that the Head of Emergency Planning has been invited to attend the 4<sup>th</sup> European Congress on Disaster Management in Bonn as a speaker.

**2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

Background to the request for the Head of Emergency Planning to attend the conference in relation to training and exercising is outlined.

**3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

Emergency Planning is under the remit of the Portfolio Holder.

**4. TYPE OF DECISION**

Non key

**5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holder only

**6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

That the Head of Emergency Planning attendance at this conference be noted.

**Report of:** Head of Emergency Planning

**Subject:** INVITATION TO SPEAK AT CONFERENCE IN GERMANY

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To report that the Head of Emergency Planning has been invited to attend the 4<sup>th</sup> European Congress on Disaster Management in Bonn as a speaker.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 This conference has been held annually for the past 3 years and in 2008 is being held in Bonn, Germany on the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> October. In 2007 it attracted 1147 delegates from across Europe.
- 2.2 The conference is organised by the German Federal Office for Civil Protection and Disaster Assistance; the German Federal Technical Relief Agency and the newspaper Behörden Spiegel.
- 2.3 The main topic will be “Disaster Management in Europe: Information – Coordination – Operation” and the Head of Emergency Planning has been asked to give a 20-30 minute presentation and be part of a panel to consider the ‘capabilities of training and exercising’. Other panel members will be the Chief of the Czech Army Disaster Management Service; the Head of Civil Protection, Bern, Germany; Commander of the Protection School of the Bundeswehr, Germany and the Head of the Mannheim Fire Department, Germany.
- 2.4 Training and exercising is the topic that the Head of Emergency Planning has spoken on at six conferences across the UK following the awarding of Beacon status to the council for emergency planning.
- 2.5 There is only one other speaker from the UK at the conference who is a Chief Fire Officer speaking on European Fire Fighting Cooperation.
- 2.6 It is understood that the invitation has arisen following a member of the organising committee hearing the Head of Emergency Planning deliver a presentation at a conference earlier this year.
- 2.7 This is a prestigious conference that attracts delegates from Ministries, the European Commission, Disaster Management and Emergency Planning authorities and Industry from across Europe and beyond.

- 2.8 This invitation will also be reported to the Emergency Planning Joint Committee.

### **3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 Indications are that travel and hotel accommodation costs will be met by the organisers, with only some ancillary costs being met locally. These would be met from the training budget of the Emergency Planning Unit.

### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 That the Head of Emergency Planning attendance at this conference be noted.

### **5. CONTACT OFFICER**

Denis Hampson, Head of Emergency Planning  
[Denis.hampson@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:Denis.hampson@hartlepool.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01642 221121

**REGENERATION & LIVEABILITYPORTFOLIO  
REPORT TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER  
29 August 2008**



**Report of:** Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

**Subject: PROPOSED EXTENSION TO HEADLAND  
CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY**

---

**SUMMARY**

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 In 2007 an appraisal of the Headland Conservation Area was carried out. The report concluded with a number of suggestions to consider in the future. One suggestion was to extend the boundary of the conservation area to include the Heugh Breakwater, this report will consider this proposal.

**2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

2.1 The report outlines the background to the proposed extension of the conservation area and the comments that have been received from interested parties.

**3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

3.1 Conservation policy falls within the Portfolio.

**4. TYPE OF DECISION**

4.1 Non-key.

**5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

5.1 Portfolio Holder.

**6. DECISION (S) REQUIRED**

- 6.1 That the Portfolio Holder notes the consultation responses provided in the report and approves the extension of the boundary of the Headland Conservation Area to include the Heugh Breakwater.

**Report of:** Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

**Subject:** PROPOSED EXTENSION TO HEADLAND  
CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY

---

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 An appraisal of the Headland Conservation Area was carried out in 2007. The report concluded by providing a number of suggestions to consider in the future. This report will consider the proposal to extend the boundary of the conservation area to include the Heugh Breakwater.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 states that local planning authorities shall ‘determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.’ Once areas are designated it is then the ‘duty of a local planning authority from time to time to review the past exercise of functions under this section and to determine whether any parts or any further parts of their area should be designated as conservation areas; and, if they so determine, they shall designate those parts accordingly.’ The starting point in reviewing an existing conservation area is to carry out an appraisal.
- 2.2 Appraisals are a means of assessing the key factors contributing to the appearance and character of existing and potential conservation areas, local authorities are encouraged to undertake periodically conservation area appraisals. There is no formal requirement for the form and content of appraisals, or the methodology to be used, but typically appraisals cover such subjects as historical development of the area, archaeological significance, prevalent building materials, the character of open spaces, the quality and relationships of buildings and also of trees.
- 2.3 Consultants Scott Wilson (formerly Ferguson McIlveen) were commissioned to carry out the appraisal of the conservation area. Their work was informed by a steering group which comprised local groups, Ward Members and officers. The group guided the appraisal process and fed advice and local knowledge into the project.

- 2.4 The report resulted in an extensive document which summarised the character of the Headland Conservation Area. In addition the report concluded by providing a number of suggestions to be considered further. These were reported to the Portfolio Holder on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2007. One such suggestion was the alteration of the boundary of the area to include the Heugh Breakwater. At the meeting in November the Portfolio Holder agreed to further consultation regarding the extension to the boundary.

### **3. PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE BOUNDARY**

- 3.1 There are two issues to be considered when reviewing an extension to the Headland Conservation Area to include the Breakwater. The first is the historic development of the area. The Headland is almost entirely surrounded by the sea which has had an enormous impact on the area's development. In considering the impact of the coast and structures associated with it the development of this historic structure, built in 1870 as the beginning of a larger plan for a harbour of refuge which was never finished, is linked strongly to the development of the area.
- 3.2 Secondly the impact the breakwater has on the architectural character of the area. The structure influences the character of the coastline as a prominent man-made edifice which dominates views both in and out of the conservation area. Architecturally and functionally, the breakwater is an integral part of the sea front infrastructure, the rest of which lies within the conservation area boundary. Unlike the Old Pier, it was not included within the original boundary of the area.
- 3.3 Although conservation area status would not convey any statutory power to enforce a particular level of repair and maintenance of the structure, the appraisal report indicates that the Breakwater's inclusion would reinforce the importance of the structure to the character of the area.

### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 Public consultation regarding proposed extensions to the boundary of the conservation area was carried out as part of the appraisal process. Throughout the three rounds of public consultation there was public support for the proposed inclusion of the Heugh Breakwater in the Conservation Area. It was considered that the Breakwater is one of the main landmarks of the Headland. Attached in **Appendix 1** are details of the consultation feedback.
- 4.2 The Planning Committee were consulted regarding the proposed extension of the boundary at the meeting held on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> August. The Committee noted the report and no objections to the proposal were raised.



- 4.3 PD Ports as the local Port Authority have jurisdiction over the Breakwater. They have been consulted directly regarding the proposed extension to the boundary of the area. A copy of their response is attached in **Appendix 2**.
- 4.4 PD Ports acknowledge the historic significance of the breakwater in their letter noting that the breakwater was constructed 'as part of a much larger concept for a 19<sup>th</sup> century refuge harbour'. However they state that the structure is not relevant to the safe operation of the modern commercial port. Further to this they caution that an increase in costs for breakwater maintenance imposed on PD Ports operation of Hartlepool port would be passed onto port users. They request that if the designation proceeds, the Borough Council takes responsibility for any and all additional duties and costs that might arise from the proposed inclusion of the breakwater. The letter concludes by suggesting the future responsibility for the Heugh breakwater should be passed to the council and asks if this option can be considered.
- 4.5 In response to the issues raised by PD Ports the Neighbourhood Services Department with responsibilities for these matters have been consulted. The recently adopted Headland Strategy Study considered coast protection issues associated with this breakwater in some detail. The report concluded that the breakwater did have a coast protection function and that it protected the coastline of Middleton Beach, entrance to the Marine and potentially as far south as Newburn Bridge.
- 4.6 There have been discussions in the past regarding the possibility of the Borough Council taking over responsibility for the breakwater. However due to the need for ongoing maintenance of the structure and a lack of available funding sources to support this, the Borough Council chose not to proceed with this proposal any further.
- 4.7 PD Ports have been consulted further regarding the implications of the proposed extension. A verbal update will be provided at the meeting of any further comments that they may wish to provide.

## 5 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 The Breakwater is a prominent structure of an age, function and architectural character similar to those of the adjoining sea front infrastructure within the conservation area. It is noted by residents to play an important part in the character of the area. In addition surveys of the area as part of the appraisal process have shown the influence the structure has on the historic development of the area and its architectural character. As such there is a clear rationale in architectural and historic terms for its inclusion within the Conservation Area. The concerns of PD Ports are noted and acknowledged, but appear to stem largely from a concern about implications for future repair and maintenance. As noted above, any inclusion within the Conservation Area would not impose any additional direct statutory responsibility on the breakwater owners, but it would acknowledge the historic and architectural interest and the local views as expressed in the appraisal. I shall comment

further at the meeting in the light of any further information received from PD Ports.

- 5.2 If the Portfolio Holder agrees to the extension of the Conservation Area it will be necessary simply to publicise the decision within the London Gazette and local press.

## **6 RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 That the Portfolio Holder notes the consultation responses provided in the report and approves the extension of the boundary of the Headland Conservation Area to include the Heugh Breakwater.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### First round of consultation

58 residents attended the consultation event with 167 questionnaires returned.

Six people suggested the boundary of the conservation area was extended to include the breakwater.

### Second round of consultation

40 residents attended the consultation event with 36 questionnaires returned.

Twenty-one residents support the inclusion of the breakwater in the conservation area.

### Third round of consultation

51 residents attended the consultation event with 34 questionnaires returned.

30 residents supported the inclusion of the breakwater within the conservation area.

APPENDIX 2



17 - 27 Queen's Square  
Middlesbrough  
TS2 1AH  
Tel: +44 (0) 1642 877 200  
Fax: +44 (0) 1642 877 057  
www.pdports.co.uk

Our Ref: MTP/LB  
Your Ref:

04 August 2008

Ms Sarah Scarr  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Bryan Hanson House  
Hanson Square  
HARTLEPOOL  
TS24 7BT

Dear Ms Scarr

**Re: Heugh Breakwater**

I refer to your letter dated 19 June 2008 with enclosed Scott Wilson report which was addressed to our Group Chief Executive, however I have been asked to respond.

Your letter proposes the inclusion of the Heugh Breakwater site as part of an extended conservation area and refers to the Scott Wilson report. Only a short reference on pages 61/62 refers to this matter.

We at PD Ports do not have any record of having been consulted prior to the commissioning of this recent Scott Wilson work either about the remit or the substance of any facts being gathered. We do not recall having input to any consultations or being a member of the steering group (see page 2). Please confirm whether you have previously formally contacted PD Ports in relation to this matter.

Survey work undertaken by PD Ports in the 1970s showed that the 1855 breakwater is not relevant to the safe operation of the modern commercial port. The breakwater was only constructed as part of a much larger concept for a 19<sup>th</sup> century refuge harbour but the rest of the 19<sup>th</sup> century project was never implemented.

We note your comment that "the impact would be negligible as there would be no additional duties placed on" PD Teesport. Please also note we have never received financial help with regards costs related to the breakwater.

Hartlepool Borough Council need to recognise that any increase in costs for breakwater maintenance imposed on PD Ports operation of Hartlepool as a port would of necessity be passed onto port users, commercial, fishing and leisure users. The imposition of added costs on commercial port users could seriously endanger current local employment.

Registered in England No. 5083373 as PD Ports Limited.  
Registered Office: 17 - 27 Queen's Square, Middlesbrough TS2 1AH.

SL - D35

All business undertaken by the company is subject to the general conditions of business of the company, copies of which are available from the company on request.

We therefore request your written assurance that if the designation was to proceed, Hartlepool Borough Council will be responsible for any and all additional duties and costs that might arise from the proposed inclusion of the Heugh Breakwater into the Headland Conservation Area.

In the absence of this written assurance we protest most strongly that PD Ports does NOT wish that the breakwater be included.

From the consultation process I note "very few of the questionnaire responses (167 include 83 from people living within the existing conservation area) included suggestions for changes to the Conservation Area boundary". See page 5.

Additionally only 10 people (page 6) wished to see the Conservation Area extended to include the Breakwater.

On page 17 we note that only 167 questionnaires of 3,000 were returned and over half were residents from outside the current conservation area.

There is therefore very little real call for change.

Your letter states we have no right or form of appeal and therefore please ensure the Mayor, and all others responsible are made fully aware of our most strong objections to the re-designation of the conservation area to include the breakwater.

We would ideally like the future responsibility for the Heugh breakwater to be passed to Hartlepool Borough Council but recognise that a Harbour Revision Order (i.e. revised legal status) would be needed to achieve this goal. Will Hartlepool Borough Council please urgently consider this option?

Yours sincerely



Martyn T Pelew  
Group Development Director

**REGENERATION & LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holder

29 August 2008



**Report of:** Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

**Subject:** REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES  
DEPARTMENTAL PLAN 2008/09 – QUARTER 1  
MONITORING REPORT

---

**SUMMARY**

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To inform Portfolio Holder of the progress made against Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan 2008/09 in the first quarter of the year.

**2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

The report describes the progress against actions contained in the Departmental Plan and the first quarter outturn of key performance indicators.

**3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

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

**4.0 TYPE OF DECISION**

Non key.

**5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holder.

**6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

Progress against actions and indicators be noted.

**Report of:** Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

**Subject:** REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES  
DEPARTMENTAL PLAN 2008/09 – QUARTER 1  
MONITORING REPORT

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform the Portfolio Holder of the progress made against the key actions identified in the Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2008/09 and the progress of key performance indicators for the period up to 30 June 2008.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability has responsibility for the Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan which was agreed in May 2008.
- 2.2 The Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2008/09 sets out the key tasks and issues along with an Action Plan to show what is to be achieved by the department in the coming year.
- 2.3 The Council's new Covalent performance management database is used for collecting and analysing performance in relation to both the Corporate Plan and the five Departmental Plans.
- 2.4 Where appropriate more detailed service plans are also produced detailing how each individual section contributes to the key tasks and priorities contained within the Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan and ultimately those of the Corporate Plan. These plans are managed within the department.

## **3. FIRST QUARTER PERFORMANCE**

- 3.1 This section looks in detail at how Regeneration and Planning Services has performed in relation to the key actions and performance indicators that were included within the Departmental Plan for 2008/09.
- 3.2 On a quarterly basis, officers from across the department are asked, via the Covalent Performance Management database, to provide an



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

- 3.3 Officers are asked to provide a short commentary explaining progress made to date and asked to 'traffic light' each section based on whether or not the action will be, or has been, completed by the target date set out in the plans.
- 3.4 Within Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan, there are a total of 167 actions and 44 performance indicators assigned to this portfolio.
- 3.5 Of the actions with Quarter 1 target dates, only the action shown in Table 1 below has not been completed by the due date.

**Table 1 – Actions not completed on target/not on target**

Ref	Action	Milestone	Comment
CST A03-3	Prepare LAA Delivery and Improvement Plan for 2008/09	Jun 08	Draft agreed by Hartlepool Partnership in July, final version to determined by HBC Cabinet in August

- 3.6 In addition, the three further actions shown in Table 2 have also not been completed within the originally anticipated timescales. Whilst these actions are integral to the corporate plan outcome of 'reducing harm caused by illegal drugs and alcohol' they are however largely the responsibility of the Primary Care Trust and beyond the direct control of Council officers. Officers are liaising with the PCT to establish new revised dates by which the actions can expect to be completed and these dates will be reported verbally at the meeting.

**Table 2 – Actions awaiting new target dates**

Ref	Action	Milestone	Comment
CSP A08-1	Negotiate primary care pathway and process with Provider	Jun 08	Delay in PCT contract start and agreement of process. This is beyond the control of HBC staff.
CSP A08-2	Commission Pharmacist Services including needle exchange	May 08	PCT's across the Tees Valley are reviewing pharmacy contracts prior to commissioning local services. The original expected date for this action to take place has therefore not been achieved.
CSP A08-3	Increase testing and vaccination programmes including Resource Centre provision	Jun 08	Delay in PCT contract led to limited vaccination in Q1. Again this slower than expected progress has been outside the control of HBC staff.

3.7 At this early stage of the year there are no performance indicator issues to bring to the portfolio holder's attention.

**4. RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 That the progress against key actions in the first quarter of the year is noted.