

CABINET AGENDA



Monday, 13 October 2008

at 9.00 am

**in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: CABINET:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond

Councillors Hall, Hargreaves, Hill, Jackson, Payne, and Tumilty

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

To receive the Record of Decision in respect of the meeting held on 29 September 2008 (*previously circulated*)

4. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 Hartlepool Local Plan Saved Policies – *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*
- 4.2 Budget and Policy Framework 2009/2010–2011/12 – Initial Consultation Proposals – *Corporate Management Team*

5. KEY DECISIONS

- 5.1 Tees Valley Growth Point Status – Programme of Development – *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*
- 5.2 Primary Capital Programme – *Director of Children's Services*

6. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 6.1 Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) – *Director of Adult and Community Services*

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

No items

8. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- 8.1 Analysis of Best Value Performance Indicators 2007/2008 – *Assistant Chief Executive*

9. REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS

No items

CABINET REPORT

13 October 2008



Report of: DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES

Subject: HARTLEPOOL LOCAL PLAN SAVED POLICIES

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek agreement to the saving of specified policies of the Hartlepool Local Plan beyond April 2009.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report explains that the Hartlepool Local Plan was prepared and adopted in April 2006 - but that under the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the policies contained within the Local Plan are retained for a period of only 3 years from the date the plan was adopted or approved..

Consequently a specific Order is required from the Secretary of State to save any of the Hartlepool Local Plan policies beyond the three year Period and the request to do so must be submitted in accordance with an established Protocol issued by The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

As the Local Development Framework (LDF) for Hartlepool is not yet fully in place, and to prevent a subsequent policy void for spatial planning within the town, it is essential that most of the Policies in the Local Plan be saved until such time as there is in place an adopted Core Strategy and other related documents making up the new Local Development Framework.

A schedule has been prepared for consideration by the Secretary of State which sets out the reasoned justification why the policies should be saved together with a separate list of Local Plan policies which it is not proposed to save. Members are requested to agree the schedule.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

As a Budget and Policy Framework item, the Executive need to consider the issues raised within the report, prior to presentation to Council.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

The Hartlepool Local Plan policies form part of the Development Plan which is part of the Budget and Policy Framework.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet 13 October 2008 and Council 30 October 2008.

6. DECISION REQUIRED

Agreement to a schedule of Policies which the Secretary of State will be asked to include in a Direction to enable them to be saved beyond April 2009. The Schedule to also be endorsed by Council at its meeting on 30th October, 2008

Report of: DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES

Subject: HARTLEPOOL LOCAL PLAN SAVED POLICIES

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek agreement to the saving of specified policies of the Hartlepool Local Plan beyond April 2009.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, unless expressly replaced by a 'new' policy, 'old' policies of an adopted local plan are automatically saved for 3 years from the date the Local Plan was adopted.
- 2.2 The Hartlepool Local Plan was prepared and adopted following a resolution of Council on 13th April 2006. The policies it contains will therefore only be retained until 13th April 2009. The Council as Local Planning Authority can however seek the express consent of the Secretary of State who in turn may issue a Direction to save specified policies beyond the 3-year period.
- 2.3 As the Local Development Framework (LDF) for Hartlepool is not yet fully in place, and to prevent a potential policy void for spatial planning within the town, it is essential that most of the Policies in the Local Plan be saved until such time as there is in place an adopted Core Strategy and other related documents making up the new Local Development Framework.
- 2.4 A request to save the policies and accompanying justification is required to be submitted six months before the expiry period, in this case by 13th October 2008. The attached schedule has therefore been prepared for consideration by the Secretary of State which sets out the reasoned justification why the policies should be saved together with a separate list of Local Plan policies which it is not proposed to save.
- 2.5 In practice, the issuing of a Direction by the Secretary of State will be carried out by the Regional Government Office and, as a result of discussions with Council Officers, the officials from that organisation are already anticipating the 'saved policies' submission from Hartlepool.

- 2.6 With their agreement, an initial Schedule is to be submitted before the expiry of the specified period on 13 October 2008, but, in view of the date of full Council on 30 October 2008 the submission will also be subject to any further amendments suggested by members of Cabinet and of full Council.

3. REASONED JUSTIFICATION FOR SAVING POLICIES

- 3.1 The application for a Direction to save the Hartlepool Local Plan policies must provide supporting reasons and set out how the policies which are the subject of the request comply with criteria set out in the established Protocol agreed by the Secretary of State.
- 3.2 In particular, policies to be saved must be deemed necessary and should not merely repeat national or regional policy. Local Plan policies which are no longer relevant or are out of date can be discarded.
- 3.3 Policies will also be assessed against the following criteria.
- Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy in place
 - Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area
 - Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy
 - There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged
 - Policies that support the delivery of housing
 - Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries
 - Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres
 - Policies for waste management
 - Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources
- 3.4 A detailed schedule of 'Saved' and 'Not to be Saved' policies with appropriate justifications has been prepared in accordance with the above criteria and this is attached as **Appendix 1** for consideration by Members.

4. HARTLEPOOL LOCAL PLAN CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The Hartlepool Local Plan was prepared comparatively recently, in close conjunction with the Sustainable Community Strategy. It was also prepared at the same time as the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy was in preparation. The policies of the Hartlepool Local Plan therefore reflect up to date objectives

and policies set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy (2008) and the Regional Spatial Strategy (approved July 2008).

- 4.2 There are 178 separate policies contained within the Hartlepool Local Plan, the vast majority of which are proving to be useful tools in determining planning applications, in promoting development sites and for safeguarding other areas.
- 4.3 The policies relate to the following topics
- General Environmental Principles
 - Industrial & Business Development
 - Retail, Commercial & Mixed Use Development
 - Tourism
 - Housing
 - Transport
 - Public Utility & Community Facilities
 - Development Constraints
 - Recreation & Leisure
 - The Green Network
 - Wildlife
 - Conservation and the Historic Environment
 - The Rural Area
 - Minerals
 - Waste
- 4.4 About half the policies are site specific and are therefore locally distinctive to Hartlepool and therefore need to be saved. These include site allocations for industrial & business uses, town centre and edge of centre areas and sites for community facilities together with protected transport schemes.
- 4.5 14 policies generally support the delivery of housing and also need to be retained.
- 4.6 11 policies relate to Minerals & Waste issues. These policies will need to be saved until such time as the Tees Valley Joint Minerals & Waste Development Plan Documents are adopted (anticipated in Spring 2010).
- 4.7 Only a very few policies are considered out of date. Examples of these include the completion of the High Point Retail Park and a specific allocation for the North Shelter at Seaton Carew which is no longer necessary following completion of remodelling of the area.
- 4.8 There are a number of general policies that repeat national policies as set out in Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and therefore should not be saved under the protocol.

- 4.9 A copy of the adopted Hartlepool Local Plan (April 2006) has been placed within the Members Library should Councillors wish to examine in more detail any of the local plan policies proposed as 'saved' or 'not saved' within the schedule being submitted to the Secretary of State.

5. **DECISION REQUIRED**

Agreement to a schedule of Policies which the Secretary of State will be asked to include in a Direction to enable them to be saved beyond April 2009. The Schedule to be endorsed by Council at its meeting on 30th October, 2008

Background Papers

Hartlepool Local Plan (HBC – April 2006))

Protocol for Handling Proposals to Save Adopted Local Plan Policies... (DCLG – Aug 2006)

CHAPTER 3 General Environmental Principles Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
GEP1	General Environmental Principles		✓	✓	N/A	✗	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	The policy and its reasoned justification needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Core Strategy. The policy relates to specific locations within Hartlepool including the limit to development and to Green Wedges. The Policy is still up to date and is an essential tool in managing development through planning applications. The sustainability principles set out in the policy are in accordance with the RSS & the Community Strategy 2008.
GEP2	Access for All	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The policy and its reasoned justification needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date and is an essential and useful tool in managing development through planning applications. Conforms with policy 2 of RSS (2.2g)

4.1 APPENDIX 1

GEP3	Prevention by Planning and Design		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The policy and its reasoned justification relate to key objectives of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008 in making Hartlepool a safer place. It is in conformity with RSS policies 2 (2.2e) & 12 (12.5c).
GEP7	Frontages of Main Approaches		✓	N/A	N/A	X	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy and its reasoned justification needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Core Strategy. The Policy is site specific and up to date. It seeks to implement Community Strategy 2008 objectives.
GEP9	Developers' Contributions		✓	N/A	N/A	X	✓	✓	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	This policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Supplementary Planning Document on Developer contributions. The policy seeks to encourage housing regeneration, environmental improvements and strengthening of the town centre.
GEP10	Provision of Public Art		✓	✓	N/A	N/A	?	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The Policy is up to date. It seeks to further the Community Strategy 2008 aim of creating a cultural identity for Hartlepool. It is in general conformity to RSS Policy 16.
GEP12	Trees, Hedgerows and Development		✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	CLG guidance on TPO's suggests LPA's should include policies to secure the conservation of natural beauty and the amenity of the land. This policy will be used when dealing with applications to develop land and to protect trees and other natural features and provide for new tree planting and landscaping. It relates to the environmental objectives within theme 5 of the 2008 Hartlepool Community Strategy. It also complies with Policy 36 of the RSS.
GEP16	Untidy Sites		✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	This policy seeks to address economic and environmental issues in furtherance of RSS Policy. Supports aims 1, 4 and 5 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

GEP17	Derelict Land Reclamation		✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	This policy is site specific and relates to a key part of the regeneration of parts of the Borough. It is in general conformity with the RSS and the Community Strategy.
GEP18	Development on Contaminated Land	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	n/a	N/A	✓	n/a	n/a	This policy relates to a key part of the regeneration of parts of the Borough. It is in general conformity with the RSS and the Community Strategy.
Policies not to be saved													
GEP4	Control of Pollution		✓		N/A				N/A				Take out – covered by other policies and EIA??
GEP5	Environmental Impact Assessment												The policy does not add to national or regional policy. It repeats T&CP (Environmental Impact etc) Regulations
GEP6	Energy Efficiency												This Policy repeats National Policy set out in PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development & PPS3 Housing Provision.
GEP8	Advertisements				N/A				N/A				Take out covered by PPG19
GEP11	Article 4 Directions				N/A				N/A				Take out – national policy
GEP13	Works to Protected Trees												The policy does not add to national or regional policy.
GEP14	Review of Tree Preservation Orders												The policy does not add to national or regional policy.
GEP15	Compulsory Purchase of Potential Development Sites		✓	✓	N/A				N/A				This policy seeks to address economic and environmental issues in furtherance of RSS Policy (This policy seems to repeat national guidance and is covered by Policy GEP16 – take out?)

CHAPTER 4 INDUSTRIAL & BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Ind1	Wynyard Business Park	✓	✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	NA	N/a	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is up to date and is in conformity to RSS Policy 20 which identifies the site as a Key Employment location. The policy supports economic development and is an important part of the Council's economic strategy. Provides the spatial dimension to achieve Aim 1 of Hartlepool Community Strategy.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Ind2	North Burn Electronics Components Park	✓	✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is site specific, up to date and is in conformity to RSS Policy 20 which identifies the site as a Key Employment location. The policy supports economic development and is an important part of the Council's economic strategy. Provides the spatial dimension to achieve Aim 1 of Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Ind3	Queens Meadow Business Park	✓	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. This is a site specific policy identifying and giving guidance on securing a high quality Business Park. Provides the spatial dimension to achieve Aim 1 of Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Ind4	Higher Quality Industrial Estates	✓	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. This is a site specific policy identifying and giving guidance on securing higher quality industrial development. Provides the spatial dimension to achieve Aim 1 of Hartlepool Community Strategy.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Ind5	Industrial Areas	✓	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. This is a specific locational policy identifying and giving guidance on securing industrial development. Provides the spatial dimension to achieve Aim 1 of Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Ind6	Bad Neighbour Uses	x	N/A	?	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. This is a specific locational policy identifying and giving guidance on identifying and containing the spread of untidy users.
Ind7	Port-Related Development	✓	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is up to date and is in conformity to RSS Policy 22 promoting north east ports. The policy is site specific. Supports aim 1 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008.
Ind8	Industrial Improvement Areas	✓	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. This is a specific locational policy identifying and giving guidance on enhancing industrial improvement areas in Hartlepool. Reflects aims 1 and 5 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008.
Ind9	Potentially Polluting or Hazardous Developments	✓	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. This is a specific locational policy identifying and giving guidance on suitable locations for these specialist industries and is still relevant. Links to policy 23 of RSS and aim 1 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

4.1 APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 5 RETAIL, COMMERCIAL AND MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT													
Policies to be saved													
Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Com1	Development of the Town Centre	?	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development. The policy conforms to RSS policy 25 and Community Strategy Aim 1.
Com2	Primary Shopping Area	?	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date, site specific and a useful tool in controlling development. The policy conforms to RSS policy 25 and Community Strategy Aim 1.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Com3	Primary Shopping Area – Opportunity Site		✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	X	N/A	✓	X	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date, site specific and a useful tool in controlling development. The policy conforms with aim 1 of the Community Strategy.
Com4	Edge of Town Centre Areas	x	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date, site specific and a useful tool in controlling development. The policy conforms with aim 1 of the Community Strategy.
Com5	Local Centres	x	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date, site specific and a useful tool in managing development to ensure services in local neighbourhoods. The policy conforms with aim 1 and 8 of the Community Strategy.
Com6	Commercial Improvement Areas	x	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development in specific locations in the Borough. The policy conforms with aim 1 of the Community Strategy.
Com7	Tees Bay Mixed Use Site	x	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development in specific locations in the Borough. The policy conforms with aim 1 of the Community Strategy.
Com8	Shopping Development	x	X	x	N/A	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	Although this policy sets out a sequential approach to the preferred locations for shopping development, it is more site specific than regional and national policies and needs to be saved until a Core Strategy is in place.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Com9	Main Town Centre Uses	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development in specific locations in the Borough. It also links to edge of centre commercial policies. The policy conforms with aim 1 of the Community Strategy.
Com10	Retailing in Industrial Areas	x	X	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date and seeks to protect industrial areas from inappropriate development.
Com12	Food and Drink	x	X	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date and is essential in protecting retail and residential areas from inappropriate development.
Com13	Commercial Uses in Residential Areas	x	X	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date and seeks protect residential areas from inappropriate development.
Com14	Business Uses in the Home	x	X	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption a Core Strategy. The Policy is still up to date and seeks to residential areas from inappropriate development.
Com15	Victoria Harbour/North Docks Mixed Use Site	✓	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption a Core Strategy. The site relates to a specific site at Victoria Harbour which is identified in the RSS Policy 13 as major mixed use development. The policy is essential for the promoting the key development site in Hartlepool. It is of regional importance and relates to the Coastal Arc strategy and the development of the Hartlepool Quays. Relates to aims 1, 5, 6 and 7 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

CHAPTER 6 TOURISM

Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
To1	Tourism Development in the Marina		✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	This policy needs to be safeguarded as it is still relevant and is locally distinctive. The policy links with aims 1 and 7 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008 and also with RSS policy 10.2.h.
To2	Tourism at the Headland		✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	This policy needs to be safeguarded as it is still relevant and is locally distinctive. The policy links with aims 1 and 7 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008 and also with RSS POLICY 10.2.a & h.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

To3	Core Area of Seaton Carew		✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	This policy needs to be safeguarded as it is still relevant and is locally distinctive. The policy links with aims 1 and 7 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy 2008 and also with RSS policy 10.2.a & h
To4	Commercial Development Sites at Seaton Carew		✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	This policy needs to be safeguarded as it is still relevant and is locally distinctive. It links with RSS policy 10.2.a & h and also with the Hartlepool Community Strategy aim 1 (jobs and the economy).
To6	Seaton Park		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	N/A	x	N/A	N/A	This is a site specific policy which seeks to regenerate the resort of Seaton Carew in furtherance of RSS policies 10 & 16. Also links to policies 3 (health and wellbeing) and 5 (environment) within the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
To8	Teesmouth National Nature Reserve	✓	✓	✓	N/A	?	✓	X	N/A	✓	N/A	X	This is a site specific policy encouraging a diverse tourism base. It is in conformity with RSS policy 10. Links with Community Strategy Policy 5 (Environment).
To9	Tourist Accommodation	✓	✓	✓	N/A	?	✓	X	N/A	✓	N/A	X	This is a site specific policy encouraging a diverse tourism base. It is in conformity with RSS policy 10. Links with Community Strategy Policy 1 (Economy).

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

4.1 APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 7 HOUSING Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Hsg1	Housing Improvements		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy supports the delivery of housing and relates to specifically identified locations within the borough. The Policy is up to date and seeks to implement objectives in the Community Strategy. It conforms to RSS Policy 29.
Hsg2	Selective Housing Clearance		✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy supports the delivery of housing. The Policy is up to date and seeks to implement objectives in the Community Strategy. It links to policy 28 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Hsg3	Housing market Renewal	✓	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy supports the delivery of housing and relates to specifically identified locations within the borough. It relates to the Hsg3 boundary on the proposals map. The Policy is up to date and seeks to implement objectives in the Community Strategy 2008. Hartlepool Housing Regeneration Strategy supports the aims of this policy. It conforms to RSS policy 10.3.c & 28.
Hsg4	Central Area Housing		✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	X	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy relates to specifically identified locations within the borough and is a useful development control. The Policy is up to date and seeks to implement objectives 5 (Environment) and 6 (Housing) in the Community Strategy.
Hsg5	Management of Housing Land Supply		✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy supports the delivery of housing. The Policy is up to date and seeks to implement objectives in the Community Strategy. It also seeks to implement RSS policy 29. Policy links to Policy GEP9 (developer Contributions) which is why it has a regeneration benefit.
Hsg6	Mixed Use Areas		✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy links to a major mixed use development which is recognised within the RSS (policy 13) and also links with the Hartlepool Community Strategy (aims 1 and 6).
Hsg7	Conversions for Residential Uses		✓	X	N/A	x	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The Policy supports the delivery of housing. The Policy is up to date and seeks to implement objectives in the Community Strategy.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Hsg9	New Residential Layout – Design and Other Requirements		✓	x	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	This policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy supports the delivery of new residential areas in the town and is frequently used by Development Control in the consideration of planning applications. It links closely with aim 6 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Hsg10	Residential Extensions		✓	x	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy is frequently used by Development Control in the consideration of planning applications along with Supplementary Note 4. Residential extensions are not covered by PPS3. It links closely with aim 6 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Hsg11	Residential Annexes		✓	x	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy is used by Development Control in the consideration of planning applications. It links closely with aim 6 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Hsg12	Homes and Hostels		✓	x	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy is used by Development Control in the consideration of planning applications. It links closely with aim 6 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy. Links with Supplementary Note 2.
Hsg13	Residential Mobile Homes		✓	x	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy is used by Development Control in the consideration of planning applications. It links closely with aim 6 of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
Hsg14	Gypsy Site		x	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	This policy is required pending inclusion of specific policy in the Core Strategy. The policy is up to date and required in the absence of the GTAA Strategy. It links to policy 30 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

4.1 APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 8 TRANSPORT Policies to be saved													
Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to				Comment	
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management		Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources
Tra1	Bus Priority Routes	x	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	This policy is required pending inclusion of specific policy in the Core Strategy. The policy is up to date and required as it relates to a specific route within Hartlepool. It links with RSS policy 10.4c and also with the Hartlepool community Strategy aim 5 (Environment).

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Tra2	Railway Line Extensions	x	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	X	This policy is required pending inclusion of specific policy in the Core Strategy. The policy is up to date and required as it relates to a specific route within Hartlepool which needs to be safeguarded. Links with aims 1 (jobs and the economy) and 5 (Environment) of the Community Strategy.
Tra3	Rail Halts	x	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This policy is required pending inclusion of specific policy in the Core Strategy. The policy is up to date and required as it is locally specific. It links to RSS policy 10.4 relating to connectivity and a modern integrated public transport network for the Tees Valley. It also links with aims 1 (jobs and the economy) and 5 (Environment) of the Community Strategy.
Tra4	Public Transport Interchange	x	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This policy is site specific to Hartlepool and seeks to improve public transport facilities. Whilst planning permission has been granted for this proposal no work has yet been implemented. The policy is therefore still relevant and should be saved. It is in conformity with RSS10.4 & 51 and to the Community Strategy 2008 on effective & efficient public transport.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Tra5	Cycle Networks	✓	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool. It identifies key links and seeks to encourage a sustainable transport network and promotes health & wellbeing in furtherance of the Community Strategy 2008.
Tra7	Pedestrian Linkages: Town Centre/ Headland/ Seaton Carew	✓	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool. It identifies key links and seeks to encourage a sustainable transport network and promotes health & wellbeing in furtherance of the Community Strategy 2008.
Tra9	Traffic Management in the Town Centre	✓	✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool. It identifies key projects to encourage a sustainable transport network and promotes health & wellbeing (Aim 3) and jobs and the economy (Aim 1) in furtherance of the Community Strategy 2008.
Tra10	Road Junction Improvements		✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying key projects to be implemented to improve the highway network and highways safety.
Tra11	Strategic Road Schemes		✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying key projects to be implemented to improve the highway network and highways safety. It seeks to facilitate and enhance the development of key employment sites in the borough including Wynyard and the Hartlepool Southern Business Zone. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Tra12	Road Scheme: North Graythorp		✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying key projects to be implemented to improve the highway network and highways safety. It seeks to facilitate and enhance the development of a key employment at North Graythorp. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.
Tra13	Road Schemes: Development Sites		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying key projects to be implemented to improve the highway network and highways safety. It seeks to facilitate and enhance the development of a key brownfield regeneration site at Victoria Harbour. In conformity with RSS 13. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.
Tra14	Access to Development Sites		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	✓	x	✓	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying key projects to be implemented to improve the highway network and highways safety. It seeks to facilitate and enhance the development of a key Brownfield regeneration site at Victoria Harbour in conformity with RSS 13. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.
Tra15	Restriction on Access to Major Roads		✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying key projects to be implemented to improve the highway network and highways safety.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Tra16	Car Parking Standards		✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	This Policy is site specific to Hartlepool identifying areas where the provision of car parking will be reduced to accord with principles of sustainability. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.
Tra17	Railway Sidings		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This policy should be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. It seeks to encourage the use of railway sidings in furtherance of RSS policy 57. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.
Tra18	Rail Freight Facilities		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This policy should be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. It seeks to encourage the use of railway sidings in furtherance of RSS policy 57. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.
Tra20	Travel Plans		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	x	This policy should be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. It stipulates that Travel Plans will be used in developments generating large numbers of users in line with policy 54 of the RSS. Links with aim 1 (jobs and economy) of the Community Strategy.

Policies not to be saved													
Tra6	Cycle Facilities												This policy repeats national guidance set out in PPS13

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Tra8	Pedestrian Routes- Residential Areas													This policy repeats national guidance set out in PPS13
Tra19	Provision of Alternative Transport													This policy repeats national guidance set out in PPS13

4.1 APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 9 PUBLIC UTILITY & COMMUNITY FACILITIES Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
PU3	Sewage Treatment Works	x	✓	N/A	N/A	X	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	N/A	This policy is site specific and looks to safeguard sites for expansion of existing sewage works.
PU6	Nuclear Power Station Site	X	✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	X	N/A	✓	x	N/A	This is a site specific policy identifying a site of regional or national importance.
PU7	Renewable Energy Developments	X	✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	X	N/A	✓	X	✓	This policy should be saved pending the adoption of a Core Strategy. The policy refers to important local distinctions and is still relevant. The policy conforms to policy 39 of the RSS and is relevant to delivering aims 1 and 5 of the Community Strategy.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

PU10	Primary School Location	X	✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	X	N/A	X	X	x	This policy should be saved as it relates to a site at Middle Warren where significant housing development is progressing. The policy should be retained as part of a future programme of school building.
PU11	Primary School Site	X	✓	✓	N/A	X	✓	X	N/A	X	X	X	This policy should be saved as it is site specific at Chester Road and relates to future programme of school building. It is in an area where significant change under Housing Market Renewal is taking place.
Policies not to be saved													
PU1	Drainage Systems												TAKE OUT - It is general and not site specific and repeats national guidance.
PU2	Industrial Sites Drainage		✓										TAKE OUT - It is general in nature and repeats national guidance.
PU4	Protection of the Aquifer		✓										TAKE OUT Covered by other regulations and Environment Agency
PU5	Electricity Transmission, Distribution and Supply												Take Out- Covered in national policies
PU8	Tele-communication s												TAKE OUT It repeats national guidance and is now out of date. Most of the detail are covered under policyGEP1.
PU9	Local Facilities Serving Residential Areas												TAKE OUT It is general and the detail is picked up elsewhere such as GEP1. Also not site specific.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 10 DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS

Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Dco1	Landfill Sites	X	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	N/A	X	✓	X	The policy needs to be saved as it as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.
Policies not to be saved													
Dco2	Flood Risk		✓										TAKE OUT Repeats national policy PPS25 and standing advice from the Environment Agency.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

CHAPTER 11 RECREATION & LEISURE Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Rec1	Coastal Recreation	x	✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.
Rec2	Provision for Play in New Housing Areas	X	✓	X	N/a	X	✓	N/A	N/A	✓	X	X	The policy needs to be saved as the Core Strategy or Planning Obligations SPD are not yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and is essential for negotiating developer contributions for play facilities. Key to delivering Community Strategy Aims 3, 5 and 7.
Rec3	Neighbourhood Parks	X	✓	X	N/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	X	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and is site specific regarding the named parks. The policy assists with aims 3, 5 and 7 of the Community Strategy.
Rec4	Protection of Outdoor Playing Space	x	✓	X	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	x	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Rec5	Development of Sports Pitches	✓	✓	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is site specific and is linked to the Community Strategy aims 3 (Health and Wellbeing) and 7 (Culture and Leisure). It is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.
Rec6	Dual Use of School Facilities	x	✓	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development and encouraging use of the school fields. Links to the Community Strategy aims 3 (Health and Wellbeing) and 7 (Culture and Leisure).
Rec7	Outdoor Recreational Sites	✓	✓	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is site specific and is linked to the Community Strategy aims 3 (Health and Wellbeing) and 7 (Culture and Leisure). It is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.
Rec8	Areas of Quiet Recreation	✓	✓	x	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is site specific and is linked to the Community Strategy aims 3 (Health and Wellbeing) and 7 (Culture and Leisure). It is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.
Rec9	Recreational Routes		✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	n/a	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is site specific and provides the framework for an integral network of routes within Hartlepool. Links to Policy 7 of the RSS and it is also linked to the Community Strategy aims 3 (Health and Wellbeing) and 7 (Culture and Leisure). It is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

CHAPTER 12 THE GREEN NETWORK
Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
GN1	Enhancement of the Green Network	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific and is a vital tool for controlling the growth of the green network in Hartlepool. The Policy links with RSS policy 8 and policies 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture and Leisure) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

GN2	Protection of Green Wedges	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific and is a vital tool for protecting the integrity and open character of green wedges in Hartlepool. The Policy links with RSS policy 8 and policies 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture and Leisure) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
GN3	Protection of Key Green Space Areas	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific and is a vital tool for protecting key green spaces in Hartlepool. The Policy links with RSS policy 8 and policies 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture and Leisure) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
GN4	Landscaping of Main Approaches	x	✓	x	n/a	x	✓	x	x	✓	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific and useful development control tool. Links with policies 1 (Jobs and the Economy) and 5 (Environment) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy.
GN5	Tree Planting	✓	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific and useful development control tool. Links with policy 5 (Environment) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy. Also reflects the aims of policy 36 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

CHAPTER 13 WILDLIFE
Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
WL2	Protection of Nationally Important Nature Conservation Sites	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and is site specific. ODM Circular 06/2005 states that LDF documents must be prepared in accordance to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of SSSIs in their area. Links to aim 5 (Environment) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy and Policy 8 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

WL3	Enhancement of Sites of Special Scientific Interest	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and is site specific. ODM Circular 06/2005 states that LDF documents must be prepared in accordance to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of SSSIs in their area. Links to aim 5 (Environment) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy and Policy 8 of the RSS.
WL5	Protection of Local Nature Reserves	x	✓	x	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	This is a site specific policy identifying local Nature reserves. It needs to be saved until the adoption of a Core Strategy. It fits with the Community Strategy aim 5 (environment).
WL7	Protection of SNCIs, RIGSs and Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland	x	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	x	x	x	x	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and links to Policy 5 of the Community Strategy (Environment) and policy 36 of the RSS. It is a useful DC tool and links to Planning Conditions to minimise the harm that developments may have on these important sites.
Policies not to be saved													
WL1	Protection of International Nature Conservation Sites												This policy repeats national policy set out in PPS9 & the Habitats Regulations.
WL4	Protected Species												These species are given special protection through national legislation.
WL6	New Local Nature Reserves												This policy is very general and it is felt that other policies within the plan and national policies would help support the creation of new local nature reserves.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

WL8	Protecti on of Biodiversity												Reflects national policy and sub-regional plans and targets and is also covered by other policies which will be saved.
-----	-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHAPTER 14 CONSERVATION OF THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria							Policies that the government will also have particular regard to				Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
HE1	Protection and Enhancement of Conservation Areas	X	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	X	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific and useful development control tool. There are clear links to Policy 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture & Leisure) of the Community Strategy. The policy reflects Policy 16 of the RSS.
HE2	Environmental Improvements in Conservation Areas	x	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific in that it refers to a supplementary note and useful development control tool. There are clear links to Policy 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture & Leisure) of the Community Strategy. The policy reflects Policy 16 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

HE3	Developments in the Vicinity of Conservation Areas	x	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific in that it refers to a supplementary note and useful development control tool. There are clear links to Policy 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture & Leisure) of the Community Strategy. The policy reflects Policy 16 of the RSS.
HE6	Protection and Enhancement of Registered Parks and Gardens	X	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	X	N/A	X	X	X	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development in specific locations in the Borough.
HE8	Works to Listed Buildings (Including Partial Demolition)	x	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date, is site specific in that it refers to a supplementary note and useful development control tool. There are clear links to Policy 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture & Leisure) of the Community Strategy. The policy reflects Policy 16 of the RSS.
HE12	Protection of Locally Important Buildings	x	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and is important to protect the character of buildings identified as being of local significance to Hartlepool. There are clear links to Policy 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture & Leisure) of the Community Strategy. The policy reflects Policy 16 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

HE15	Areas of Historic Landscape	x	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓	x	N/A	✓	x	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and a useful tool in controlling development in specific locations in the Borough. There are clear links to Policy 5 (Environment) and 7 (Culture & Leisure) of the Community Strategy. The policy reflects Policy 16 of the RSS.
Policies not to be saved													
HE4	Control of Demolition in Conservation Areas		✓		N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Policy is too general and repeats national policy PPG 15
HE5	Review of Conservation Areas				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Policy is too general and repeats national policy PPG 15
HE7	Control of Demolition of Listed Buildings				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Policy is too general and repeats national policy PPG 15
HE9	Changes of Use of Listed Buildings				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Policy is too general and repeats national policy PPG 15
HE10	Developments in the Vicinity of Listed Buildings				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Policy is too general and repeats national policy PPG 15
HE11	Review of Listed Buildings				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – The policy is too general and is covered by other existing policies.
HE13	Scheduled Monuments				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Repeating national policy PPG16 and national legislation.
HE14	Protection of Archaeological Sites				N/A				N/A				TAKE OUT – Repeating national policy PPG16 and national legislation.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Rur1	Urban Fence		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	✓	✓	N/A		The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy defines the limit to development and is in accordance with RSS policy 10.5. The limits have recently been reviewed as part of the Local Plan Preparation and reflect up to date policy. The Policy is an essential tool in encouraging brown field urban development and restricting the urban spread into the countryside.
Rur2	Wynyard Limits to Development		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	✓	✓	N/A		The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy defines the limit to development and is in accordance with RSS policy 10.5. The limits have recently been reviewed as part of the Local Plan Preparation and reflect up to date policy. The Policy is an essential tool in restricting further urban spread into the countryside.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Rur3	Village Envelopes		✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	✓	N/A	N/A		The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy defines the limit to development and is in accordance with RSS policy 10.5. The limits have recently been reviewed as part of the Local Plan Preparation and reflect up to date policy. The Policy is an essential tool in restricting further urban spread into the countryside and protecting the character of the villages.
Rur4	Village Design Statements		✓		N/A	x	✓	x	✓	x	N/A	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and refers to a distinct area. The policy and SPD are useful tool in informing development decisions. More Village Design Statements are planned.
Rur5	Development At Newton Bewley	x	x	x	N/A	x	✓	x	✓	x	N/A	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and refers to a distinct area.
Rur7	Development in the Countryside		✓	x	N/A	x	✓	x	✓	x	N/A	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and refers to a distinct area. It links with aims 1, 5 and 6 of the Community Strategy.
Rur12	New Housing in the Countryside	X	✓	✓	n/a	x	✓	✓	✓	X	N/a	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and is a useful tool in controlling development. The policy reinforces the emphasis on brownfield land and maintaining a strong urban form of the built up area of Hartlepool. It reflects the principles of RSS policy 24.
Rur14	The Tees Forest	✓	✓	✓	N/A	x	✓	x	✓	x	N/A	x	The policy needs to be saved as no Core Strategy is yet in place. The Policy is still up to date and refers to a distinct area. It links with aims 5 (environment) of the Hartlepool Community Strategy and also with policy 36 of the RSS.

4.1 APPENDIX 1

[illegible]

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Rur6	Rural Services												It is considered that this policy is covered by national guidance within PPS7 (Sustainable Development of Rural Areas).
Rur8	Prior Notification for Agricultural Development												This policy reflects national guidance set out in PPS7
Rur9	Protection of Agricultural Land												This policy reflects national guidance set out in PPS7
Rur10	Intensive Livestock Units												This policy reflects national guidance set out in PPS7
Rur11	Farm Diversification												This policy reflects national guidance set out in PPS7
Rur13	Re-Use of Rural Buildings												This policy reflects national guidance set out in PPS7 and PPS3.

CHAPTER 16 MINERALS

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Min1	Safeguarding of Mineral Resources		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan Minerals policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and conforms to the strategy set out in RSS policy 42

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Min2	Use of Secondary Aggregates		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan Minerals policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and conforms to the strategy set out in RSS policy 42
Min3	Mineral Extraction		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a		The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan Minerals policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and conforms to the strategy set out in RSS policy 42
Min4	Transport of Minerals		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan Minerals policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and conforms to the strategy set out in RSS policy 42
Min5	Restoration of Mineral Sites		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	n/a	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan Minerals policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and conforms to the strategy set out in RSS policy 42

Policies not to be saved												
N/a												All five Minerals policies need to be saved.

CHAPTER 17 WASTE

Policies to be saved

Policy	Subject	Government criteria						Policies that the government will also have particular regard to					Comment
		Where appropriate there is a clear central strategy	Policies have regard to the Community Strategy for the area	Policies are in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy	Policies are in conformity with the core strategy development plan document (where the core strategy has been adopted)	There are effective policies for any part of the authority's area where significant change in the use or development of land or conservation of the area is envisaged	Policies are necessary and do not merely repeat national or regional policy	Policies that support the delivery of housing	Policies on Green Belt detailed boundaries	Policies that support economic development and regeneration, including policies for retailing and town centres	Policies for waste management	Policies that promote renewable energy; reduce impact on climate change; and safeguard water resources	
Was1	Major Waste Producing Developments		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	✓	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan waste policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and reflects current waste strategies. It conforms to RSS policy 46

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Was2	Provision of 'Bring' Recycling Facilities		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	✓	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan waste policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and reflects current waste strategies. It conforms to RSS policy 46
Was3	Composting		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	✓	✓	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan waste policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and reflects current waste strategies. It conforms to RSS policy 46
Was4	Landfill Developments		✓	✓	n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	✓	✓	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan waste policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and reflects current waste strategies. It conforms to RSS policy 46
Was5	Landraising				n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	N/A	✓	N/A	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan waste policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and reflects current waste strategies. It conforms to RSS policy 46

4.1 APPENDIX 1

Was6	Incineration				n/a	X	✓	N/a	N/a	N/A	✓	x	The policy needs to be saved pending the adoption of the Joint Minerals & Waste DPDs being prepared by the Tees Valley Authorities. The Local Plan waste policies are the only adopted planning policies in the Tees Valley area. The Policy is still up to date and reflects current waste strategies. It conforms to RSS policy 46
Policies not to be saved													
N/A													All waste policies need to be saved.

CABINET REPORT

13th October, 2008



Report of: Corporate Management Team

Subject: BUDGET & POLICY FRAMEWORK 2009/2010 TO
2011/12 – INITIAL CONSULTATION PROPOSALS

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to enable Cabinet to determine the initial Budget and Policy Framework proposals it wishes to put forward for consultation.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

- 2.1 The report provides a detailed overview of the financial issues affecting the Council in relation to:
- the development of the 2008/2009 Outturn Strategy;
 - Capital programme 2009/2010 to 2011/12;
 - General Fund and Council Tax 2009/2010 to 2011/12.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

- 3.1 The report enables Cabinet to determine the initial Budget and Policy Framework proposals it wishes to put forward for consultation.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

- 4.1 Budget and Policy Framework

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

- 5.1 Cabinet, Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, Scrutiny Forums, Council.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

- 6.1 Cabinet is required to determine its proposals.

Report of: Corporate Management Team

Subject: BUDGET & POLICY FRAMEWORK 2009/2010
TO 2011/12 – INITIAL CONSULTATION
PROPOSALS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to enable Cabinet to determine the initial Budget and Policy Framework proposals it wishes to put forward for consultation.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Government have recognised that Local Authorities need greater financial certainty to enable authorities to plan services effectively. As part of 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR07) the Government introduced the first three-year settlement covering 2008/2009 to 2010/2011. The Council therefore knows how much grant funding it will receive for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

- 2.2 The Council needs to roll its own budget forecasts forward to include 2011/12. Details of Government Grant levels for 2011/12 will not be known until the next CSR is announced in 2010. This may be delayed owing to the timing of the next General Election. An assessment of grant allocations beyond 2010/11 therefore needs to be made. It is becoming clear that the credit crunch and associated problems in the financial sector are deeper and will take longer to resolve than previously hoped. These factors will continue to affect the real economy and Central Government's own financial position, including the income raised from national taxes. Against this background it is expected that public services will face a tougher financial settlement beyond 2010/11 and this will include the level of grant support for Councils. These factors are covered in greater detail later in this report, together with the following issues:

- Policy Drivers
- Outturn Strategy 2008/09
- Capital Programme 2009/2010 to 2011/2012
- General Fund and Council Tax

3. POLICY DRIVERS

- 3.1 Previous budget reports have advised Members that the development of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) reflects various

national and local service priorities, which are underpinned by a range of service expenditure and corporate policy drivers. These issues are detailed in various strategy documents prepared by the Council, which set out the Council's key objectives. The documents include:

- The Corporate (Best Value Performance) Plan;
- The Efficiency and Business Transformation Strategy;
- The IT Strategy;
- Departmental Service Plans

3.2 The MTFS details the financial implications of the various strategies and the issues affecting financial sustainability of services. This latter issue is driven by the Council's policy for uplifting base budgets to reflect the impact of inflation, with additional top ups for specific policy driven service priorities. This policy reflects Members' views and feedback during the 2005/2006 budget consultation process that the overall balance of the budget is "about right" and should be maintained if resources were available. Clearly in the current financial climate this will not be possible. Therefore, the MTFS enables Members to determine those areas it wishes to prioritise.

3.3 Another important policy driver is the level of Council Tax, which funds 42% of the Council's net budget. This factor will become increasingly important in a period of reducing grant increases and continued upward pressure on demand lead services for Children and Older People, together with the affordability of the tax given the possible impact of a recession.

4. FINANCIAL POSITION AND 2008/2009 OUTTURN STRATEGY

4.1 An initial assessment of the current year's financial position was reported to Cabinet on 18th August 2008. A detailed budget monitoring report for the first six months is being prepared and will be submitted to your meeting on 24th November, 2008. The report will include the first detailed forecast outturn for this year's budget. The initial work has identified a number of key financial issues, which are detailed in the following paragraphs.

4.2 Stock of Council Funds

4.3 As reported previously the stock of the Council's funds has increased owing to two one-off factors. Firstly, the receipt of the final years Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) grant and the secondly the contribution to General Fund Balances in 2007/08.

4.4 Cabinet has previously indicated that they wish to allocate part of these resources to manage the following budget risks. It is assumed that Cabinet will wish to include these proposals in the draft budget package to be put forward for consultation.

**Value
of Risk
£'000**

Timing of RTB Receipts from Housing Hartlepool

400

The existing Medium Term Financial Strategy is based on using £7m of reserves over the period 2008/2009 to 2011/2012. These resources will come from the Budget Support Fund and the remaining RTB income which the Council is due to receive from Housing Hartlepool over the period 2008/2009 to 2011/2012.

However, owing to the credit crunch and the impact this is now having on consumer confidence, the reduction in the availability and affordability of mortgages and house price reductions, there is a greater risk that the RTB income will not be received by 2011/12 and will be received over a longer period.

For planning purposes it assumed that receipts over this period will be £1.0m, which equates to £0.25m per annum for the four years 2008/2009 to 2011/2012. This would leave a temporary shortfall of £0.4m. Given the level of change in the market at the moment this may prove to be optimistic and there may be a higher shortfall which needs to be managed. This position will be kept under review.

Funding Initial Budget Deficits 2009/2010 and 2010/2011

639

The existing MTFS approved in February 2008 anticipated budget deficits in 2009/2010 of £0.402m and £0.237m in 2010/2011.

Total Budget Risk 2009/2010 and 2010/2011

1,039

- 4.5 The Council should also benefit financially from the achievement of Local Public Service Agreement 2 (LPSA) Reward Grant. Assuming the minimum reward grant is earned the Council will receive a total revenue and capital reward grant of £1.8m. Half of this amount will be paid as a capital grant and half as a revenue grant. This grant will be paid in two equal instalments in 2009/10 and 2010/11. As part of the current years approved budget Cabinet and Council determined to earmark £0.45m of the anticipated capital reward grant for Building School's for the Future costs. It was also determined that a strategy for using the remaining amount would be developed as part of the

2009/10 budget process. The following strategy is now suggested for the remaining amount:

- 2009/10 Revenue instalment £0.45m – earmark to increase stock of funds:
- 2010/11 Revenue instalment £0.45m – develop a strategy for using this amount as part of 2010/11 budget process. This proposal will minimise the risk of committing resources which are not yet certain;
- 2010/11 Capital instalment £0.45m – earmark to support capital projects, as detailed in section 5.

4.6 In summary the uncommitted stock of resources is £2.3m as summarised below. These resources are available to either support additional one-off expenditure commitments, or to meet departmental overspends in the current year or to support the budget in 2009/10 and future years. A suggested strategy is detailed later in the report.

	<u>Adverse/ (Favourable) Variance £'000</u>
Timing of RTB Receipts from Housing Hartlepool	400*
Funding Initial budget deficits 2009/10 and 2010/11	639
Uncommitted General Fund Reserves	(790)
LABGI Year 3 Grant allocation	(2,100)
LPSA 2 Revenue Reward Grant 2010/11 instalment	<u>(450)</u>
	<u>(2,301)</u>

*Risk that this will increase thereby reducing one off funds.

4.7 **New Budget Risks**

4.8 The first quarter's budget monitoring report highlighted the key issues which have arisen since the 2008/09 budget was approved. This included the financial risks in relation to Building School's for the Future (BSF) and Tall Ships.

4.9 Specific resources have previously been earmarked for these initiatives, although it was recognised at the time that additional monies may be required.

4.10 Detailed planning for delivering the BSF programme is progressing. This work indicates that costs which it was initially anticipated would be capitalised and funded from the BSF grant will not be eligible for BSF grant funding. The majority of these costs will not need to be funded in the current year, although there will be a requirement for an additional £0.16m in 2008/2009. It would be prudent to begin to set aside monies for this commitment as soon as possible.

- 4.11 Similarly, detailed plans for hosting the Tall Ships in 2010 are still being developed and this work includes the determination of costs and the identification of funding from outside the Council. The initial work indicates that additional Council funding may need to be made available to meet costs which will be incurred in 2009 and 2010. The income generated from the “park and ride” arrangements will have a key impact on the net cost of this event and this income will be depend on the weather conditions at the time of the Tall Ships visit. Therefore, whilst there is not an immediate requirement for funding in the current year, it would be prudent to begin to set aside monies for this commitment and to cover the potential income risks from adverse weather. Hopefully, there will be no weather related problems and any resources set aside to manage this risk which are not needed can be returned to the General Fund. The potential for insuring this event against the impact of adverse weather is also been pursued to determine if this is a viable financial option. On a more positive note there was a risk that part of “park and ride” income would be subject to VAT, which would have either meant a higher charge was needed to maintain the net income to the event, or there was a lower income stream from this source. Following negotiations with HM Customs and Excise it has been recently been agreed that the whole of the “park and ride” income is exempt from VAT, which removes this risk.
- 4.12 Initial indications suggest that the additional costs in relation to BSF and Tall Ships are likely to exceed £2 million.
- 4.13 **2008/09 Budget Position and Forecast Outturn**
- 4.14 At the time this report was prepared a detailed review of progress against the current year’s budget for the first half year and forecast outturns was being undertaken. These details will be reported to Cabinet in November.
- 4.15 As indicated previously a number of adverse trends are beginning to emerge covering the following areas:
- Increased expenditure on demand lead services for Looked after Children.
 - Demand lead pressure on Learning Disabilities and services for Older People.
 - Inflationary pressures – fuel costs;
 - Reduction in income – owing to the impact of the credit crunch on a range of income streams, including planning/development control fees, land charges, car parks and shopping centre income;
 - Delays in the achievement of efficiencies.
- 4.16 At this stage it is anticipated that there will be an over-spend on departmental budgets in the order of £2 million at the year end.
- 4.17 On the upside the Council’s and paradoxically the credit crunch is one of the factors having a positive impact on investment income, which

for the first six months of the year is better than anticipated. This is a complex area and the net increase is driven by a favourable cash balance in the early part of the year, abnormally high short term interest rates driven by the credit crunch, offset by a restriction in counter parties to protect the Council's investments. The final factor is likely to have a less beneficial impact in the second half of the year as a greater proportion of the Council's cash investments have been placed with the Debt Management Office (DMO) in response to continued uncertainty in the financial sector. Investments with the DMO are effectively investments with the Government and are therefore the safest available investments. The downside to this security is a lower interest rate on the investment. However, as reported in the Treasury Management Strategy the primary principle governing the Council's investment criteria is the security of its investment and then the return on the investment. In the current climate a more risk averse approach is appropriate. At this stage it is expected that investment income will exceed the budget by around £2 million. However, the final figure could be lower if interest rates fall more quickly than anticipated as a result of a further deterioration in the economic position.

4.18 **Proposed Outturn Strategy**

4.19 As indicated in the previous paragraphs there are a range of issues which need addressing as part of the outturn strategy. These issues cannot be considered in isolation and need to be considered alongside the Council's medium term financial strategy. This strategy needs to demonstrate more clearly that the Council is actively managing its financial position. This will address the Audit Commissions concerns that the previous strategy of offsetting favourable and adverse budget variances was not achieving this objective.

4.20 It is therefore suggested that the additional income on the Council's investments is earmarked firstly to offset the loss of income, then for additional costs in relation to BSF and Tall Ships. This proposal will substantially fund these additional one-off costs. Any shortfall will need to be funded over the next two years. In the first instance it is suggested that should additional funding for these costs be required this should be a first call on the second LPSA 2 Revenue Reward Grant instalment which will be received in 2010/11. In the event that these resources are not needed for these areas a strategy for using these monies can be determined as part of the 2010/11 budget process.

4.21 With regard to the increase in the stock of resources of £2.3 million (detailed in paragraph 4.5) it is suggested that this is allocated to support the budget in the three years 2009/10 to 2011/12. The implications of this proposal are considered later in the report.

- 4.22 In terms of the development of a strategy for managing the anticipated departmental overspends for the current year two options have previously been identified:

Option 1 – Carry forward the departmental overspends as managed overspends against Departments three year budgets. This will provide a longer time span within which to manage service provision and in practice mean that such overspends will need to be repaid from departmental budget allocations in 2009/2010, 2010/11 or 2011/2012. In the short-term this will result in a usage of cash from within the Balance Sheet. There is a risk that if departments are unable to adjust spending in the medium term that the resulting shortfall may need to be written off against reserves.

Option 2 – Write-off the departmental overspends against the General Fund Reserves in the current year. If this option is adopted this will reduce the amount of resources available to support the budget in 2009/10 to 2011/12 by £0.79 million. This is the value of General Fund Reserves included in the stock of resources figure of £2.3 million. In addition, the level of General Fund Reserves will reduce to £2.5 million 31st March 2009. This will equate to 2.6% of the forecast net budget for 2011/12, compared to a minimum prudent level for this reserve of between 2% and 3%.

- 4.23 It is suggested that Cabinet adopts option 1 and instructs CMT to report back on the actions and implications needed to implement this strategy. The adoption of this strategy will mean that the estimated General Fund Reserves at 31st March 2009 will be £3.7m. This is higher than the minimum prudent level. However, it will be necessary to maintain this higher level until the 2008/09 overspends are repaid.

4.24 **Ongoing Service and Financial Issues**

- 4.25 A number of issues which have arisen in 2008/09 will continue in 2009/10 and future years. As these issues predominantly relate to services for vulnerable people it is assumed that Members will, in accordance with their existing priorities wish to reflect these issues in the budget proposals for 2009/10 detailed later in the report. Key issues include the following items:

	<u>2009/10</u>
	<u>Pressure</u>
	<u>£'000</u>
• Learning and Disability Agency	300
• Mental Health Agency	200
• Legal Division	63
• Looked After Children, Residential & Fostering Agency	475

5. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2009/2010 TO 2011/2012**5.1 Government Capital Allocations**

- 5.2 The availability of resources for the Capital Programme will continue to be affected by the level of supported capital allocations provided by the Government. These allocations take the form of specific capital grants, or supported prudential borrowing allocations, which must be repaid from the Council's revenue budget. These allocations cover key Government priorities, which are closely aligned to the Council's own priorities and objectives. These areas account for the majority of available capital resources. As part of the current MTFS Members reaffirmed their commitment to using these allocations for the three years up to 2010/11. Cabinet needs to confirm that they will continue this strategy to cover 2011/12.

5.3 Local Initiatives

- 5.4 The Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan approved by Cabinet on 31st July, 2006, indicated that Government capital allocations will not fund all capital expenditure priorities, particularly areas with a high local priority which do not fall within the areas which attract Government funding. Therefore, as part of the current MTFS Members determined to use Unsupported Prudential Borrowing to fund local priorities. As the cost of using unsupported Prudential Borrowing needs to be met from the revenue budget annual revenue provisions of £0.1m were included in the budget forecasts for 2007/2008 to 2009/10. This supports annual capital expenditure of £1.2m.
- 5.5 Members need to determine if they wish to continue with this strategy for 2010/11 and 2011/12. The revenue forecasts detailed later in the report assume that Members will wish to continue this strategy.
- 5.6 The detailed preparation of the 2009/10 revenue budget has identified a range of health and safety and property improvements issues which need to be undertaken as soon as practical. It was initially suggested that a revenue pressure of £0.5m was needed for the next three years. However, owing to the nature of these works and the revenue position it would be appropriate to fund these works from capital resources. It is therefore proposed that a revenue pressure of £0.1m is included in the 2009/10 budget proposals, which will provide a capital sum for these items of £1.2m. It is also suggested that this amount is supplemented by allocating the 2010/11 LPSA Capital Reward grant of £0.45m for these items. This amount cannot be spent until it is received, although a programme of works can be prepared in advance. If Members approve this strategy detailed proposals for using these resources will be included in the December budget report.

- 5.7 As part of the existing MTFS it was also determined to use unsupported borrowing to provide annual allocations for the three years up to 2010/11 for a number of small initiatives, detailed in the following table. Members need to determine if they wish to continue to support these initiatives up to 2011/12.

	<u>Annual Allocations</u>
	<u>£'000</u>
Community Safety Initiatives	150
Disabled Adaptations	50
Neighbourhood Forum Minor Works	156

- 5.8 The revenue budget forecast for 2009/10 includes a provision of £0.3m to support a capital contribution towards the development of the H20 centre of £3m. As reported recently to Members the development of the H20 centre is not likely to occur in the medium term. Therefore, Cabinet needs to determine if they wish to re-allocate the existing H20 revenue provision of £0.3m to support investment in the Mill House Leisure Centre. If Members support this proposal a detailed investment scheme will need to be developed. As this is likely to take some time to develop and then implement it is unlikely that the £0.3m revenue provision will be needed in 2009/10. It would be prudent to allocate this amount to support the overall level of capital investment in the Mill House Leisure Centre.

- 5.9 Alternatively, Cabinet may wish to take the £0.3m revenue provision as a permanent budget saving and look for other funding sources for investment in the Mill House Leisure Centre, such as the establishment of a Leisure Trust or external grant funding. These options are less likely to secure the necessary investment and therefore increase the risk of this facility having to close permanently.

6. GENERAL FUND AND COUNCIL TAX

6.1 Background

- 6.2 As indicated earlier in the report the Council received a three year grant settlement for the period 2008/09 to 2010/11. The Council therefore knows how much grant funding it will receive for 2009/10 and 2010/11 as follows:

	2009/2010	2010/2011
National Grant Increase	2.8%	2.6%
Hartlepool Increase	3.9%	3.4%
Annual increase in Hartlepool Grant	£1.86m	£1.69m
Total Formula Grant allocation	£49.83m	£51.52m

- 6.3 The announcement of grant allocations for a three year period provides the Council with a period of greater financial stability.

Therefore, Cabinet approved a three year MTFS for 2009/10 and 2010/11 which reflects the following principles:

- The achievement of annual efficiencies of 3%;
- The provision of annual headroom of £1.5m for above inflationary costs increases arising from pressures, contingency, terminating grants and priorities;
- The phased use of the Budget Support Fund;
- Indicative annual Council Tax increases of 3.9%

6.4 The Council needs to roll its own budget forecasts forward to include 2011/12. Details of Government Grant levels for 2011/12 will not be known until the next CSR is announced in 2010. This may be delayed owing to the timing of the next General Election. An assessment of grant allocations beyond 2010/11 therefore needs to be made. It is becoming clear that the credit crunch and associated problems in the financial sector are deeper and will take longer to resolve than previously hoped. These factors will continue to affect the real economy and Central Government's own financial position, including the income raised from national taxes. Against this background it is expected that public services will face a tougher financial settlement beyond 2010/11 and this will include the level of grant support for Councils.

6.5 On the basis of developing trends it is expected that the next CSR will be tougher than the existing CSR as the Government will need to restrict increases in public expenditure to ensure borrowing does not become unsustainable. It is therefore also certain that growth in public expenditure will not be maintained at levels recently seen and in total may actually reduce. Against this background it is likely that grants to local government will increase at lower rates beyond 2010/11.

6.6 Lower increases in local authority grants will also affect the Government's ability to phase out, or even just reduce the level of floor damping adjustments applied at an individual authority level. As Members are aware whilst Hartlepool's floor damping adjustment reduces over the three years up to 2010/11 the Council will still lose £2.4m through this arrangement in 2010/11. This equates to a grant loss of 4.8%.

6.7 **For planning purpose a grant increase of 2% in cash terms is forecast for 2011/12, which at this stage assumes there will be no further reduction in the level of floor damping adjustment.**

6.8 As indicated in previous reports a significant change in grant levels is needed to have a major impact on the Council's financial position as each 1% variation equates to approximately £0.5m. The most critical issue affecting the Council's financial position is the impact of demand on services and the Council's ability to control costs.

6.9 The base budget forecasts for 2011/12 also reflect the following planning assumptions:

- A 2.5% inflation increase in departmental resource allocations;
- The use of £0.5m of from the Budget Support Fund;
- An indicative Council Tax increase of 3.9%;
- The assumption that any new pressures etc. will be funded by the identification of efficiencies and/or service reductions in other areas.

6.10 The initial budget gaps for the next three years are summarised below. These forecasts are before any new pressures etc. are approved for 2009/10.

	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000
Gross Budget Gap	5,536	3,759	614
Less 3% Efficiency Target	(2,460)	(2,522)	0
Less Use of Budget Support Fund	(2,000)	(1,000)	(500)
Less Use of March 2007 Discount	(674)	0	0
Gap reported February 2008	402	237	114

6.11 Budget Issues 2009/2010

6.12 An initial examination of the issues facing the Council for 2009/2010 has been completed. These issues fall into the following broad categories:-

- Job Evaluation
- Budget Pressures
- Contingency
- Terminating Grant Issues
- Budget Priorities
- Area Based Grant
- Departmental and Business Transformation Efficiencies
- Impact of Credit Crunch
- Revised Budget Position 2009/10 to 2011/12
- Strategy for bridging 2009/10 to 2011/12 Budget gaps.

6.13 These details are covered in more detail in the following paragraphs.

6.14 Job Evaluation

Provision for the estimated cost of implementing Job Evaluation has been made within the budget forecasts for the period up to 2010/11. These forecasts were based on the completion of 90% of job evaluations and an allowance for the net impact of changes in various allowances, the potential cost of appeals and annual pay awards for 2008/09 and future years not exceeding 2.5%.

A detailed exercise is currently to being undertaken to reflect the implementation of the new pay and grading system for 100% of the affected workforce. Work is also progressing on the finalisation of changes to a number of allowances. A number of employees have submitted appeals in accordance with the agreed appeals procedures and these issues will be reviewed over the next few months. In overall terms the assumption at this stage is that these issues will be neutral. This position will continue to be reviewed as the remaining work streams are progressed and the latest position will be reported in December.

6.15 **Budget Pressures - £1.679m**

These items represent the additional costs of continuing to provide existing services and/or address requirements placed on the Authority by Central Government. These items are detailed in **Appendix A**, which includes a detailed risk assessment of each proposal. It should be noted that the risk criteria used for the 2009/10 budget process are the same as those used for the Council's Risk Management Policy. This was not the case last year. Therefore, risk comparisons between the two years are not directly comparable. The criteria used for 2009/10 will be used for future budget rounds. These risk criteria have also been used for terminating grants, priorities and efficiencies.

6.16 **Contingency - £0.885m**

As part of the review of budget pressures it has been determined that a number of pressures are not certain to arise, or the value of the pressure is not certain, or it would not be in the Council's financial interest to explicitly identify a specific pressure for items still subject to negotiation with other organisations. These items have therefore been classified as "contingency" and cover a range of issues.

The main issues relate to additional potential costs in relation to External Audit fees, planning for the transfer of 16 to 19 Education from the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), funding of community facilities, increase in fuel and energy prices, renewal of Service Level Agreements with Housing Hartlepool and increased cost of preventative services for children.

At this stage a total contingency provision of £0.885m is suggested for these items. Further work to quantify these issues will be completed over the next few months. These details will be reported to Cabinet on 15th December 2008 to enable Members to determine the detailed proposals they wish to put forward for formal scrutiny.

No allowance has been included in the contingency for potential one off costs associated with the review of the existing ICT contract and the arrangements for providing this service once the existing contract

ends. The value of these one-off costs will depend on the strategy adopted for the provision of ICT services after the end of the current contract. Therefore, until this strategy is determined it is not possible to estimate these costs, which will in any event not arise until 2010. This issue will therefore need to be addressed when the 2010/11 budget is prepared. It would be prudent to set resources aside before then if this becomes possible.

6.17 Terminating Grant Issues - £0.260m

The position in relation to a number of grants streams is uncertain and dependant upon detail grant announcement later in the year. Therefore, for planning purposes it is currently anticipated that Terminating Grants will be in the order of £0.260m, as detailed in **Appendix B**.

6.18 Budget Priorities - £1.182m

These items are similar to budget pressures, but relate to areas where the Council has a greater choice. These items are detailed in **Appendix C**.

6.19 Area Based Grant

The Area Based Grant was introduced for the 2008/09 financial year and brought together a number of specific grant streams into an Area Based Grant. The Department for Communities and Local Government indicated that the aim of this change is to provide local authorities with greater financial flexibility to determining how resources are used at a local level. As these changes were introduced very late in the 2008/09 budget process Members determined to passport the Area Based Grant on the basis of existing service specific grant allocations. It was also determined that a review of the Area Based Grant would be completed during the current year and this would inform the 2009/10 budget process.

For 2009/10 the Council has the option to make a strategic choice to use the Area Based Grant to support the General Fund, or to allocate to priorities within the Area Based Grant Initiative.

This issue has been complicated by conflicting guidance from Government departments. On the one hand this guidance indicates that the Area Based Grant is an un-ringfenced grant which local authorities can determine how to use. On the other hand there is guidance which indicates that the Area Based Grant should be spent on specific priorities which reflect the service specific allocations going into the Area Based Grant. This is particularly the case in relation to the Working Neighbourhood Renewal element of the grant, which will be subject to a specific Government review. Over the last few months there has been a greater emphasis on the latter position. It is

therefore assumed that Members will wish to allocate the Area Based Grant in line with service specific allocations.

In terms of the resulting implications for the Council's own budget process this means that the Area Based Grant is likely to be neutral. A number of specific issues still need further work, including the impact of Job Evaluation on Area Based Grant projects and the potential need to provide inflationary increases for some projects. At this stage it is anticipated these issues can be accommodated within the overall Area Based Grant allocation. These details will be reported to Cabinet on 15th December 2008 to enable Members to determine the detailed proposals they wish to put forward for formal scrutiny.

6.20 **Departmental and Business Transformation Efficiencies**

The Government require all local authorities to achieve 3% annual efficiencies over the three years 2008/09 to 2010/11. Beyond this period it is not known if the Government will set further efficiency targets, although given the outlook for public expenditure it is expected that further targets will be set. If central efficiency targets are not set, the Council will need to set its own targets, as this will be the only way of limiting Council Tax increases and funding growth in demand lead services or priority areas.

For 2009/10 the 3% efficiency target equates to £2.36m. Proposals for achieving this target from departmental efficiency proposals are detailed in **Appendix D**.

Beyond 2009/10 it will not be possible to achieve annual efficiency targets from departmental efficiencies and a more strategic approach will be needed to achieve efficiencies through a more fundamental change in the way services are provided.

To achieve a step change in the achievement of efficiencies Cabinet has agreed that a Business Transformation Programme should be determined. A detailed report outlining the scale, scope and initial timescales for implementing the Business Transformation Programme was reported to Cabinet on 15th September 2008. This report indicated that the overall programme varies in degrees of complexity and the extent to which more detailed preparatory work is required to ensure that any transition process operates effectively and that the costs and benefits of each element have been adequately determined.

Work is currently progressing to develop an implementation plan. Until this plan is complete it is not possible to determine the level of efficiencies which can be taken into account for 2009/10 from the Business Transformation Programme. From a practical perspective it is unlikely that the Business Transformation Programme will make a significant contribution towards the 2009/10 budget owing to the lead

in times for implementing these changes. Although it may be possible to determine a target before the 2009/10 budget needs to be finalised. This target will need to take account of risk of achieving efficiencies from the 1st April 2009, both from departmental initiatives and from Business Transformation. Based on previous experience the achievement of all planned efficiencies is difficult owing to the short lead times between formal approval of the budget and the start of the new financial year. In order to manage this risk it may be prudent to over-programme the level of planned efficiencies in order to ensure the minimum level of £2.36m is achieved next year. The Business Transformation target could provide this over-programming.

The Business Transformation Programme will however need to deliver the required efficiencies for 2010/11 and future years.

6.21 Impact of Credit Crunch

6.22 As indicated earlier in the report the credit crunch and the associated slow down in the real economy is likely to put further pressure on Government tax revenues. It is highly unlikely that this position will be resolved in the short-term and this will result in downward pressure on public expenditure for sometime. In the short-term it is not expected that the Government will reduce its expenditure plans for 2009/10 or 2010/11. However, beyond this period the Government will need to take action to balance the national budget. This is likely to mean lower increases in the grants paid to Council's from 2011/12. This position has been reflected when rolling the MTFS forward to include 2011/12.

6.23 At a local level the slow down in the economy is likely to lead to a reduction in a number of income streams, such as income from the shopping centre, land charges, car parking, planning and development fees etc. In the short-term it is expected that this position may be neutral, but medium to longer term it is expected to be adverse. At this stage it is not possible to quantify the potential shortfalls in income or how long this position will last. Further work will be needed over the next few months to quantify these issues. It is currently expected that income shortfalls which may arise in 2009/10 can be offset by higher interest income on the Council's investments, although this will mean this income isn't available for other purposes.

6.24 Revised Budget Position 2009/10 to 2011/12

6.25 The Corporate Management Team (CMT) have consider the issues affecting the 2009/10 detailed in the previous paragraphs and suggest that the pressures, contingency and terminating grants need to be included in the base budget for 2009/10 and future years. In total the value of these items exceeds the headroom of £1.5m included in the MTFS for such items in 2009/10.

- 6.26 In view of this position CMT are also suggesting that the priorities identified are not included in the base budget as this would exacerbate the budget position and require a significant increase in the value of efficiencies which need to be implemented from 1st April 2009.
- 6.27 The budget forecasts for 2009/10 to 2011/12 have been updated to reflect the above issues and in summary the revised deficits for the next three year's are summarised below. These forecasts also reflect the following planning assumptions:
- Annual Council Tax increases of 3.9%;
 - The achievement of 3% efficiencies in 2009/10 and 2010/11;
 - Provision for 2010/11 pressures etc. of £1.5m;
 - 2011/12 pressures etc. to be funded from efficiencies;
 - Phased Use of Budget Support Fund and LABGI.

Summary Budget Position 2009/10 to 2011/12

	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000	2011/12 £'000	Cumulative £'000
Gross Budget Gap	5,536	3,759	614	
Less 3% Efficiency Target	(2,460)	(2,522)	0	
Less Use of Budget Support Fund	(2,000)	(1,000)	(500)	
Less Use of March 2007 Discount	(674)	0	0	
Gap reported February 2008	402	237	114	
Less Use of 2008/09 LABGI grant	(402)	(237)	0	
Add Continuation of SCRAP capital allocation	0	100	200	
Add 2008/09 Pressures, contingency and terminating grant shortfall	2,824	2,895	2,967	
Less Provision for 2008/09 Pressures etc.	(1,500)	(1,538)	(1,576)	
Revised Budget Gap	1,324	1,457	1,705	4,486
One off uncommitted resources - maximum available	1,851	450	0	2,301
One off uncommitted resources - suggested phasing	801	750	750	2,301

- 6.28 **Strategy for bridging 2009/10 to 2011/12 Budget gaps**
- 6.29 As indicated in the above table the Council faces increasing budget deficits if action is not taken to address this issue on a permanent basis, either by reviewing the indicative Council Tax increases, or by reducing costs.
- 6.30 A reduction in costs will be in addition to the 3% efficiency targets which are already built into the forecasts for 2009/10 and 2010/11.

- 6.31 If no action is taken to reduce the 2009/10 budget gap on a permanent basis then total efficiencies of approximately £4m will need to be implemented from 1st April 2010. This equates to an efficiency target of nearly 5% and assumes pressures etc for 2010/11 do not exceed the £1.5m headroom provided in the MTFS. As indicated early in the report these efficiencies will need to come from the Business Transformation Programme.
- 6.29 In the short-term the budget position can be assisted by using the uncommitted increase in the stock of Council funds of £2.3m. As the Council currently faces a cumulative budget gap for the next three years of nearly £4.5m, these resources will only address part of the problem. In view of this position it would not be prudent to allocate all of these resources to support the 2009/10 budget as this will simply defer the problem for a year. In addition, significant temporary support of the budget is already planned over the next three years, particularly for 2009/10.

7. CONSULTATION AND BUDGET TIMETABLE

- 7.1 In previous years consultation on the draft Budget and Policy Framework proposals has included:
- Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee
 - Trade Unions
 - Hartlepool Business Sector
 - Neighbourhood Forums
- 7.2 Members are requested to determine if they wish to adopt similar arrangements for 2008/2009.
- 7.3 The Government have also recently issued guidance on the development of a national strategy for “Participatory Budgeting”. The aim of this guidance is to deliver the Government’s ambition of all local authorities using participatory budgeting by 2012. Further details on this issue will be reported to a future Cabinet meeting, including the impact on existing local initiatives which fall under the participatory budgeting umbrella, such as devolving funding to the Neighbourhood Forums.
- 7.4 Details of the budget timetable for the next phase of the budget process are detailed in **Appendix E**.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The report outlines the financial issues affecting the Council for the next three years and informs Members that the financial outlook, both nationally and locally, is more challenging than anticipated a year ago.

- 8.2 At a national level the credit crunch and the associated slow down in the real economy is likely to put further pressure on Government tax revenues. It is highly unlikely that this position will be resolved in the short-term and this will result in downward pressure on public expenditure for sometime. In the short-term it is not expected that the Government will reduce its expenditure plans for 2009/10 or 2010/11. However, beyond this period the Government will need to take action to balance the national budget. This is likely to mean lower increases in the grants paid to Council's from 2011/12. This position has been reflected when rolling the MTFS forward to include 2011/12.
- 8.3 At a local level the slow down in the economy is likely to lead to a reduction in a number of income streams, such as income from the shopping centre, land charges, car parking, planning and development fees etc. At this stage it is not possible to quantify the potential shortfalls in income or how long this position will last. Further work will be needed over the next few months to quantify these issues. It is currently expected that income any shortfalls which may arise in 2009/10 can be offset by higher interest income on the Council's investments, although this will mean this income isn't available for other purposes.
- 8.4 The greatest impact at a local level relates to the value of pressures etc. as these items exceed the headroom included MTFS. As a result the budget deficits for the next three years are greater than anticipated when the current year's budget was approved. Cabinet needs to develop a sustainable strategy for addressing this position before the final budget proposals are submitted for formal scrutiny later in the year.
- 8.5 In the meantime Cabinet needs to determine the specific proposals it wishes to refer for consultation in relation to the following items:

2008/2009 Provisional Outturn Strategy

- Do Cabinet wish to confirm their previous proposals to earmark £1.039m of one off resources to manage the RTB timing risk and to fund the initial 2009/10 and 2010/11 budget deficits? (paragraph 4.4).
- Do Cabinet wish to earmark the net increase in the stock of Council resources of £2.3m (inclusive of £0.79m Uncommitted General Fund Reserves) to support the 2009/10 to 2011/12 MTFS? (paragraph 4.6)
- Do Cabinet wish to earmark the increase in investment income earned in 2008/09, estimated to be £2m, for the following prioritised commitments, firstly loss of income, then Building Schools for the Future costs and finally Tall Ships? (paragraph 4.20)

- Determine which of the following options they wish to propose to fund departmental 2008/09 overspends:
 - Option 1 - carry forward overspends as managed overspends against Department three year budgets, OR
 - Option 2 - write-off departmental overspends against the General Fund Reserve in the current year? (paragraph 4.22)

2009/2010 to 2011/12 Capital Proposals

- Do Cabinet wish to maintain service based capital expenditure at the level of Government allocations? (paragraph 5.2)
- Do Cabinet wish to use locally funded Prudential Borrowing to continue to support annual capital expenditure of £1.2m in 2010/11 and 2011/12 not eligible for other capital funding?
It should be noted that the annual borrowing cost for each £1.2m of capital expenditure is £0.1m. (para 5.4)
- Do Cabinet wish to use locally funded Prudential Borrowing to support capital expenditure of £1.2m in 2010/11 on a range of health and safety and property improvement, and to supplement this resource in 2010/11 from the LPSA Capital Reward Grant of £0.45m? (paragraph 5.6)
This proposal reduces the revenue budget pressures.
- Do Cabinet wish to extend the use of locally funded Prudential Borrowing until 2011/12 to fund the following annual capital expenditure
 - Community Safety Initiatives £150,000
 - Disabled Adaptations £50,000
 - Neighbourhood Forum Minor Works £156,000 (Paragraph 5.7).
- Determine a strategy for using the existing H2O revenue budget:
 - Option 1 – reallocate to fund capital investment of £3m in the Mill House;
 - Option 2 – Take the £0.3m revenue provision as a permanent saving and look for other funding sources for investing in the Mill House. (paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9)

2009/2010 General Fund and Council Tax

- Do Cabinet wish to refer the proposed Budget Pressures, Contingency, Terminating Grants and Efficiencies for consultation?

- Do Cabinet want to refer the indicative 2009/10 Council Tax increase for consultation?
- Do Cabinet wish to seek views on the strategy for managing the budget deficits in 2009/10 to 2011/12, in particular
 - the timing Business Transformation efficiencies and
 - the use of the £2.3m increase in one off resources.
- Do Cabinet wish to adopt the suggested consultation arrangements? (Paragraphs 7.1).

9. **RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 It is recommended that Cabinet determines their views on the issues identified in Section 8.

Appendix A

[illegible]

Chief Executive's Department - Pressures

Perf	Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability -	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	All Diversity strand(s)	No Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
Perf		CED HR		9. OrgD	Safer workforce - HR Operational support increased to ensure compliance by Depts in respect of safer workforce practices. Major areas include recruitment, structure/checking of personal files etc. Additional and on-going training of managers in departments required. Risk to the Authority in respect of non compliance in respect of procedures will be increased. Potential effect of Councils rating. Independent Safeguarding Authority - increased work in relation to registration/clearance of employees. Failure to support could result in the employment of individuals who pose a risk to children / vulnerable adults. Independent Safeguarding Authority - increased work in relation to registration/clearance of employees. Failure to support could result in the employment of individuals who pose a risk to children /	Pressure	53	0	0		3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	All	No	0	
Perf		CED HR		9. OrgD	Tees Valley and Durham Communications service - (BSL interpretation). Previously funded from Human Resources managed revenue underspend. The Council has extended the contract for another three years. This service provision is essential so as not to discriminate the deaf people from using our services. The benefits are that we will be complying with the Equality legislation and promoting equal opportunities to all our customers. Diversity consultations with ethnic minorities, Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Trans-gender (LGBT) community, people with disabilities and to start a religious forum. Previously funded by Corporate Strategy as new initiative. Equality Act 2006 looks for compliance in providing services to all the diversity strands. The benefits are immense as this would lead to providing services to all	Pressure	13	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Positive	Disability	No	0	This payment is to cover the admin costs as the usage is re-charged to the relevant departments. Corporate strategy funded these as they were initiatives. Now with their budget pressures, they cannot continue to fund these existing consultations.
Perf		CED All		9. OrgD	The Government have been developing, for some considerable period of time, a mechanism to allow the secure sharing of data between public sector organisations. Whilst this development has been ongoing for a period of time the Government, through a variety of government departments are now mandating the use of this mechanism, called Government Connects, for the sharing of key elements of information. The first, though not likely to be last, government department to mandate it's use for information is Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). Government Connects, from April of next year, will be the only place that the authority can access DWP data which is essential for the ongoing operation of the Benefits function in the authority. Although this is the only government department to do this to date there are likely to be other departments taking such a stance in the near future. Not enabling the connection to Government Connects will mean that there are mandatory parts of the benefits service which the authority will be unable to provide with a subsequent impact on a high performing and important service Government connects is currently partially funded from central resources but this funding will cease in 2011 hence the increased revenue costs of 24K	Pressure	9	0	24		3. High	4. Almost certain	12	Red	Negative	All	No	0	There are two elements to the pressure. A capital cost to enable connect £ 43 K and an ongoing revenue impact of £ 9K

[illegible]

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	All Diversity strand(s)	No Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
						09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
CS	CSD S&SS		4. Csa	The increased costs of care proceedings resulting from the Public Law Outline are expected to continue at an annual cost of at least £100,000 per year. This was highlighted when the 2008/09 budget was set and is being funded from contingencies in the current year.	Pressure	100	0	0	0	3. High	4. Almost certain	12	Red	Neutral	All	No	0	
CS	CSD S&SS		4. Csa	Anticipated commitments for the provision of residential care to children looked after exceed base budget. Commitments based on current children remaining in placement (which is anticipated) and no new placements being made. Budget volatile and subject to change based on presenting needs of children, costs may increase further.	Pressure	100	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	All	Yes	0	
CS	CSD S&SS		4. Csa	Anticipated commitments for independent foster placements for children looked after, based on current numbers in 08/09 financial year. Numbers unlikely to reduce.	Pressure	275	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	All	Yes	0	
CS	CSD P&SI		4. Csa	Revenue implications of implementing electronic assessment and social care records. Implementation of these systems is required by DCSF and failure to do so would lead to significant adverse inspection outcome. These systems underpin the development of integrated working to secure better outcomes for children	Pressure	20	0	0	0	3. High	4. Almost certain	12	Red	Neutral	All	No	0	Grants from government only covered capital investment not ongoing revenue costs.
CS	CSD P&SI		3. H&C	Funding to increase the capacity of the Acorn Therapeutic Team to deliver Parent Partnership Services as required by Special Educational Needs regulation. New national exemplar standards have been issued by DCSF in 2007 and further capacity is needed if the service is to reach these standards.	Pressure	5	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	Disability	No	0	This will allow a 'top up' of funding available in the budget to recruit additional staffing to provide additional hours.

[illegible]

Appendix A

[illegible]

Adult and Community Services - Terminating Grants

Neighbourhood Services - Terminating Grants

[illegible]

Regeneration and Planning - Terminating Grants

[illegible]

Adult and Community Services - Priorities

Portfolio	Dept/Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
						09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
CLT	A&CSD CS	Community Centres	7. C&L	It is anticipated that the NDNA community facilities will be made available to the public for use from 2009/10 - however there are no revenue budgets in place currently for it's operation. Allowance needs to be made for staffing as well as premises costs and based on similar sites, is estimated to be around £31,000, offset by some income (est. £3k)	Priority	28	0	0	0	3. High	4. Almost certain	12	Red	Positive	All	No	0	If the community pod needs to operate as a standalone facility, this is the anticipated cost pressure.
CLT	A&CSD CS	Leisure Centres	7. C&L	3metre and 5metre diving platform currently out of action. Cracks have appeared in the main structure, cause unknown, but may be due to corrosion/metal fatigue of the main structural supports that are encased in concrete. Investigatory work required and repairs. Scaffolding needs to be erected which will require a pool closure (loss of income issue as well as additional costs associated with draining down, refilling & reheating) as part of the scaffolding will have to go into the pool tank. Quote for scaffolding and some investigatory work £3,500 - cost of any repairs required difficult to quantify as is loss of income.	Priority	17	0	0	0	3. High	4. Almost certain	12	Red	Positive	All	No	0	£3,500 intial cost. Repairs estimated at £2,500 but obviously could be more. Loss of income estimated at £6,000 (2 weeks loss of pool income) & £5,000 for draining, refilling , reheating etc.
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Learning Disabilities Agency	3. H&C	Tees Commissioning priority work (20% funding contribution towards delivering the project). Failure to fund will risk missing targets to bring people home from out of area, resulting in continued high cost placements and Service User's being accommodated away from home and family etc.	Priority	20	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Negative	Disability	No	0	This is a priority for both national and local targets
CLT	A&CSD CS	Maritime Exp & Museum of H'pool	7. C&L	External painting at HME and MOH	Priority	33	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	All	No	0	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Libraries General	7. C&L	1)Pressure created by very large increase in BT computer line charges to Branch Libraries. Price per branch has more than doubled, from £2550 p.a. to £5450 pa. These lines are necessary for the provision of all public access ICT provision in branch libraries (People's Network). 2)This well used service (arguably essential service in the digital age) will not be possible to maintain without identifying additional funds to meet this very large price increase. Discussion with Northgate has taken place, but at this stage no solution to mitigate position has been found. There is no immediately available alternative cheaper supplier. 3)Benefit will be continued provision of public internet access in Hartlepool in branch libraries, a service that has particular benefit for more vulnerable and lower income groups.	Priority	15	0	0	0	2. Medium	4. Almost certain	8	Red	Neutral	All	No	0	This will affect Owton Manor, Foggy Furze, Seaton Carew, Throston Grange and West View Libraries
APHS	A&CSD ASC	MH Agency	3. H&C	To provide User Led leadership and dedicated time ensuring the MH LIT responds to the new planning requirements adressing Social Inclusion, Wellbeing Agenda and to develop meaningful engagement with people who experience a wide range of mental health needs. The risk of not providing this resource is the LIT not being demonstrably User Led and being unable to deliver current functioning and high level of results	Priority	25	0	0	0	3. High	2. Possible	6	Amber	Negative	Disability	No	0	Lit has been led by MH Commissioner and this should now be replaced with user led model and salaried time to to ensure it happens.

Budget Value

[illegible]

Chief Executive's Department - Priorities

Portfolio	Perf	CED	HR	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
								09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
	Perf		CED	HR	N/A	9. OrgD	Priority	20	0	0	0	3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	All	yes	0	Funding from 2009/210 onwards only needed if the new HR/Payroll system does not have the skills and appraisal capability of the Skills Portal.Funding from 2009/210 onwards only needed if the new HR/Payroll system does not have the skills and appraisal capability of the Skills Portal. One off funding of 10k is needed for 2008/9 as 9k LSC funding available
	Perf		CED	HR		9. OrgD	Priority	5	0	0		3. High	3. Likely	9	Red	Neutral	All			
	Perf		CED	HR		9. OrgD	Priority	13	0	0	0	2. Medium	4. Almost certain	8	Red	Positive	All	No		This is a temporary post now until March 09 funded by the contingency funds. This needs to become a permanent post for future years to continue with this work.
	Perf		CED	HR		9. OrgD	Priority	10	0	0	0	2. Medium	4. Almost certain	8	Red	Positive	All	No		Funding at the moment is provided by the contingency fund. This needs to continue as the stakeholders have themselves have said that there is value in this process.
	Perf		CED	HR		9. OrgD	Priority	10	0	0	0	2. Possible	3. Likely	6	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	Any sponsorship gained would be offset against any provision made.

Perf	Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments	
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000											
	Perf	CED HR	Contact Centre	9. OrgD	Additional CRM system and middleware software maintenance. Risk of not supporting constrains effectiveness/efficiency opportunities of the Contact Centre.	Priority	0	0	0		2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0		
	Perf	CED HR		9. OrgD	Data-matching software annual licence fee for Hopewiser. Software may be required again next year if Northgate to not deliver LLPG Satellite Hub by end of August 2008 to allow time to match to departmental datasets	Priority	6	0	0		2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0		
	Perf	CEX L	Legal	9. OrgD	A restructure of the Legal Services Division to compensate for the dissipation of staff and to meet increasing workloads as reported to the Council’s Cabinet on 18th August, 2008. The Cabinet agreed to the recommendation to restructure in principle through the addition of the post of a Solicitor (commercial/procurement), Legal Assistant (Childcare) and a Trainee Solicitor. Solicitor and Legal Assistant posts included as pressures. This was to meet additional functionality, increasing caseloads and to meet and comply with statutory requirements/obligations against a service with a low resource base. Pressures upon the service includes; increasing childcare caseloads and the adoption of the Public Law Outline governing the conduct of childcare proceedings, work involved with regeneration/partnering initiatives, school transformation/BSF, Freedom of Information and Data Protection compliance, Crime and Disorder Act provisions, equal pay/JE implementation, the locally based assessment and determination process, major corporate projects eg., Tall Ships, Victoria Harbour etc., developments, as well as maintenance of the Should a restructure not be implemented then recourse and reliance will need to be placed on the “call off” of legal work through the Council’s External Legal Partnership or through other outsourcing mechanisms with attendant financial and other implications	Priority	23	2	2		2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber						
	Perf	CED HR	Contact Centre	9. OrgD	Office furniture / equipment / supplies. Historical resource transfers means budget is unsustainable with emerging operating cost pressures. Risk of budget overspends.	Priority	0	6	0		1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	0		
	Perf	CED HR	Contact Centre	9. OrgD	Additional Team Leader capacity to ensure the sustained delivery of customer service standards, linked to the Hartlepool Connect Service Integration and Improvement Strategy. The corporate principles of resource transfer for those services moving into the Contact Centre do not require transferring departments to fund Contact Centre management capacity. Risks include service standards not being delivered and damage to Council reputation.	Priority	57	0	0		2. Medium	1. Unlikely	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	2		

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
						09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
Per	CED HR		9. OrgD	Diversity Mapping (Mosaic Origins) - this will assist in mapping exercise and will assist in implementing the New Equality Framework. One of the main themes in this framework is Knowing your community- equality mapping to measure the outcomes of our service provision. The benefits will be immense as communication and service provision can be tailored to relevant sections of the town and in the long run will be cost effective to measure performance and conduct relevant consultations.	Priority	5	0	0	0	2. Medium	1. Unlikely	2	Green	Positive	All	No		There is a possibility of sharing costs in partnership with Housing Hartlepool.
Perf	CED HR		9. OrgD	l&DeA electronic self assessment tool. The benefit is that it assists the Council to self assess its diversity achievements and to set the right objectives and targets for achievements. It is good for compiling evidence either for external validation purpose or for CPA in respect to Equality and Diversity	Priority	1	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	Yes		May be able to use Covalent for this
Perf	CED HR		9. OrgD	Civic Regalia/antique furniture repairs - bid for resources as requested by Civic Regalia Working Group.	Priority	3	0	0		1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
				Total Chief Executives		153	8	2			1. Unlikely							

Children's Services - Priorities

[illegible]

Neighbourhood Services - Priorities

[illegible]

Regeneration and Planning - Priorities

[illegible]

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

CLT Portfolio	A&CSD CS Dept/ Div	Budget heading / Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	1. Unlikely/Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	All Diversity strand's)	No Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
CLT	A&CSD CS	Community Forest	7. C&L	Membership of North East Community Forest ended following merger of NECF with Groundwork Trust . In future work to be bid for on a project by project basis.	Efficiency		28	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	No	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Grounds Maint Contract 1 and 2	7. C&L	Reconfigure attendant provision at Grayfields and Summerhill at a lower cost than the current contractual Arrangements	Efficiency		13	4	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Art Gallery Tourist Information	7. C&L	Streamlining of site management rosters and <u>minor</u> adjustments to service opening times, including streamlined private view arrangements.	Efficiency		18	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0.4	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Art Gallery Maritime Experience Museum of Hartlepool	7. C&L	To get better value from suppliers by reviewing contracts and replacing them with more efficient ways of working.	Efficiency		22	0	0	0	1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	0.5	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Libraries General Reference Library	7. C&L	Reduce expenditure on library stock; using internal and external data to enable better and more informed purchasing choices to be made. Stock and community profiling in 2009/10 to help identify local usage and key areas of stock. Benefits; improved stock turn [stock attracts more issues], stock better reflects user requirements	Efficiency		15	0	0	0	1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	No	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Central Library Relief Register	7. C&L	Introduction of RFID ie. self issue & receipt of library books, at the Central Library. RFID agreed by Cabinet and approved by IT Partnership Board subject to further clarification of cost analysis. Benefit: staff released from repetitive and manual tasks to improve customer services.	Efficiency		21	0	0	0	1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	1.0	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Community Centres	7. C&L	Restructure of cleaning and caretaking staff within Community Centres to deliver service at lower cost than current arrangements.	Efficiency		20	15	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0.0	

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading / Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand's)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
CLT	A&CSD CS	Community Development	7. C&L	Reduction in printing, training and project development fund budgets whilst maintaining service level.	Efficiency		12	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Negative	All	No	0.0	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Borough Building	7. C&L	Redine the working arrangements within the Borough Hall and Sports Centre to maximise targeted activity and use.	Efficiency		20	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	2.0	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Arts Development	7. C&L	Redirect investment in professional artist fees. This includes reduction of budget from Tees Valley investment Fund to allow direct spend in Hartlepool.	Efficiency		10	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	2.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Support, Time & Recovery Team	3. H&C	Current Support Time and Recovery service over staffed by 2 posts (currently vacant). Reducing this service by these 2 posts will not affect provision and retains the number of staff needed to deliver the service.	Efficiency		39	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	2.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Brooklyn Day Centre	3. H&C	Access ing people to mainstream provision rather than building based statutory provision thereby promoting choice and social inclusion.	Efficiency		5	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	Nil	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Warren Road Day Centre	3. H&C	Reduction in the number of senior link workers to allow a flatter management structure and more flexible working to promote a more modernised and efficient service and release cash for Individual Budgets.	Efficiency		60	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	3.5	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Learning Disabilities SWAT Team	3. H&C	Co-location of LA and NHS Learning Disability teams at Warren Road, enabling efficiencies across rent and utilities.	Efficiency		30	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	Nil	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Sensory Loss Team	3. H&C	Physical Disabilities team to be relocated within loclity teams to promote integrated and seamless service provision. Team Manager post, currently vacant, to be disestablished.	Efficiency		45	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	1.0	

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading / Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand's)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Sensory Loss Team	3. H&C	Physical Disabilities team to be relocated within locality teams to promote integrated and seamless service provision. Team clerk post, currently filled by temporary postholder, to be disestablished.	Efficiency		20	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	1.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Warren Road Day Centre	3. H&C	Relocation to share accommodation and thereby reduce costs of rent and utilities by sharing the costs across the LA and NHS.	Efficiency		3	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	Nil	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Learning Disabilities Agency	3. H&C	Use of the fair price tool kit across the Tees region to allow efficient and equitable pricing by reviewing contracts.	Efficiency		30	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	Nil	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Learning Disabilities Agency	3. H&C	End block contract for respite care beds service and develop alternative, smaller unit with other respite care alternatives in line with personalised services.	Efficiency		50	0	0	0	2. Medium	1. Unlikely	2	Green	Neutral	Disability	No	Nil	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Adults Management	9. OrgD	Review of planning function to link to wider reorganisation of Adult Social care to ensure more efficient processes.	Efficiency		44	0	0	0	1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	1.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Care Management Team 2	9. OrgD	Integration of management structures with PCT.	Efficiency		45	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	1.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Duty Team	9. OrgD	Re-alignment of skill mix within Duty team - capacity at first point of contact unaffected.	Efficiency		10	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0.0	

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading / Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand's)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
APHS	A&CSD SS	Support Services	9. OrgD	Review of divisional admin staff planned for late 2008. Links to wider Business Transformation programme.	Efficiency		37	0	0	0	1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	2.0	
APHS	A&CSD SS	Workforce Planning & Development	9. OrgD	Changes to deployment of training resources, including possible procurement and partnership gains.	Efficiency		15	0	0	0	1. Low	3. Likely	3	Green	Neutral	All	No	No	
APHS	A&CSD SS	Finance Section	9. OrgD	Finance Section receive and manage benefits on behalf of many service users. Departmental Review planned for late 2008, including processes and numbers of referrals.	Efficiency		25	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	1.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Older People Purchasing	9. OrgD	Hartfields Extra Care Village to be utilised rather than residential care for older people who require substantial levels of support to remain safe. Improve quality of live. Manage financial resources more effectively.	Efficiency		125	0	0	0	2. Medium	3. Likely	6	Amber	Neutral	All	No	No	
CLT	A&CSD CS	Leisure Centres	7. C&L	Review of Mill House Leisure Centre staffing and rostering arrangements to maximise efficient working.	Efficiency		20	10	5	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	3.0	
APHS	A&CSD ASC	Integrated Care Team 1 and 3	9. OrgD	Integration of internal Homecare service and Intensive Support team to create new Direct Care & Support Service. Integration with PCT will support the introduction of Telehealth and offer a more efficient service around rapid response cases. Focussing on early intervention and using specialist workforce to deliver outcomes and transfer less complex work to independant sector.	Efficiency		193	0	0	0	2. Medium	4. Almost certain	8	Red	Neutral	All	No	6.7	

APHS	A&CSD ASC	Occupational Therapy	9. OrgD	Redesign of business processes in Occuptational Therapy, building on work completed with Care Services Efficiency Delivery programme, and embracing electronic and home working. Improvements in technology and review of skill mix will lead to more robust scheduling at first point of contact.	Efficiency		35	0	0	0	2. Medium	4. Almost certain	8	Red	Neutral	All	No	2.0	
							1,010	29	5										

CHIEF EXECUTIVES DEPARTMENT - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

Perf Portfolio	CED CS	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
								09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
Perf	CED CS			9. OrgD	A reduction in a variety of operating expenses within Corporate Strategy division including, as a result of reviews of paper circulation, reductions in printing costs	Efficiency		9.1	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
Perf	CED CS			9. OrgD	Reviews of consultation activity and changes in practise have resulted in a reduced need for fieldwork activities to undertake scheduled consultation	Efficiency		7.0				1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	The reduction in fieldwork activities will have no direct impact on staffing as these workers are employed only for specific consultation exercises on short term contracts
Perf	CED CS			9. OrgD	Minor reductions in operating expenses	Efficiency		2.5				1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
Perf	CED CS			9. OrgD	Reduction in printing costs for Corporate Plan as take up of hard copies has reduced significantly in recent years	Efficiency		1.0				1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
Fin	CED F	Accountancy		9. OrgD	Following the implementation of new Financial Management System and review of working practices a vacant Accounting Technician post can be deleted. Whilst, this proposal will not impact on current operational requirements, it reduces capacity to support non core activities, such as new corporate initiatives, support for departmental finance teams when they have vacancies, or support of new grant regimes.	Efficiency		22.0				1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	-1.0	Staffing reduction already achieved as post vacant.

CHIEF EXECUTIVES DEPARTMENT - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

[illegible]

CHILDREN'S SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

CS Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
CS	CSD R&SS	Admin	2. LLL	In setting the 2008/09 budget the department had to incorporate £100k for the back scanning of social care records to comply with legislation. This exercise involves temporary staffing and equipment costs and the exercise should be completed by 31st March 2009.	Efficiency		100	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	-4	Temporary contracts will not be extended for 4 staff.
CS	CSD R&SS	Premature Retirement Costs	2. LLL	The department is continuing to experience reduced costs on its PRC (Premature Retirement Costs) budget as former employees and their dependents die. Based on current commitments, savings of £30,000 are projected in 2009/10.	Efficiency		30	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
CS	CSD P&SI	Youth	8.5IC	A mini restructure as part of integrated working between Connexions and the Youth Service will result in a managerial post being saved. This will release a vacant post yielding a net saving of £40k. There would be no adverse impact on provision for young people.	Efficiency		40	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	This will involve the transfer of a mainstream funded post to PAYP grant funding with longer term risk if grant is discontinued. Currently secure until 2010/2011.
CS	CSD S&SS	Exmoor Grove	3. H&C	Staffing and premises savings have been identified resulting from changes to the shift patterns and opening hours at Exmoor Grove with no adverse impact on service delivery or children accessing service.	Efficiency		90	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
CS	CSD S&SS	Resource Centres	4. Csa	Efficiencies from maintenance and building costs associated with family resource centres.	Efficiency		20	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
CS	CSD R&SS	Admin Support	2. LLL	Reduction in admin support posts across the Children's Services Department through rationalisation of service and maximising potential benefits of current vacancies.	Efficiency		54	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	These savings can be made without redundancy
CS		School Improvement Partners	2. LLL	Review arrangements in relation to School Improvement Partners and OfSTED inspections to maximise income and reduce costs.	Efficiency		12	6	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	Some minimal impact on services to schools.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

CS Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
CS			Co-ordinators	2. LLL	Deletion of Outdoor Education Co-ordinator post.	Efficiency	40	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	Currently a vacant post.
CS		School Development & Curriculum	2. LLL	This budget is used to support "one-off" initiatives and to help those schools in challenging circumstances. Deletion of this funding may increase the risk of schools moving into Ofsted or cause for concern category and/or pupil performance declining.	Efficiency		40	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	Possible adverse impact on schools
CS	CSD R&SS		Pupil Support	2. LLL	Further reduce the subsidy paid to support attendance at Lanehead and Carlton Outdoor Centres by pupils from low income families. Hartlepool currently provides higher subsidies than Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland Councils although the gap narrowed as a result of the 2008/09 budget.	Efficiency	5	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	
CS	CSD R&SS		Admin Support	2. LLL	Reduction of admin support posts across the Children's Services Department through rationalisation of service.	Efficiency	126	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	5	These savings can be made whilst maintaining appropriate service levels but could lead to up to 5 redundancies.
CS	CSD R&SS		Primary Swimming	2. LLL	Savings could be made from the use of swimming pools and rationalisation of staff employed to deliver the primary swimming programme. This could involve redundancy costs and/or one off costs to buy out existing contracts.	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	2. Medium	3. Likely	6	Amber	Neutral	All	No	1	
CS	CSD S&SS		Commissioning	4. Csa	Efficiencies could be realised via improved commissioning and procurement practice with external suppliers of daycare.	Efficiency	26	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	
							593	6	0										

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
							09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
NC	PP	Pride in Hartlepool	5. Env	External Sponsorship for Pride in Hartlepool	Efficiency		5	0	0	n	1. Low	1. Unlikely	-1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
NC	NSD F&BD	Admin	9. OrgD	Revised reception arrangements at Church Street Offices releasing 0.5 FTE	Efficiency		10	10	10	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	ALI	No	1	
APHS	PP	Consumer Services	3. H&C	Savings in licensing operations based on income predictions / operational needs.	Efficiency		20	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	All	no	0	There may be a risk if there are changes in these needs.
APHS	PP	Cems and Crems (36743)	3. H&C	Additional income by increasing burial and cremation charges by 10%.	Efficiency		44	29	13	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	ALL	No	no	
Fin		FM ex Property Services	5. Env	Restructure building maintenance and management section	Efficiency		35	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	All	No	1	
Fin	NSD PS	Asset and Property Management	5. Env	Reconfigure property management service with retirement of staff member	Efficiency		40	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	all	no	1	
NC	NSD TS	Road Safety	5. Env	Advertising and marketing within road safety section	Efficiency		5	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	all	No	0	e.g. marketing of driver training scheme
nc	NSD NM	Env	5. Env	Rationalisation of supervision of weekend working	Efficiency		10	2	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	all	no	0	A review of weekend operations to be carried out to identify areas of efficiency and duplication

NC Portfolio	Budget heading/ Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Efficiency Classification	09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000	Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
NC	NSD NM	Waste Disposal	5. Env	Reduction of end market costs for the recycling of plastic and cardboard	Efficiency	20	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	green	Neutral	all	no	0	
NC	NSD NM	FM	5. Env	Restructure of Facilities Management Services	Efficiency	30	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	all	no	1	
nc	NSD NM	Grounds	5. Env	Reconfigure schools grounds maintenance service releasing 0.5 FTE	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	all	No	1	
NC	NSD NM	Env Enforcement	5. Env	Fine income generation through the introduction of dog control orders	Efficiency	10	2	2	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	all	no	0	
nc	NSD NM	Neighbourhood Management	5. Env	Restructure savings within Neighbourhood Management	Efficiency	80	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	all	no	0	
nc	NSD ALL	overall budgets	9. OrgD	Cash freeze a range of budget headings at 2008/09 level.	Efficiency	25	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	all	No	0	
nc	NSD ALL	overall budgets	9. OrgD	Restructure within each Division to reconfigure service operation, management and income generation	Efficiency	177	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	amber	Neutral	all	no	7	
						521	43	25										

REGENERATION AND PLANNING – PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	All Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
						09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
RS	R&PD P&ED	Economic Development: Contribution to Sub Regional Partnerships	1. Jobs	Reduction in the HBC contribution to the Joint Strategy Unit. It is expected that the JSU will once again reduce their budget to reflect the national cashable efficiency target. The final saving will depend on the inflation factor used and population statistics applied by the JSU but a reduction in the region of £5,000 could be possible with no effect on the council's services	Efficiency	5	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
NC	R&PD Ho	Housing Advice / Private Sector Housing	6. Ho	Reduction of a number of supplies and services headings within the Housing Division's budget. A number of minor budgets can be reduced or removed which would together generate a small scale efficiency without a major effect on the service.	Efficiency	15	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD CStr	Community Strategy	8.StC	Reduction in several supplies and services headings within the Community Strategy Division's budget. A number of small budgets can be reduced which would generate a small scale efficiency with a limited negative impact on services.	Efficiency	3	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD SS	Admin	9. OrgD	Reduction in several supplies and services headings within the Support Services Division's budget. Several budgets can be reduced which would generate a small scale efficiency with only a minimal affect on the service.	Efficiency	5	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD Reg	Planning Policy and Regeneration Management	5. Env	A mini restructure within the Planning Policy and Information Team and reduction in budget for supporting the production of Local Development Framework (LDF) related documents by the team and any associated research / consultancy support. This does carry some risk to the delivery of a statutory process but nevertheless is deemed manageable within overall budget resources.	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS		Inflation Freeze		An inflation freeze imposed on various non contractual budget headings. It is proposed to manage a number of headings without implementing a 2.5% inflation allowance. It is felt that such a freeze could be implemented without a major negative affect on departmental services.	Efficiency	9	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	

REGENERATION AND PLANNING - PROPOSED EFFICIENCIES

APPENDIX D

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
						09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
RS	R&PD CSaf	Youth Offending	4. Csa	YOS Commissioning: Youth Offending Service (YOS) provides a comprehensive service to young offenders, and also works with their family and victims. Several services are provided by the voluntary sector, and the Service Level Agreements have been re-negotiated on an annual basis. A programme to re-commission these services will be developed for 2008-2010. Specifications will be reviewed following consultation with service users	Efficiency	4	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD CSaf	Youth Offending	4. Csa	YOS Sessional Workers: The Youth Offending Service requires a pool of sessional workers, with different skills, knowledge and experience to support the full-time staff with their supervision of young offenders. Sessional workers have a contract with HBC which allows them to work flexibly, to suit the requirements for each individual young offender. They are not contracted to work fixed hours per week and are paid by the hour. This proposal will change the funding for sessional workers from HBC mainstream budget, to a grant budget. All other arrangements will remain the same	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD CSaf	Community Safety	4. Csa	Cost of Accommodation. HBC currently supports the Police occupation at 6 of the 7 local offices by funding (or contributing to) the rates, repairs and maintenance and rent (where appropriate) of these buildings. One of these buildings (9 Church Street) is however shortly to be vacated by the Police and it is proposed to accommodate the Partnership's Reducing Re-offending Team within this office. Contributions from the Drug Interventions Programme and Probation towards the running costs of the building will result and consequently reduce the cost to the authority.	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0.0	
RS	R&PD CSaf	Youth Offending	4. Csa	YOS Admin Post: Due to a full-time vacancy arising with the YOS, a review of the admin capacity has been undertaken and an efficiency saving of 0.5 Fte can be achieved.	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	1. Low	2. Possible	2	Green	Neutral	All	No	0.5	Some additional risk of not being able to make this saving exists due to lack of clarity in respect of actual staffing budgets available as a result of the Job Evaluation exercise

Portfolio	Dept/ Div	Budget heading/Cost Centre	Corp Strategy theme	Description	Type of budget proposal	Budget Value			Cost of efficiency saving £000	Risk impact	Risk probability .	Risk score	Risk status	Rate the Diversity impact	Diversity strand(s)	Treat as contingency item	Staffing Impact	Other Comments
						09/10 £000	10/11 £000	11/12 £000										
RS	R&PD SS	Admin	9. OrgD	Reduction in staffing resources within the Support Services Division. Further work would be required to identify the most appropriate course of action to achieve this efficiency although there appears to be an opportunity (albeit fairly limited) to do this without negatively impacting on existing permanent employees. This would however increase the pressure on team members who at the start of 2007/08 began to support the newly transferred Housing Division with no additional resource.	Efficiency	7	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0.3	Some additional risk of not being able to make this saving exists due to lack of clarity in respect of actual staffing budgets available as a result of the Job Evaluation exercise
NC	R&PD Ho	Strategic Housing	6. Ho	Reduction in the budget for research activities and specialist studies on Housing. Ongoing specialist work is required to statutorily assess housing needs for the council's housing and planning strategies and to support bids for funding. This proposed reduction does carry risk of the authority failing to adequately identify or respond to local need in statutory services. Some mitigating measures exist through the continuing work with other authorities at the sub regional and regional level and the introduction of Choice Based Lettings will contribute to our understanding of current and emerging housing issues.	Efficiency	10	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD P&ED	Development Control	5. Env	Development Control fee income: projected fee income increase reflects increased fee rates, widened scope of charging for applications (including related to discharging of conditions) and projected level of future applications, based on patterns over 2007-8, 2008-9 to date and assumptions based on known schemes in the pipeline. Such increase would reduce the net cost of the DC service, whilst allowing the maintenance of existing level of service and performance (which contributes towards level of Housing and Planning Delivery Grant received). Fee income level is monitored throughout the year and overall service budget will be managed to take account of any variance from projected fee income level. There is however RISK attached to this proposed efficiency in view of the reliance on external factors and in particular the current uncertainties in relation to the economic climate.	Efficiency	20	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	
RS	R&PD Reg	Major Regeneration Projects	5. Env	Major Regeneration Projects: A reduction on this budget heading would be necessary to meet a 3% efficiency saving target. The budget is used primarily to support the Victoria Harbour programme and as such is a high priority. There is a risk of not securing grant funding as a result of this reduction and the lower resource level may slow the momentum of preparation of related schemes.	Efficiency	20	0	0	0	2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	Neutral	All	No	0	Reduction in this budget may not be well-timed given the overall Victoria Harbour position

REGENERATION AND PLANNNG TOTAL		176	0	0
--------------------------------	--	-----	---	---

2009/2010 BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK TIMETABLE

13/10/08	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal consideration and determination of draft 2008/2009 Budget and Policy Framework proposals to be put forward for consultation.
Late Oct to early Dec	Main consultation period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will include referral of draft Budget and Policy Framework proposals to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, consultation with political groups, trade unions, business sector and neighbourhood forums. Detailed meetings to be scheduled.
15/12/08	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of consultation feedback and finalisation of draft Budget and Policy Framework to be put forward for formal scrutiny.
Late Dec to mid Jan 09	Formal Scrutiny period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second round of consultation with Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, political groups, trade unions, business sector and neighbourhood forums. Detailed meetings to be scheduled.
09/02/09	Cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of feedback from formal scrutiny and finalisation of Budget and Policy Framework to be referred to Council.
12/02/09	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of Cabinet's Budget and Policy Framework proposals.

CABINET REPORT

13 October 2008



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: TEES VALLEY GROWTH POINT STATUS –
PROGRAMME OF DEVELOPMENT

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek endorsement of the approach taken in preparing the Tees Valley Growth Point 'Programme of Development' which is the next step of the process to secure funding from Government for the Tees Valley authorities to help deliver accelerated housing growth.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

A previous report to Cabinet (31st March 2008) endorsed a proposal by the Tees Valley Local Authorities to submit a bid for round 2 Growth Point status to the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). The first stage Growth Point proposal was approved on the 24th July 2008 by CLG and the Tees Valley authorities have been asked to prepare a Programme of Development (PoD). The report provides information regarding the content of that draft document and given the deadline for submission of this document to CLG (27th Oct 2008) seeks authority for the Mayor and the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services to approve the final draft document under delegated powers. The previous report also informed Cabinet members of the availability of the closely related Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) aimed at providing transport infrastructure to support housing growth. This report provides an update on the detail of the CIF bid subsequently submitted.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Achieving Growth Point Status will help to support accelerated housing growth at sites across Hartlepool and the Tees Valley which is a strategic issue.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key Decision (test ii applies)

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet 13th October 2008.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Cabinet are recommended to:

- Approve the approach suggested in preparing the draft Tees Valley Growth Point Programme of Development
- Delegate power to the Mayor to approve the final draft document in conjunction with the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services.

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: TEES VALLEY GROWTH POINT STATUS –
PROGRAMME OF DEVELOPMENT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek endorsement of the approach taken in preparing the Tees Valley Growth Point 'Programme of Development' which is the next step of the process to secure funding from Government for the Tees Valley Authorities to help deliver accelerated housing growth.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The previous report to Cabinet (31st March 2008) explained that Growth Point Status was an initiative to support the Government's drive to deliver 3 million new homes by 2020. The initiative will provide funding to support local authorities willing to accelerate housing development on existing public and private sites and to bring forward new ones. The previous Cabinet report explained Growth Point status brings with it two separate but related funds to support accelerated development and alleviate its effects: the Community Infrastructure Fund and the Growth Point Fund.
- 2.2 Following the announcement that the Tees Valley had been successful in its bid for Growth Point status the next stage of the bidding process is to prepare a Programme of Development. This document will then be assessed by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). The confirmation of round 2 Growth Point status for the Tees Valley also enabled a bid to be prepared for CLG and the Department of Transport (DoT) for Community Infrastructure Funding.

3. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

- 3.1 To support Growth Point status, partnerships are eligible to apply for funding through the Community Infrastructure Fund. This scheme is jointly funded by CLG and DoT and is intended to fund small to medium scale transport schemes which are linked to unlocking housing development sites or the impact of housing development and helping to ensure the sustainability of areas targeted for growth.
- 3.2 In terms of available resources nationally for the period up to the end of 2011, £200m is available to share between the existing 'Growth Areas', 29 round 1 'Growth Points', and 20 recently confirmed round 2 'Growth Points' of which the Tees Valley is one.

- 3.3 The deadline for expressions of interest for CIF submissions was the 15th September 2008. The current government timetable suggests that successful schemes will be shortlisted and announced in January 2009. A full business case for these selected schemes will then need to be worked up and successful schemes will be allocated for funding in July 2009. The following package of projects was submitted for the Tees Valley:

Scheme	Local Authority Area
Tees Valley Network Management Strategy Phase 1	Tees Valley Wide
A19 / A689 / A1185 Junction and Corridor Improvements	Hartlepool (&Stockton)
A1035 Riverside Enhancements	Stockton
Former School Sites Access	Darlington
Hemlington Grange Access	Middlesbrough
Low Grange Farm Residential Site Access Improvements	Redcar & Cleveland

- 3.4 The development of this package of projects was coordinated by the Joint Strategy Unit and submitted as a joint bid to CLG/DoT. This includes one scheme for each Local Authority area and a strategic project that will address the key areas of congestion on the strategic road network (A66/A19).
- 3.5 From a Hartlepool perspective as one of the two main connections to the A19, the impact that physical developments will have on the A19/A689 junction (and the other related junctions in this area) is an important consideration in determining larger scale residential and commercial developments/planning applications that are expected to generate large volumes of traffic. If the Highway Authorities feel that developments are likely to increase usage to an unacceptable level, then they may object to planning applications for further developments.
- 3.6 A comprehensive package of improvements for the A19/A689/A1185 junction had been previously worked up in response to future traffic demands and expected developments in both Hartlepool and Stockton, including Wynyard Park and Victoria Harbour. The design work has been developed in such a way that a phased approach could be taken to deliver the various individual elements that make up the overall scheme. If the CIF bid is successful, a discrete phase of improvements to this area could include signalisation and provision of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to help encourage a reduction in traffic numbers at peak times. The Hartlepool CIF scheme therefore represents a discrete element of this larger package that has been developed in partnership with the Highways Agency and can be delivered within the timescale associated with the CIF programme.
- 3.7 In addition to works at the A19 junction, the Hartlepool CIF bid also includes proposals for improvements along the A689 corridor eastwards toward

Hartlepool. Enhancements along this route will be aimed at improvements that ensure the free flow of traffic especially at the busiest junctions.

4. GROWTH FUND AND PROGRAMME OF DELIVERY

- 4.1 The other funding opportunity associated with Growth Point Status is the Growth Fund. This fund is administered by CLG and is used to enable or accelerate specific housing development sites, that otherwise may not be viable. The Tees Valley has been included in round 2 of Growth Point. This round of Growth Point has a national allocation of £97m over 2 years. The Tees Valley has already been allocated £200,000 for 2008/09 which will be used in part to fund the production of the Programme of Development.
- 4.2 The Tees Valley allocation of the Growth Fund will be determined by CLG based on the information supplied in the Programme of Development (PoD) document which the Tees Valley authorities have been requested to produce. The document is being prepared by consultants on behalf of the Tees Valley authorities. The PoD document will expand the vision set out in the initial proposal and include more detailed information on housing projections up to 2016, key sites/areas for development, approaches to delivery of affordable housing, key infrastructure schemes, linkages with other strategies (LAA, MAA, LDF) and resource requirements. The document will also highlight the economic aspirations and proposals for the Tees Valley embedded in the City Region Business Case which will help underpin increased housing demand and growth. The document also details the successful partnership working at Tees Valley level which will also help in the appraisal process at Government level. The deadline for submission of the PoD document is the 27th October.
- 4.3 An announcement on individual allocations for Growth Fund is anticipated February 2009. Unlike the Community Infrastructure Fund which is project specific, the Growth Fund will offer non ring fenced funding to local authorities and partnerships. This will mean that there are fewer restrictions and greater flexibility regarding the funding and how and when it is spent. Local authorities and partnerships will therefore prioritise resources for their own areas. Although housing sites for each authority have been identified, in order to demonstrate capacity for achieving growth targets for the purposes of the Programme of Development, at this stage no specific schemes or projects will need to be identified for specific sites. It is intended that the PoD is a 'living document' which is responsive to changing circumstances. The document is not intended to tie partners into the delivery of specific sites, but will demonstrate the capacity of the area to deliver the increased housing growth specified in the plan. The Hartlepool sites put forward are broadly those that have been identified in the previous Cabinet report (31st March 2008):
- 4.4 The key Hartlepool sites are:
- **Britmag/Steetley/CJC Chemicals site**

- **North Hartlepool** (*potentially including currently underused/surplus industrial/educational land, future surplus health authority land*)
- **East Central Area**
- **Golden Flatts**
- **Central Hartlepool HMR**
- **Coronation Drive**
- **Victoria Harbour**
- **Eaglesfield Road**
- **Marina**

4.5 All of the sites suggested within the PoD document will be subject to the Local Development Framework (LDF) requirement to prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which will provide further reassurance regarding the deliverability of sites. The inclusion of the sites in the PoD will be with the caveat that all sites would be subject to due diligence and the statutory planning process. In line with Government guidance the document will cover the period up to 2016. In response to this the document and its contents will be 'live' and subject to change as the circumstances of individual sites evolve over the period. It will also allow further sites to be introduced if new opportunities arise or withdrawn if proposals or priorities for sites change.

4.6 At this stage we do not know what the financial allocation (if any) will be for the Tees Valley authorities, however feedback from Government is that the interest in the CIF scheme was very high, given the number of local authorities or partnerships eligible to apply. There is likely to be a similar scenario with regard to the Growth Fund, however the preparation and submission of information will mean that the local authorities could also be eligible for future rounds of funding if and when they become available.

5.0 PROCESS FOR APPROVAL

5.1 At the sub regional level, the draft document will be considered by the Tees Valley Living Board on the 10th October 2008 and delegated authority sought for the Chair of the Board to approve the final document prior to submission to CLG on 27th October 2008.

6.0 RISK IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The current economic and housing market conditions will have an impact on the ability of all established and new Growth Points/Areas to deliver previously agreed housing targets. These issues will be addressed in the draft PoD and have been recognised by CLG, therefore consideration will be given to these issues in determining the agreed increase in housing growth over the period up to 2016.

7.0 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 There are no financial implications for the Council at this stage, it is anticipated that if the PoD is well received by CLG it is anticipated that Growth Point status will bring additional external funding to assist in the delivery of housing development sites.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet are recommended to:

- Approve the approach suggested in preparing the draft Tees Valley Growth Point Programme of Development
- Delegate power to the Mayor to approve the final draft document in conjunction with the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services.

9.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 Growth Point will contribute to the overall economic regeneration of the Tees Valley improve the housing offer available and attract external funding. It will also help to bring forward key development sites and address the challenges faced by the current housing market conditions and credit crunch.

10.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

Cabinet Report 31st March - Tees Valley Growth Point Status Proposal

CABINET

13 October 2008



Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: Primary Capital Programme

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform members of the outcomes of the second stage of consultation in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme.

To seek approval to prepare a third stage of consultation.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

This report provides a summary of the outcomes of the second stage consultation process in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme and outlines the suggested scope of a third stage of consultation.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

The Primary Capital Programme will have a significant impact on the future provision of education in Hartlepool.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key Decision both test 1 and test 2 apply.

5. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) note the outcomes of the second stage of consultation in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme;
- b) consider recommendations from the Schools Transformation Project Board in relation to:
 - 1) Area One
 - 2) Area Two
 - 3) Area Three
 - 4) Area Four
 - 5) Early Years in Area Four

6) Priorities for early investment

- c) authorise the Schools Transformation Project Board to prepare a third stage of consultation, focusing on the outcomes of those recommendations in (b) above that are approved;
- d) authorise the Schools Transformation Project Team to undertake further work on long term pupil number projections, enabling the Schools Transformation Project Board to formulate recommendations on the possible adjustment of the size of some schools to meet future pupil place demand.

Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: Primary Capital Programme

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform members of the outcomes of the second stage of consultation in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme.

To seek approval to prepare a third stage of consultation.

2. BACKGROUND

In his 2005 Budget statement the Prime Minister (then Chancellor) set out his plans for long-term strategic capital investment in primary schools through a Primary Capital Programme (PCP).

On 10th October 2007 initial PCP allocations were notified to authorities. These allocations are intended to cover the current three year Comprehensive Spending Review period. Hartlepool's allocation is:

- 2009/10: £3 million
- 2010/11: £5.4 million

Government intends that PCP will be a fourteen year programme. Information available to date suggests that Hartlepool's total allocations for PCP, over the entire PCP programme, will be in excess of £36 million. By joining up other capital sources available for primary school investment, as recommended by government, it is expected that capital spending on Hartlepool's primary schools during the fourteen year programme period could exceed £50 million.

On 25th October 2007 the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) provided initial information in respect of its requirements of local authorities in relation to PCP. All authorities were expected to submit a locally agreed Primary Strategy for Change by 16 June 2008. Detailed guidance on the scope and content of the Primary Strategy for Change was published in December 2007. Hartlepool's Primary Strategy for Change was submitted on time.

3. STAGE ONE CONSULTATION

On 26th November 2007 Cabinet authorised a first stage of consultation in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme. The aims of the first round of consultation were to share information on the Primary Capital Programme with as wide an audience as possible and to collect views on possible ways forward. The Authority did not formulate any options or proposals as part of

the Stage One process and agreed that this would happen as part of further rounds of consultation, depending on the outcomes of Stage One.

Consultation began on 11th February 2008 and closed on 21st March 2008. Stage One consultation focused on seven key issues:

- i) Vision;
- ii) Extended Services;
- iii) Priorities;
- iv) Removal of surplus places;
- v) Options on use of spare capacity;
- vi) Future consultations;
- vii) Other general comments.

A range of views was expressed by those who responded to Stage One consultation. These views were analysed and reported to Project Board and Cabinet. The outcome of Stage One consultation was approval to undertake a second stage of consultation.

4. THE STAGE TWO CONSULTATION PROCESS

Stage Two consultation took place in June and July 2008. Stage Two focused on ensuring that primary education in Hartlepool is transformed through Primary Capital Programme investment while meeting key government challenges in relation to:

- Addressing standards of performance in English and maths;
- Removal of excess surplus places;
- Rebuilding or taking out of use schools in the worst condition;
- Prioritising areas of deprivation.

Stage Two consultation documents provided a range of options for the future organisation of primary schools in Hartlepool. An overall surplus place target of 7% was established. Options produced in Stage Two consultation documents indicated a number of different ways in which school places in each of four areas of the town could be reorganised so that the target number of places to be provided could be achieved. 63 meetings were organised, including three meetings at each of the schools potentially most affected by one or more of the options:

- Meeting for teaching and support staff;
- Meeting for governing body;
- Meeting for parents and public.

5. OUTCOMES OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION

63 meetings were attended by more than 1,400 people and there were approximately 1,600 written responses, including:

- Pro-forma responses;
- E-mails;
- SMS text messages;
- Letters;
- Collective responses;
- Others.

A summary of the main issues raised at meetings and in responses is presented on an area by area basis in the sections of this report that follow. A more detailed analysis of meeting outcomes and individual responses, along with the full text of collective responses, can be found in **Appendix 1**.

6. ANALYSIS OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION RESPONSES: AREA ONE

Area One consists of five primary schools: Barnard Grove Primary School; St Bega's RC Primary School; St Helen's Primary School; St John Vianney RC Primary School; West View Primary School. There were two options for Area One:

- Option 1 – Keep things as they are;
- Option 2 – Adjust the size of some schools.

Details of the options for each school in Area One, which were consulted on in June and July 2008, are shown in **Appendix Two**.

Brief Summary of Responses to Options for Area One:

Appendix 1 provides an overview of all of the responses to the consultation held in June and July 2008. This summary identifies the main strategic issues:

a) Barnard Grove Primary School

The majority of responses received in relation to this school recognised that significant capital investment was required. The majority of individual respondents favoured re-building of the school on its current site. There was a suggestion that the school might be re-built on the site opposite St Hild's Church of England Secondary School (referred to as the Henry Smith site). There was also a suggestion that the school might become a Church of England primary school. There was a range of views on whether the number of places should be reduced.

b) St Bega's RC Primary School

The possible need to increase places at St Bega's RC Primary School in respect of the potential Victoria Harbour development was queried by respondents. The school's governing body was in favour of the school

remaining at its current size, unless there was evidence of an increase in the number of Catholic children in the area at some time in the future.

c) St Helen's Primary School

There was a very limited volume of response in respect of St Helen's Primary School. The possible need to increase places at the school in respect of the potential Victoria Harbour development was queried. The governing body of St Helen's is of the view that potential families moving to Victoria Harbour would send their children to a number of different schools in the town.

d) St John Vianney RC Primary School

A collective response from the Roman Catholic headteachers in Hartlepool indicated support for St John Vianney at its current size. There was no evidence of any other response relating to this school.

e) West View Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to West View Primary School. Some respondents were in favour of reducing the number of places at the school and there was support for refurbishment of the school buildings.

7. ANALYSIS OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION RESPONSES: AREA TWO

Area Two consists of nine primary schools: Clavering Primary School; Eldon Grove Primary School; Hart Primary School; Elwick Hall CE Primary School; Jesmond Road Primary School; Kingsley Primary School; Sacred Heart RC Primary School; Throston Primary School; West Park Primary School. There were five options for Area Two:

- Option 1 – Keep things as they are;
- Option 2 – Adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 3 - Build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert and adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 4 – Build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert, close Hart Primary School and adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 5 – Build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert, close Hart and Elwick Primary Schools and adjust the size of some schools.

Details of the options for each school in Area Two, which were consulted on in June and July 2008, are shown in **Appendix Two**.

Brief Summary of Responses to Options for Area Two:

Appendix 1 provides an overview of all of the responses to the consultation held in June and July 2008. This summary identifies the main strategic issues:

a) Clavering Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to Clavering Primary School. There was one suggestion at a meeting in the school that Clavering Primary School might federate with Hart Primary School and share resources. An increase in pupil numbers at Clavering Primary School was seen as potentially beneficial; any decrease in pupil numbers was regarded negatively. One

collective response suggested that Clavering Primary School could be re-built on a new site opposite the Saxon Field.

b) Eldon Grove Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to Eldon Grove Primary School. Respondents generally focused on unsuitability of buildings. One response favoured Option One for Eldon Grove Primary School.

c) Hart Primary School

There was a high volume of responses in relation to Hart Primary School. A very significant majority of responses received were opposed to the closure of Hart Primary School. A number of collective responses were received in relation to this school; almost all were opposed to closure. Respondents tended to focus on the role of the village school in its community, the government's presumption against the closure of rural schools, existing high standards at the school, relative lack of building works required, lack of support for the building of a new school at Bishop Cuthbert. At a meeting at the school there was unanimous support for Option Two in Area Two.

d) Elwick Hall CE Primary School

There was a high volume of responses in relation to Elwick Hall CE Primary School. A very significant majority of responses received were opposed to the closure of Elwick Hall CE Primary School. A number of collective responses were received in relation to this school; almost all were opposed to closure. Respondents tended to focus on the faith and denominational character of the school, the role of the village school in its community, the government's presumption against the closure of rural schools, high standards at the school, relative lack of building works required, lack of support for the building of a new school at Bishop Cuthbert. At a meeting at the school there was unanimous opposition to the closure of both Hart Primary School and Elwick Hall CE Primary School.

e) Jesmond Road Primary School

A small number of respondents suggested that Jesmond Road Primary School should be closed. There were mixed views on whether there should be a co-location of Jesmond Road Primary School with Sacred Heart RC Primary School. At a meeting at the school it was suggested that the existing site of Jesmond Road Primary School might be redeveloped as an alternative to moving to a new site. Support for remaining on the existing site was also expressed in a response from the school's governing body.

f) Kingsley Primary School

Only one written response refers directly to Kingsley Primary School and indicates a preference for Option One.

g) Sacred Heart RC Primary School

There were a number of suggestions regarding the future of Sacred Heart Primary School. These included co-location with Jesmond Road Primary School on a new site, relocation to Jesmond Road Primary School site, relocation to Bishop Cuthbert, relocation to Springwell Special School site, rebuild on existing site. At a meeting held in the school, significant concerns were expressed about a potential co-location with Jesmond Road Primary

School. Some opposition to aspects of a potential co-location was evident in a response from the Sacred Heart RC Primary School's governing body, which expressed a clear preference to remain at the current site.

h) Throston Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to Throston Primary School. Some concerns were expressed about a potential negative impact on Throston Primary School if a new school were to be built at Bishop Cuthbert, in relation to pupil numbers and the role of the school in its community.

West Park Primary School

A number of respondents suggested that West Park Primary School should have new buildings. Some stated that the school should be able to accommodate more pupils, although not all agreed. Respondents expressed concern that building condition and suitability needs at West Park Primary School had not been highlighted in the Stage Two consultation documents; this is acknowledged as an administrative error. At a meeting held in the school general concern was expressed about funding issues in relation to West Park Primary School.

8. ANALYSIS OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION RESPONSES: AREA THREE

Area Three consists of seven primary schools: Brougham Primary School; Lynnfield Primary School; St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School; St Cuthbert's RC Primary School; St Joseph's RC Primary School; Stranton Primary School; Ward Jackson Primary School. There were three options for Area Three:

- Option 1 – Keep things as they are;
- Option 2 – Adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 3 – Close Ward Jackson Primary School and adjust the size of some schools.

Details of the options for each school in Area Three, which were consulted on in June and July 2008, are shown in **Appendix Two**.

Brief Summary of Responses to Options for Area Three:

Appendix 1 provides an overview of all of the responses to the consultation held in June and July 2008. This summary identifies the main strategic issues:

a) Brougham Primary School

Only one written response refers directly to Brougham Primary School and indicates a preference for Option One

b) Lynnfield Primary School

There are two responses that make direct reference to Lynnfield Primary School. One respondent suggested a collaboration between Lynnfield Primary School and Jesmond Road Primary School; the other response indicates support for Option One in relation to Lynnfield Primary School.

c) St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School

Most respondents, including the governing body, were opposed to a possible co-location of St Aidan's CE Memorial School with St Cuthbert's RC Primary School. At a meeting held in St Aidan's CE Memorial School, significant concern was expressed about the possible co-location, particularly in relation to congestion and the perceived possibility of St Cuthbert's RC Primary School moving in to new buildings if St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School remained in its existing buildings. Concern was also expressed about partner primary school admission arrangements for secondary schools. Staff at St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School are in favour of new build on the existing site.

d) St Cuthbert's RC Primary School

A significant number of respondents were in favour of St Cuthbert's RC Primary School remaining on its existing site in a new build, once redundant parish properties had been cleared from the site. There was opposition to co-location with St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School. There was support for a reduction in the capacity of the school to 210 places.

e) St Joseph's RC Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to St Joseph's RC Primary School, all of which supported Ward Jackson Primary School remaining open, with a possible supporting role for St Joseph's RC Primary School. These views were also evident at meetings held in St Joseph's RC Primary School.

f) Stranton Primary School

Only one written response refers directly to Stranton Primary School and indicates a preference for Option One. At a meeting held in the school, concern was expressed about the possible implications for Stranton Primary School if Ward Jackson Primary School were to close. Concerns focused on social need in the area and access, particularly in relation to the dual carriageway that runs between the two school sites. Stranton Primary School expressed its willingness to collaborate with Ward Jackson Primary School and strong support was expressed for Ward Jackson Primary School to remain open.

g) Ward Jackson Primary School

There was a very significant volume of response in relation to Ward Jackson Primary School and almost all were in favour of the school remaining open. Those who supported Ward Jackson Primary School in writing or at meetings made particular reference to improvements in leadership and governance, expected significant improvements in pupil performance and the success of the school in meeting the needs of a deprived community. There was strong support for the possibility of the school becoming a Church of England voluntary aided school. Staff and governors of the school indicated their willingness to work collaboratively with other schools and to be supported where appropriate.

9. ANALYSIS OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION RESPONSES: AREA FOUR

Area Four consists of ten schools: Fens Primary School; Golden Flatts Primary School; Grange Primary School; Greatham CE Primary School; Holy Trinity CE Primary School; Owton Manor Primary School; Rift House Primary School; Rossmere Primary School; St Teresa's RC Primary School; Seaton Carew Nursery School. There were five options for the statutory age schools in Area Four (ie all except Seaton Carew Nursery School):

- Option 1 – Keep things as they are;
- Option 2 – Adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 3 – Close Owton Manor Primary School and adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 4 – Close Rossmere Primary School and adjust the size of some schools;
- Option 5 – Close Owton Manor and Rossmere Primary Schools, create a new school on either the Owton Manor site, the Rossmere site, or the current Brierton site and adjust the size of some schools.

Details of the options for each school in Area Four, which were consulted on in June and July 2008, are shown in **Appendix Two**.

Brief Summary of Responses to Options for Area Four:

Appendix 1 provides an overview of all of the responses to the consultation held in June and July 2008. This summary identifies the main strategic issues:

a) Fens Primary School

Only one response made direct reference to Fens Primary School; this response favoured Option Two in relation to Fens Primary School.

b) Golden Flatts Primary School

Only one response made direct reference to Golden Flatts Primary School; this response favoured developing community facilities at Golden Flatts Primary School, to meet the needs of its distinct community. At a meeting held in the school, support for Option Two in Area Four was expressed. Comments at the meeting focused on the potential benefits of any increase in pupil numbers, a perceived need to rationalise the school buildings and the success of the school in meeting the needs of pupils with Special Educational Needs, through the additionally resourced support base.

c) Grange Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to Grange Primary School, a significant majority of which made reference to standards issues in relation to the two additionally resourced Special Educational Needs support bases at the school. Concern focused on the publication of raw performance data. These views were also evident at meetings held in the school.

d) Greatham CE Primary School

Only one response made direct reference to Greatham CE Primary School; this response favoured retaining Greatham CE Primary School.

e) Holy Trinity CE Primary School

An account of the responses received in relation to early years education in Area Four can be found in Section 10 below. Respondents who commented on the options for compulsory age education in relation to Holy Trinity CE Primary School generally favoured an expansion of the school to 315 or 420 places, although there was some opposition to the expansion of this school. There was strong support for a new build adjacent to the church and several references were made to the denominational character of the school. Respondents and those who attended meetings at the school strongly supported the role the school played in the community of Seaton Carew.

f) Owton Manor Primary School

There was a high volume of responses in relation to Owton Manor Primary School; the majority of those who responded were opposed to the closure of Owton Manor Primary School, although some respondents felt that both Owton Manor Primary School and Rossmere Primary School should close to enable a fresh start approach. There was evidence of some respondents from the community of Rossmere Primary School favouring the closure of Owton Manor Primary School. Those who attended meetings at Owton Manor Primary School were clearly in favour of the school remaining open and drew attention to improving standards, a positive Ofsted report and significant community use of the school.

g) Rift House Primary School

Only one response made direct reference to Rift House Primary School; this response favoured Option Two in relation to Rift House Primary School.

h) Rossmere Primary School

There was a high volume of responses in relation to Rossmere Primary School; the majority of those who responded were opposed to the closure of Rossmere Primary School, although some respondents felt that both Owton Manor Primary School and Rossmere Primary School should close to enable a fresh start approach. There was evidence of some respondents from the community of Owton Manor Primary School favouring the closure of Rossmere Primary School. Those who attended meetings at Rossmere Primary School were clearly in favour of the school remaining open and drew attention to significant community use of the buildings. It was asserted that the buildings were not in as poor condition as the consultation documents suggested and there was a suggestion that Rossmere Primary School and St Teresa's RC Primary School could be combined.

i) St Teresa's RC Primary School

There was a low volume of responses in relation to St Teresa's RC Primary School. One written response indicated a view that St Teresa's RC Primary School should remain at its current size. Some respondents suggested involving St Teresa's RC Primary School in collaboration with other schools in Area Four, including a possible co-location with Rossmere Primary School.

10. ANALYSIS OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION RESPONSES: EARLY YEARS IN AREA FOUR

Early Years issues in Area Four are of particular relevance to two schools: Holy Trinity CE Primary School; Seaton Carew Nursery School. There were three options for Early Years in Area Four:

- Option 1 – Keep things as they are;
- Option 2 – Re-locate Seaton Carew Nursery School to the same site as Holy Trinity CE Primary School;
- Option 3 – Close Seaton Carew Nursery School and establish a nursery unit at Holy Trinity CE Primary School.

Further details of the options for Early Years in Area Four, which were consulted on in June and July 2008, can be found in **Appendix Two**.

Brief Summary of Responses to Options for Early Years in Area Four:

Appendix 1 provides an overview of all of the responses to the consultation held in June and July 2008. This summary identifies the main strategic issues:

a) Holy Trinity CE Primary School

Responses from the Holy Trinity CE Primary School community, and those who attended meetings at the school, were strongly in favour of developing a maintained nursery unit attached to the school. Respondents were concerned that Holy Trinity CE Primary School is the only primary school in the area without its own nursery unit. Respondents felt that foundation stage should be a seamless stage that parents should not have to travel to two sites with sibling children and that opening a foundation stage unit at Holy Trinity CE Primary School would be more cost effective than current arrangements. Respondents drew attention to perceived difficulties of current arrangements for early years provision in Seaton Carew.

b) Seaton Carew Nursery School

Responses from the Seaton Carew Nursery School community, and those who attended meetings at the school, were strongly in favour of retaining Seaton Carew Nursery School. Respondents drew attention to perceived excellent results and excellent facilities at Seaton Carew Nursery School and to evidence suggesting that children do better in settings that include community facilities and in nursery schools. Collective responses from staff and the governing body of Seaton Carew Nursery School favoured the development of the school to provide extended all year round education and care facilities for children from birth to four years of age, alongside training facilities for town wide early years practitioners.

11. JOINT MEETING OF PROJECT BOARD AND STAKEHOLDER BOARD 10th SEPTEMBER 2008

The Schools Transformation Project Board met jointly with the Schools Transformation Stakeholder Board, on 10th September 2008, to receive an analysis of consultation responses from the Schools Transformation Project

Team and an update on four of the key drivers for change that had informed the preparation of Stage Two consultation:

- Standards: Key Stage Two provisional outcomes summer 2008;
- Condition of Buildings: latest position following summer holiday capital works;
- Surplus Places: latest projections from Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit – received August 2008;
- Deprivation.

Key facts in relation to these drivers are summarised below:

Standards

Provisional Key Stage Two results for summer 2008 indicate a very significant improvement overall and also in schools that were identified for possible closure through one or more of the Stage Two consultation options. The provisional summer 2008 Key Stage Two results for all primary schools are shown in **Appendix Three**.

Condition of Buildings

Stage Two consultation booklets quantified the Essential, Necessary and Desired condition related building works at all primary schools as at January 2008. Further work on the scope of condition need that has adjust some cost estimates, along with capital works that have been carried out during the first months of the 2008/09 financial year mean that the total cost of potential condition related works has fallen by just over £1 million from £9,824,458 to £8,771,319. A table indicating potential scope of works in January 2008 and the September 2008 position relating to all primary schools can be found at **Appendix Three**.

Surplus Places

Hartlepool Borough Council receives its pupil number projections from the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (JSU). The ten year projections that were used in the Stage Two consultation were the projections provided by JSU in June 2007. In August 2008 JSU provided a new set of projections that showed a significant increase in projected primary school age population in the long term. Notes that accompanied the projections indicated that JSU now believed that a birth rate increase was likely to become a trend, whereas in 2007 they had believed the increase to be temporary only.

There is still a significant number of surplus places overall and in certain schools and government will expect the Authority to make removal of excess surplus places a priority, as indicated in the Primary Capital Programme guidance published in December 2007. The latest projections are shown in **Appendix Three**.

Deprivation

In preparing their strategic approach to the Primary Capital Programme, local authorities were expected to achieve a minimum target for rebuilding or taking out of use schools in the worst condition. The national baseline was set at 5%. Those authorities with higher levels of deprivation were subsequently set a higher target for rebuilding or taking out of use the schools in their authority

that were in the worst condition. Hartlepool's target was set at 15%. As Hartlepool currently maintains 30 primary schools, this suggests a target of four or five Hartlepool primary schools to be rebuilt or taken out of use, as 15% of 30 equals 4.5.

Although there was no explicit requirement only to replace or remove schools in deprived parts of the Authority, it seems logical to consider deprivation when considering priorities for early investment. Entitlement to a free school meal is often taken as a proxy indicator of deprivation. Schools with a high percentage of pupils entitled to a free school meal often serve an area of significant deprivation. The Stage Two consultation booklets provided information on the percentage of pupils entitled to a free school meal on a school by school basis. This information is repeated in Appendix Three, alongside the updated 2008 figures. Deprivation information based on the School Funding Deprivation Indicator and the Indices of Multiple Deprivation is also shown in **Appendix Three**.

12. PROJECT BOARD MEETING 24th SEPTEMBER 2008

The Schools Transformation Project Board met on 24th September 2008 to consider the outcomes of Stage Two consultation and to formulate recommendations to be put to Cabinet. The Board considered responses to Stage Two consultation on an area by area basis. Before formulating their recommendations the Project Board took into account the latest available information on the following key drivers:

- standards of achievement at the end of Key Stage Two (age 11);
- condition and suitability of school buildings;
- surplus places;
- deprivation.

Project Board members were particularly concerned to ensure that Primary Capital Programme investment maximised opportunities to ensure the transformation of teaching and learning and that all schools were encouraged to explore innovative and collaborative ways of working in order to ensure the sustainability of improvement in performance that was evident in the summer 2008 provisional Key Stage Two results.

The Project Board agreed to make the following recommendations to Cabinet, subject to further review of the school place capacity needed in each area in light of latest demographic projections:

Area One

1. Rebuild Barnard Grove Primary School on its existing site. The exact size of the school and timing of the rebuild to be subject to further investigation and consultation.
2. Consider significant improvement works or possible rebuild at West View Primary School. The precise nature and timing of the works to be subject to further investigation and consultation

Area Two

3. Withdraw option to build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert.
4. Withdraw options to close Hart Primary School
5. Withdraw options to close Elwick Hall CE Primary School
6. Rebuild Jesmond Road Primary School on a new reserved site with 315 places. The timing of the rebuild to be subject to further investigation and consultation.
7. Consider possible future scope of works to Sacred Heart RC Primary School, subject to further investigation and consultation.

Area Three

8. Withdraw option to close Ward Jackson Primary School.
9. Consider further the options for improving or rebuilding St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School and St Cuthbert's RC Primary School, subject to further consultation.

Area Four

10. Withdraw options to close Owton Manor Primary School. Reduce size of Owton Manor Primary School to 210 places in such a way as to maximise opportunities for further transformation. The exact size of the school and timing of any capital works required to be subject to further investigation and consultation.
11. Withdraw option to close Rossmere Primary School. Reduce size of school to 315 places in such a way as to maximise opportunities for further transformation. The exact size of the school and timing of any capital works required to be subject to further investigation and consultation.

Early Years in Area Four

12. The Project Board agreed in principle that every primary school community in Hartlepool should have the opportunity to benefit from its own nursery unit, but recognised the unique position in Seaton Carew with regard to Holy Trinity CE Primary School and Seaton Carew Nursery School. The Board recommends that further consultation takes place in the Seaton Carew area involving, as a minimum, the Authority, the Church of England Diocese, the schools, the families and the local communities.

13. PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME: INITIAL INVESTMENT PRIORITIES

Guidance published in December 2007 by the Department for Children Schools and Families in relation to the Primary Capital Programme and submission of Primary Strategy for Change (PSfC) invited authorities to identify priorities for early investment and details of how they would spend the first two allocations that had been previously announced. In Hartlepool's case the first two allocations amounted to £8.4 million (£3 million in 2009/10 and £5.4 million in 2010/11). Hartlepool's PSfC, submitted in June 2008, gave a broad indication of initial investment priorities, without any commitment in respect of any individual school.

If Hartlepool is to be ready to begin investment in April 2009, as expected by government, it will be necessary to identify the first projects for investment well in advance of April 2009, in order to scope the projects and undertake an appropriate procurement process. The Schools Transformation Project Board, meeting on 24th September 2008, recommended the following short list of potential projects, presented in alphabetical order, for consideration by Cabinet:

- Barnard Grove Primary School
- Jesmond Road Primary School
- Rossmere Primary School
- St Aidan's CE Memorial Primary School
- St Cuthbert's RC Primary School
- West View Primary School

14. RISK IMPLICATIONS

There are two key risks in relation to the Primary Capital Programme:

- Failure to secure approval to the Primary Strategy for Change, preventing access to Primary Capital Programme funding from government;
- Failure to secure sufficient capital resources to meet all of Hartlepool's aspirations in relation to the transformation of primary education.

It is unlikely that Hartlepool's Primary Strategy for Change will be approved until the projects that will benefit from the initial £8.4 million allocations have been named.

Securing sufficient capital resources to meet aspirations for transformation will be dependent on the outcomes of consideration of potential funding sources listed in Section 15 below. Government's Primary Capital allocations, over a fourteen year period, are designed to address issues in approximately 50% of an authority's schools.

15. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The revenue costs associated with Stage Three consultation will be met from the Schools Transformation Programme revenue budget.

It is intended that the capital costs associated with the Primary Capital Programme will be met from a combination of a number of different potential capital sources. These could include some or all of the following:

- Primary Capital Programme allocations from the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF);
- Modernisation Funding (an annual formula allocation to Authorities from DCSF);
- Basic Need Funding (an annual formula allocation to Authorities from DCSF);
- School Access Funding (an annual formula allocation to Authorities from DCSF);
- Local Authority Coordinated Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP), (an annual formula allocation to Authorities from DCSF that is earmarked for expenditure at voluntary aided schools only);
- Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay (RCCO), (a revenue budget set aside each year by the Children's Services Department, to supplement capital resources provided by DCSF);
- Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) allocations, (annual allocations made by DCSF through local authorities and Dioceses to schools);
- Proceeds of sale of redundant school sites;
- Prudential borrowing.

16. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Should Cabinet wish to proceed to make proposals in relation to any area or any individual school, it is a legal requirement that consultation takes place on a draft proposal before it is formally published.

Should Cabinet wish to amend any of the previously published options or publish new options it would be possible to undertake further formative consultation before publishing draft proposals.

17. DECISIONS REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) note the outcomes of the second stage of consultation in preparation for the Primary Capital Programme;
- b) consider recommendations from the Schools Transformation Project Board in relation to:
 - 1) Area One
 - 2) Area Two
 - 3) Area Three
 - 4) Area Four

- 5) Early Years in Area Four
 - 6) Priorities for early investment
- c) authorise the Schools Transformation Project Board to prepare a third stage of consultation, focusing on the outcomes of those recommendations in (b) above that are approved;
- d) authorise the Schools Transformation Project Team to undertake further work on long term pupil number projections, enabling the Schools Transformation Project Board to formulate recommendations on the possible adjustment of the size of some schools to meet future pupil place demand.

Contact Officer

Paul Briggs, Assistant Director of Children's Services (01429) 284192

**Primary Capital Programme
Stage 2 – Summary of Consultation**

1. Summary of consultation arrangements between 19 June 2008 and 31 July 2008

- 60 consultation meetings in schools and one in Town Hall. Overall attendance was 1,414 people
- 2 Elected Member consultation meetings
- 42,000 flyers to all Hartlepool households
- 6,600 consultation documentation packs issued to parents of primary aged pupils
- 1,660 consultation documentation packs issued to stakeholders (Head teachers, Governing Bodies, Staff, Libraries, Unions, Project Board, Childminders, Neighbouring Authorities etc)
- Two advertisements in the Hartlepool Mail

2(a) Summary of Responses:

Area	1	2	3	4	Early Years	All Areas	Total
Pro-forma Responses	36	786	170	173	70	Nil	1235
E-mails	1	52	7	14	1	2	77
Text Messages	Nil	20	2	8	Nil	Nil	30
Letters:- Public	1	109	12	3	4	Nil	129
**Collective Responses	1	9	8	7	3	7	35
Other	Nil	86	2	4	1	Nil	93

2(b) Area Responses:

Area 1	Number of Responses
Pro-forma Option 1	9
Pro-forma Option 2	12
Pro-forma No preference	15
E-mails	1
Text Messages	NIL
Letters	1
**Collective Responses	1
Other	NIL

Area 2	Number of Responses
Pro-forma Option 1	54
Pro-forma Option 2	642
Pro-forma Option 3	38
Pro-forma Option 4	6
Pro-forma Option 5	1
Pro-forma No preference	45
E-mails	52
Text Messages	20
Letters: Public	109
**Collective Responses	9
Other: Elwick Hall Pupil messages, & drawings.	86

Area 3	Number of Responses
Pro-forma Option 1	7
Pro-forma Option 2	45
Pro-forma Option 3	11
Pro-forma No preference	107
E-mails	7
Text Messages	2
Letters	12
**Collective Responses	8
Other: Ward Jackson school pupil DVD Response to PCP Proposals. Signatures & Comments To Support Ward Jackson Primary School (Petition of 430 names).	2

Area 4	Number of Responses
Pro-forma Option 1	16
Pro-forma Option 2	50
Pro-forma Option 3	19
Pro-forma Option 4	10
Pro-forma Option 5	12
Pro-forma No preference	66
E-mails	14
Text Messages	8
Letters: Public	3
**Collective Responses	7
Other:	4

Owton Manor Primary School Staff Signatures Supporting Option 2 (96 signatures). Transforming Primary Education Petition Rossmere Primary School (1,943 signatures). Folder of Rossmere Primary School Pupil Views. Folder of Holy Trinity Primary School Pupil Views	
--	--

Early Years	Number of Responses
Pro-forma Option 1	16
Pro-forma Option 2	16
Pro-forma Option 3	24
Pro-forma Option 4	14
Pro-forma No preference	NIL
E-mails	1
Text Messages	NIL
Letters: Public	4
**Collective Responses	3
Other: Seaton Nursery Parental Response Signatures (57 signatures).	1

Collective Responses		
	Method	From
1	Letter & Report	Elwick Action Group
2	Letter	Elwick Hall C of E Primary School Governors
3	Letter	Staff Group Elwick Hall Primary School
4	Letter	Elwick Parish Council
5	Letter	Hart Parish Church Parochial Church Council
6	Letter	Hart Governing Body
7	Letter	Staff at Hart Primary School
8	Letter	Hart Parish Council
9	Letter	Holy Trinity Governor Response
10	Letter	Holy Trinity Staff Response
11	Letter	Governing Body of Jesmond Road Primary School
12	Letter	Governing Body of Owton Manor Primary
13	Letter	Staff of Owton Manor Primary School
14	Letter	Governing Body of Rossmere Primary School

15	Letter & Folder	Rossmere Primary School Staff
16	Letter	Rossmere Parents Action Group
17	Letter	Sacred Heart RC Primary School Governing Body
18	Letter	St Aidan's C of E Memorial Primary School Governing Body
19	Letter	Governing body of St Bega's RC Primary School
20	Letter	St Cuthbert's RC Primary School Staff
21	Letter	St Cuthbert's RC Primary School Governing Body ***
22	Letter	Governing Body of Seaton Carew Nursery
23	Letter	Parents & Friends of Seaton Carew Nursery
24	Letter	Staff of Seaton Carew Nursery
25	Letter	Parochial Church Council of Stranton Church
26	Letter	Ward Jackson Primary School Governing Body
27	Letter	Ward Jackson Primary School Staff Response
28	Letter	Burbank Community Forum
29	Letter	Catholic Headteacher's Collective Response
30	Letter	Collective response from Church of England Headteachers
31	Letter	The Diocese of Durham Board of Education
32	Letter & report	Hartlepool Labour Group's Collective response
33	Letter via E-mail	Hartlepool Constituency Labour Party collective response
34	Letter	Hartlepool Sixth Form College
35	Statement via E-mail	Integrated Support Managers, Sure Start Children's Centres collective response

** N.B. Collective Responses are included as appendices to this analysis report.

*** St Cuthbert's Governors collective response is identical to the staff response with the word staff changed to governor in the title therefore was not copied.

**PCP Stage 2 Area 1 Response Analysis
(By School / Subject)
(Proformas; E-mails & Text messages)**

Comment	No of same comment
Barnard Grove	
Barnard Grove is in serious need of re-building. Barnard Grove to be rebuilt on the same site.	14
Barnard Grove should retain their current numbers	2
A new school for Barnard Grove should include a house for the caretaker	3
Barnard Grove – (Henry Smith's Site)	
If a new school was built on old Henry Smith site there would be a lot of congestion/safety issues.	6
Barnard Grove – Becoming a VA School	
Barnard Grove to become a Church of England School.	5
West View Primary	
West View KS2 building needs a rebuild.	2
Reduce size at West View to incorporate single year classes	2
Building a new school is not cost effective because there are sufficient spaces in this area (Bishop Cuthbert)	1
St Helen's & St Bega's	
St Helen's needs support	1
Increases at St Helen's & St Bega's aren't necessary	1
Backlog repairs to St Helen's need addressing	1
Do not increase size at St Helen's	1
There is no indication that extra places are required at St Helen's	1

General	
Agree with the need to reduce places at Barnard Grove and West View	1
Single year groups will help raise standards.	1
The council should consider walking distances to school as a priority	1
Why extend schools? This puts pressure on them	1
We need minimal disruption to pupils, parents and staff	1
Option2 is preferred as it will make sure all children have a place in the school nearest to their home	2

**Primary Capital Programme – Stage 2 Consultation
Area 1 Letter Analysis**

Comments made in letter	No of same comment
St Helen's (1 letter)	
Kiddikins Nursery to be co-located on St Helen's site to provide full range of extended service with regard to childcare and to allow for more integrated working.	1

AREA 1 Meeting Summary
Barnard Grove
It would be sensible, given the closeness to St Hild's for Barnard Grove to become a church aided school as Option 3
Do not agree with the Labour group's preference for a new build on the old St Hild's site: Traffic congestion, three schools in close proximity; road safety issues etc etc
No school should be rebuilt without caretaker accommodation
The reduction in size is a concern for the school and would impact on our viability and restrict flexibility.
St Bega's
Our pupils' parents tell us that they would like to see more extended services than we already offer and the community wants us to maintain what we already do and extend to meet demand.
The local Labour Party has recently published its vision for the future of our primary schools which suggests only one school on The Headland; this suggestion is a non starter and is not being well received in the area and we hope there is no credence placed on this.
There is a long history of Roman Catholicism and education here on The Headland and the overwhelming response from all those connected with the school is the need for that presence to continue.
We cannot see why Clavering Primary should not have been included in Area 1: It is clearly a natural part of the area and its inclusion in Area 2 gives a lop sided view.
St Helen's
Statement from Chair of Governors: If the Victoria Harbour development does go ahead and is included in St Helen's catchment area there is a belief that due to its geographical location pupils would have a tendency to opt to go to schools closer to the area: Brougham, Lynnfield and Sacred Heart being three.
The issue of St Helen's having a split site, Key Stage 1 in one building and Key Stage 2 in another creates major problems. We would like to propose the option that St Helens should be housed in one building.
West View Primary
Disappointed by the omission of the condition & suitability elements from the options
Against rural schools with small numbers – subsidised education for "posh" kids.
The school is in great need of refurbishment – the condition & suitability figures show this to be the case.



St Bega's R.C. Primary School

Thorpe Street, Hartlepool, TS24 0DX Tel / Fax (01429) 267768
Email: admin.stbegas@school.hartlepool.gov.uk

Headteacher: Mr M.S. Cooney



28 July 2008

The Schools Transformation Team
Aneurin Bevan House
Avenue Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8HD

Dear Sir

Re: Transforming Primary Education Stage 2 Consultation – Area One

I write on behalf of the governing body of St Bega's R.C. Primary School.

There has been a long history and tradition of Catholic education centred on the Headland area of Hartlepool. This remains today and has expanded to cover the Central Estate and West View Road area within the parish boundary of St Mary's.

St Bega's and St Helen's are both essential, responsive and vibrant to the needs of the community and both do this very well – social events and educational activities for children, adults and community and a range of extended activities – yoga, belly dancing, stilt walking, slimming club etc.

The schools already work together as part of the 'Children's Centre initiative and we can see the two schools working ever more closely together in joint ventures e.g. the recent performances of music and dance from both schools at the Headland Heritage Day.

However the governors strongly believe that the two schools should retain their individual identities in serving the best needs for the children's education and the wider needs of the community.

In this respect we support option one but would propose that if Catholic numbers continue to rise in our area that at some later date consideration ought to be given to increasing the size of St Bega's to accommodate this growth.

Yours sincerely *Pat Carroll*

Mrs Pat Carroll
Chair of Governors



**PCP Stage 2 Area 2 Response Analysis
(By School / Subject)
(Proformas; E-mails & Text messages)**

Comment	No of same Comments
Hart & Elwick - Combined	
Rural schools form the heart of their communities - closure would have an adverse effect on the demographics and viability of villages.	109
Closing rural schools is contrary to government guidelines to protect them.	33
Village schools have the fewest spare places and the best SAT results – this proves smaller schools work.	29
Village/rural schools should remain open.	31
Schools should be in walking distance – closing Hart & Elwick would stop this and make children travel further and increase traffic congestion as well as carbon footprints and not all families have transport.	39
No justification provided in option to close Hart or Elwick Hall – in no way do they hit any triggers of performance, surplus places or condition.	15
Closing Hart/Elwick is not consistent with the “every child matters philosophy”!	8
Extend Hart/Elwick Primary schools to allow pupils from other areas to attend.	7
No justification given to keep Jesmond Road open. Impact is to punish high performing schools like Hart & Elwick	1
The 4 Labour Cabinet members should not be allowed to have a say on the outcome of PCP after publically endorsing the closure of Hart & Elwick	1
Hart & Elwick - Closure	
Close either Elwick or Hart – send the pupils to one rural school.	1
Close Jesmond Road, Hart & Elwick and build a school at Bishop Cuthbert (Also listed under Jesmond Road)	1
Close Hart most pupils do not live in Hart	1

Hart Primary	
Hart should remain open.	7
5 schools in Area 2 are in far worse condition than Hart, yet they are not under threat of closure.	2
Closing Hart Primary would deprive the village of an extended facility	1
Hart should become a C of E school and federate with Elwick Hall.	1
No logical reason to propose closure of Hart Primary.	4
Extend Hart to include Elwick and West Park.	1
Elwick Hall C of E Primary	
Elwick Hall has strong links with church and they should remain	1
Elwick Hall should remain the same size	1
Elwick Hall's SAT results are excellent	4
If Elwick Hall closes where is the nearest C of E alternative?	1
Retain current age mix at Elwick Hall	1
Bishop Cuthbert – No New School	
No need for a new school at Bishop Cuthbert – Clavering, Hart and Throston have sufficient spaces to take these children – invest in them not a new school.	41
No new school build needed (at Bishop Cuthbert) if built it would be at the expense of rural schools.	23
Why waste money building an un-necessary school at Bishop Cuthbert – existing schools have sufficient capacity to absorb the pupils. Divert any funding to support those schools.	11
As residents of Bishop Cuthbert I do not want a school – my children are happy at their present school which was our choice.	4
Why reduce school places in schools adjacent to Bishop Cuthbert & then propose to build a new school?	1
No new school at Bishop Cuthbert – it would split Throston & Bishop Cuthbert communities.	3
A new school would ruin the community spirit	1

Bishop Cuthbert – New Build	
Build a new (210 place) school at Bishop Cuthbert to serve the expanding area.	27
Move Throston School to Bishop Cuthbert (Hart residents)	2
Jesmond Road - Closure	
Close Jesmond Road it is a failing school in a failing area which ticks all of the boxes; failing standards, high surplus places, poor quality building (TS26 or 27) and move pupils to other schools with surplus places.	21
Close Jesmond Road, Hart & Elwick and build a school at Bishop Cuthbert	1
Lynnfield & Jesmond Road should be joined together	3
Close Jesmond Road move pupils to Brougham, Lynnfield and or Throston	1
Close Jesmond Road and build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert	1
Jesmond Road - General	
Building a new school at Jesmond Road is clearly needed.	9
Support Jesmond Road as it has far greater issues – don't close Hart & Elwick	2
Jesmond Road will need a new school once the Trinity Square and other new housing is complete.	2
New school for Jesmond Road on current site.	1
Jesmond Road & Sacred Heart	
Jesmond Rd & Sacred Heart should be joined together on the same site.	1
Co-locating Jesmond Road and Sacred Heart onto the proposed site will not work unless the site is expanded & traffic issues resolved.	2
Proposed site for Sacred Heart & Jesmond Road far too small and co-locating 2 schools will cause massive traffic problems.	2
Different faith schools sharing the same facilities will not work.	2
Build a single school on Sacred Heart or Jesmond Road site.	1

Sacred Heart	
New Sacred Heart school should be built on vacated Jesmond Road site	2
Sacred Heart should be built at Bishop Cuthbert. Sacred Heart site could be used for a smaller (Jesmond Road) school.	7
Sacred Heart should be built up and remain on its present site.	5
Ridiculous to build a new school on present Sacred Heart site – already congested.	3
Reducing numbers at Sacred Heart would reduce parental choice.	1
Springwell site should be used to build a new Sacred Heart school	1
Close Sacred Heart and move children to Jesmond Road	1
Children from a non-catholic background should not be allowed into Sacred Heart they would dilute the catholic ethos.	1
Throston Primary	
Throston is an excellent school	1
West Park Primary	
West Park needs a new school – preferably to accommodate more pupils – current buildings are totally inadequate for present role.	15
West Park needs a lot of money spending on it to bring it up to standard	5
Why increase West Park – leave it as it is.	2
Why wasn't the correct condition information applied to West Park's Area Booklet – our pupils are just as important as children in other areas	6
Improvements to West Park's condition are not documented.	3

Investment	
Well performing schools should be supported not closed	36
	45
Money should be spent on upgrading existing buildings and services - not closing schools.	43
Invest in existing schools by allocating funding for refurbishment – existing schools can take on additional pupils without need to build new schools.	13
	10
Spend money on deprived areas and low performing schools to improve their standards.	
Invest in smaller schools with smaller class sizes – they work better!	
Miscellaneous	
A new school isn't able to guarantee to perform any better than an existing school	36
Need to maintain church links– the option of closing a school that has a clear Christian ethos should not be there and it would restrict parental choice to have a faith education	10
Road crossing at Throston Grange Lane & access to Bishop Cuthbert due to closure of Falcon Road need resolving.	4
Small schools are more personalised. Children learn better.	4
The Labour Group's published view seems to prove in spite of the 'consultation' this is a done deal	4
Close underperforming.	4
Underperforming schools are being proposed to stay open at the expense of better performing ones	1
There are underlying political reasons for closing rural schools	1
Eldon Grove needs a new hall and sports facilities	1
Traffic problems around most primary schools need resolving.	1
Co-location is all about cost cutting – ALL schools should be on a single site.	2

**Primary Capital Programme – Stage 2 Consultation
Area 2 Letter Analysis**

Comments made in letter	No of same comment
Elwick/Hart (101 letters)	
Losing the village schools means losing the heart of the community	33
Government objectives for the future of education are already being achieved at Elwick and Hart	25
Children need to be able to walk to school	14
Further travel would increase family's fuel costs and also their carbon footprints	12
Closure of the two village schools would mean increased traffic flow into other areas of the town	11
Close links with the local church will be lost if there is a closure	11
Moving Children will have a damaging impact on their education	8
Young children flourish better in smaller schools	8
Small rural schools are at the heart of their communities	7
Bishop Cuthbert should have its own school but not at the detriment of Elwick and Hart	6
Closure of the school would mean that young families would not move into Elwick	5
The closing of Hart and Elwick will leave a number of areas isolated without easy access to a primary school	4
The ethos and enthusiasm are traditions that have been developed over time and should not be destroyed	4
Borough Council would incur more costs as travelling would have to be paid for	3
Both sites are considered prime development land	3
Cost of building a new school is far more than upgrading	3
Village businesses rely on the existence of a sustainable village community - removing the school will impact on local businesses	3
Higher standards are achieved due to the ratio of staff to pupils	3
Pupils benefit from the nurturing environment of the schools and their community	2
Closure would mean a journey of three miles for very young children to attend another school	2
Is rural transport really a sustainable option?	1
How would school transport work for children who do half days?	1

Children who have to bussed into schools cannot take part in extended services	1
Rural schools are based on team building and building people for the future	1
Closing Hart and Elwick would create two deprived communities and not address deprived communities.	1
Building a new school at Bishop Cuthbert would be at the expense of four other communities	1
The learning environment at these schools is unique and cannot be replicated	1
If children had to travel to other schools their 'school day' would be far too long	1
If Hart closes we will lose the village field which is our only community space	1
The nature orientated setting of these schools is motivational and conducive to pupil development	1
West Park (1 letter)	
Why increase the numbers given no major increase in intake?	1
Buildings are in desperate need of regeneration and this is not mentioned in your options	1
The cost of a new build would be offset by the cost of bringing the school up to standard	1
This is a deprived school in an affluent area	1
Throston (2 letters)	
Building a new school at Bishop Cuthbert would be detrimental to the community cohesion that has been developed by the school over recent years	2
A new school would destroy the social mix of children at Throston	1
Increase in numbers can be accommodated within existing schools	1
Eldon Grove (2 letters)	
Highest percentage of unsuitable teaching areas in Hartlepool	2
No area large enough to bring whole school together	2

Sacred Heart (2 letters)	
Jesmond Rd and Sacred Heart in one building on one site would mean 777 children in one building.	1
Catholic beliefs would be compromised	1
Major traffic concerns with two schools on the designated site	1
Sacred Heart would be reduced to Jesmond Roads level of standards	1
Alternative option – build Sacred Heart on a more central site between St Joseph's Parish and St Thomas More's Parish	1
Alternative option – Sacred Heart rebuild on Jesmond Road reserved site and new build at Bishop Cuthbert for Hart, Elwick and Jesmond Road	1
Alternative option – Sacred Heart rebuild at Bishop Cuthbert, keep Hart and Elwick and rebuild Jesmond Road on the reserved site	1
Co-location will not retain the ethos of the school	1
Jesmond Road (1 letter)	
Maintain a school in a deprived area	1
Smaller classes will have a positive impact on education	1

AREA 2 Meeting Summary

Clavering Primary

Not being in an additionally funded area our budgets are very tight and limits our ability to allow for much movement in pupil numbers.

It is wrong to close the village schools, villages should have an identity.

The options suggest that there will be travelling issues. There needs to be a travel plan initiative in place.

If Hart was to close, Clavering would need to increase its intake.

It would be much easier to manage the school with 345 pupils rather than 310

Clavering & Hart could form a federation and share resources

Elwick Hall Primary

People send their children to Elwick to access a Church of England faith school for its ethos

Building a new school at Bishop Cuthbert will make matters worse for other schools other than Hart & Elwick

There are concerns that this is all about the economics of village schools

PCP money could be better spent on existing schools, like Jesmond Road rather than building a new school that is not needed – surplus places proves that

Building an unwanted new school will prove to be a large drain on available monies at the expense of existing schools

The consultation is already having an impact on our admissions list

One of the reasons Elwick Hall is oversubscribed is because of the church ethos

Current Government guidance is to protect rural schools. The option to close Hart & Elwick contradicts that policy.

It is perverse to close two high achieving schools and then build a new one to address surplus places – (this view agreed by the whole audience)

Hart & Elwick fits both the statutory guidance on rural schools and the local authority vision.

The community has strong attachments to this school

Elwick Hall is the only C of E school in this area of the town and it can be demonstrated that there is a need for the school. The same cannot be said for the option to build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert especially when Clavering & Throston have 129 surplus places between them.
Closing village schools and busing pupils to other schools will make offering extended services extremely difficult.
Extended services are for the benefit of the community – closing Elwick Hall will not meet the needs of the community.
We want our children to be able to walk to school safely, closing Elwick Hall and moving to another school will take that away from us.
Closing this school will have a major impact on the community of Elwick – ripping the heart out of the village
Larger schools don't work – look at Jesmond Road
Hart Primary
It was unanimously agreed that Option 2 would be the preferred option as it addresses all of the points raised in PCP.
There should be investment in other schools, such as Throston & Clavering rather than closing two of the best schools in the town.
This school is oversubscribed with many parents choosing to travel from outside of the area.
Hart & Elwick take from as wide an area as Greatham, yet you are not considering any changes there.
Clavering, Throston and the proposed new school at Bishop Cuthbert would all be too close together.
You should look at poor performing schools and address the issues there before you propose building any new schools or close schools including Hart.
What is the relevance of the Government's agenda on rural schools on this consultation? This school is full, it does not need repairs, and it does not fall into any of the criteria that you have to cover. Rural schools are not to be closed without very good reason. There are no reasons to close Hart.
The demographics show that people attend from outside the village but this should not be a pointer for closure. Faith schools have pupils attending from all across the town.

If a school was built to accommodate 420 pupils it would be very close to the "retirement village" what about the impact on access to that. If Hart and Elwick close, the traffic will increase into Bishop Cuthbert.

There is no information available showing that moving children into a bigger 420 place school at Bishop Cuthbert will be beneficial or indeed give children a first class education.

A new state of the art school cannot replace two near perfect schools. It is people that count not just bricks and mortar.

If you want to build a new school at Bishop Cuthbert then you should close either Clavering or Throston as they are closer.

Jesmond Road

The last thing we want is other schools having a 'pop' at us. We are happy but if other people's views are taken into sole account – it is not fair.

It should be noted that this year's SAT's results for English & Math's combined is 73%, the reason for our low standards in the past is not down to the quality of teaching but intake of children unfortunately people don't look at or understand the Contextual Value Added (CVA) score.

The map shows how close pupils live to the school which indicates how much the school is an integral part of the community.

A number of issues/suggestions were made:

- Jesmond Road co-located with Sacred Heart and have separate school buildings with shared facilities. Taking into account there would be 700 pupils, there would be a huge amount of traffic problems.
- The new site has been looked at using Google Earth. There seems to be some allotments that are not used. Could the Council compulsory purchase these allotments and possibly double the size of the proposed site? A new road infrastructure could also then be developed which makes more sense.
- Compulsory purchase the two houses which are in between our existing school and car park? The school could be rebuilt on the car park and the existing school site used as the field. It would seem the reserved site is not big enough for one school never mind two.
- It must be recognised that this school could be developed further, especially to the north and west, the two houses next to the school, which are surrounded by the school, could be purchased and this would allow the school to be expanded. The school building could be demolished to make way for the playing field area. Sacred Heart could be then built on our reserved site.

Building a new school, other than making a serious dent in the money available would have little impact on the Government's criteria of deprivation and surplus numbers.

The present reserved site would need to be assessed as to whether two separate buildings could be located on to the site. The whole allotment site may be used with one school at one end toward Thornhill Gardens and the other at the Jesmond Road end.

Sacred Heart should be moved to a new school at Bishop Cuthbert or combine St Cuthbert's and Sacred Heart onto one site at St Cuthbert's. Alternatively if Springwell School is moving to the Brierton site could their site not be used by Sacred Heart. After all catholic children already travel greater distances to school.

Elwick Primary should be retained as it is a proper village school with the majority of its pupils coming from close by. Hart on the other hand is far less of a village school with only 28 of its pupils coming from the village and because of its close proximity to other schools it should be closed and its pupils relocated to the other schools like Throston & Clavering

Sacred Heart

Do not believe co-location site is of sufficient size for two schools. Would suggest as an alternative would be to build up the present Sacred Heart site to free up ground space. The present school site could be remodelled to create much more space.

Reducing pupil numbers will have an effect on funding which in turn will lead to job losses and a lack of parental preference.

The building of a community school at Bishop Cuthbert would seriously affect Throston Primary and increase surplus places. Sacred Heart could be transferred to a new build at Bishop Cuthbert which would not impact on the other schools in the area and allow Hart & Elwick to remain open.

We need a Roman Catholic school in this area providing a good catholic education reducing numbers will reduce the schools ability to offer that education.

We need to keep the ethos of this school. This reserved site should be large enough to allow us to pull up the drawbridge.

Co-locating two relatively large primary schools onto one small site would not solve the traffic congestion and parking problems. If the reserved site is the one that was cleared 25 years ago for one school it would not be large enough to house two separate schools

We do not want to lose our school's ethos – a shared building would do that.

Access into the Bishop Cuthbert has been reduced recently with the council deciding to close Falcon Road – moving a school such as Sacred Heart with its town wide catchment area would seriously hamper access.

Sacred Heart is the only school with no spare places in the 10 year projections. We are currently full to capacity and projected to remain that way. The facilities on this site are poor; we are a land locked site with no room to expand except upwards. Moving the school to improve facilities would be a sensible option provided it was to the right location. The ethos of this school goes well beyond its boundaries. Sacred Heart and Jesmond Road would not sit well together.

The Bishop Cuthbert development is by no means the finished article – the number of children eventually living there is still an unknown quantity although Bishop Cuthbert is crying out for community facilities and a school could provide that.

Car ownership would be an issue. The proportion of car ownership must be higher at Bishop Cuthbert than around this area. The walking distance for pupils in this locality would be a problem if they had to travel to Bishop Cuthbert.

730 pupils accessing same site is a non starter and co-locating two schools with a different ethos will give rise to conflicts.

The Labour Party has recently produced a document which spells out their vision for primary education. The majority of the cabinet are members of the Labour party how then can this be anything but a flawed consultation? I believe some other schools are seeking legal advice.

How will our views be listened to, the decision makers didn't listen to the overwhelming opinion of those Bishop Cuthbert residents who opposed the closure of Falcon Road.

This is pretend consultation – the decisions already been made.

It is a concern that Sacred Heart is the only school of the 9 in Area 2 being moved.

(C of G) I would table the following option for consideration: Move Sacred Heart to a new build at Bishop Cuthbert. Build a smaller Jesmond Road school on Sacred Heart site and sell Jesmond Road's current and reserved sites for development.

A new school should be built at Bishop Cuthbert for Hart, Elwick and Jesmond Road. The vast majority of Hart pupils do not live in the village, it caters for a minority and there are sufficient places in the other schools and more so if a school is built at Bishop Cuthbert.

There is a disadvantage at being the only catholic school out of 9 in Area 2 –this is not fair.

Throston Primary School

A new school at Bishop Cuthbert is a major concern as any new build is going to impact on pupil numbers attending Throston, 45% of our reception pupils come from Bishop Cuthbert. If there are surplus places in neighbouring primary schools, why spend money building new schools? The money would be better spent on the schools which already exist.

We have worked very hard to have a 2 class intake so we don't have mixed year groups. Most of the options take the numbers down. The Local Authority's aims and vision for the future is that they don't want mixed year groups.

Bishop Cuthbert isn't a separate estate it is part of Throston which has been embraced by the Throston ethos.

If a new school was built it would split the community. 'Bishop Cuthbert – middle class/private and Throston – council estate'. At the moment the children are mixing very well

Rumours are circulating that a new C of E school will be built on Bishop Cuthbert that will feed into St Hild's school, which is a concern to Throston.

A primary school's role is to be at the heart of the community. Throston has worked very hard and been very successful in fulfilling that role.

A brand new school does not necessarily mean it will be a good school.

The analysis projects places in AREA 2 for 2017 is 2740, that's only a difference of 4 pupils that the area has now (2736) so why the options for changes?

The access to Throston is poor. A new crossing patrol is required with improved transport links.

It should be made clear very early which secondary school the Bishop Cuthbert primary would be a feeder to – parents should be told their children won't automatically go to High Tunstall which is the assumption they are making.

A new school at Bishop Cuthbert would be detrimental to Throston and would have massive implications not least on the children as it would split the community into private and public housing.

West Park Primary

There is a grave error in omitting West Park's suitability and conditions from the options, which tends to suggest it was a deliberate omission.

I believe West Park is slightly out of the loop. The seven Head Teachers do not represent the views of this school; no one within this group has recognised the needs of West Park.

There is a worry we have fallen off the option list. How can we make a decision when we do not have a clear picture with the omission of our condition and suitability from the options page.
Demand for places at West Park is high; there is an expectation that a larger percentage of the pot will be available to do a lot more with the school.
If nothing is done shortly and money spent on the necessary work highlighted in the Condition Survey will soon become the essential work. Conditions are not fair.
Unless major work or a new build is undertaken an increase to 420 pupils would create major problems within school especially providing school meals, movement around school and in transforming education. There are already accessibility problems at the school which would need to be addressed
Deprived areas already receive additional funding from other sources to address issues why then is the PCP funding also favouring them.
Historically West Park has always felt it was getting a raw deal with funding. It is a matter of record that Jesmond Road is given far more money per pupil than West Park. Why should pupils at Jesmond Road receive more funding than pupils at West Park? That skews funding.
A two form entry would be much better for the school. Mixed classes are causing problems for managing the school.
Based on the figures in the AREA booklet Jesmond Road should be an option to close. Hart & Elwick should remain open and no school at Bishop Cuthbert.
Options are biased against the most affluent areas and successful schools.
Refurbishing schools would allow more schools to benefit rather than a select few. It must be more cost effective and make better use of the available resources.
More effort should be placed on improving standards in all schools. This would give all children the same opportunity. It is natural for parents to want their children to go to a successful school. Improving standards would balance the demand across schools.
Recent funding changes suggest there is an issue of mistrust. There is a disappointment that no councillors have attended tonight's meeting.
The option tabled in relation to Hart & Elwick goes against the government's stand on closing village schools.
We would expect to see some elected representatives at the next stage of consultation?

West Park could fill these additional places twice over – the obvious answer is to build us a new school.

Transport should be part of the consultation.

Nº2 AREA 2

David C Fanthorpe
Vice Chair of Governors
Elwick Hall Voluntary Aided C o E Primary School

16th July 2008

Mr Paul Briggs
Assistant Director Children's Services
Schools Transformation Project Director

Copies to:

Steve McDonnell, Head Teacher, Hart and Elwick Primary Schools
Rev. Cannon Sheila Bamber, Director of Education, Diocese of Durham
Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services, Hartlepool
Mayor Drummond, Elected Mayor of Hartlepool
Ian Wright MP

Dear Paul,

Primary Capital Project Options

At the joint Elwick and Hart Governing Body Meeting of 8th July 2008, I was empowered to write to you and your team to express the considered and unanimous view of the Elwick Governing Body on the Options within the Primary Capital Project.

It is the strong unanimous view that this Governing Body recommend Option 2 as the way forward in Area Two and that under no circumstances should Options 4 and 5 be pursued. The reasons for this recommendation are as follows.

Option 2 would maintain the two excellent schools in Elwick and Hart while addressing the pressing needs of Jesmond Road. It is this Governing Body's view that a rebuild of Jesmond Road and combination with Sacred Heart on a new site would wipe the slate clean and provide an excellent new start for Jesmond Road while preserving all that is good in Area Two.

Elwick School meets and exceeds the criteria for Standards with, currently, 100% of children reaching Level 4. It is also fully subscribed and a very popular school, attracting some pupils from all over Hartlepool whose parents have clearly demonstrated a confidence in and preference for the school in exercising their choice.

Elwick is a village school and together with St. Peter's Church, at the heart of its community with a very clear village identity. The School is part of who they are and to remove the school would be to rip out the heart of this village community. The community cares very deeply about its School and for many with young children, it is one of the main reasons they are there. As evidence of that caring, the community at large raised some £14,000 to build one of the first dedicated computer rooms in Hartlepool Primary Schools in 1999. They did not do this with large donations. It was painstakingly done with Coffee Mornings, Raffles, Fetes and BBQs, and it was done

with deep affection and, more importantly, deep respect for the School and what it achieves with the children.

Elwick is also a designated Rural School by the Ministry for Schools and Learning in their Statutory Guidance on Rural Schools. That Statutory Guidance, reiterated as late as January 2008 by Jim Knight MP, Minister of State for Schools and Learners says unequivocally that there is "a presumption against closing rural schools". It says further, and I quote, that the local authority "must have regard to the presumption and also take account of several other factors when considering proposals to close a rural school. These include transport availability and cost, alternatives to closure and the impact on the community. Authorities will also want to take school performance into account as our policy is that local authorities should support popular and successful schools." And yet elsewhere "We encourage authorities to look at other options available to them and their schools, for example by promoting shared governance arrangements between small primary schools ----." (All my underscores.)

Since January 2007, Elwick and Hart have shared a Head Teacher and have worked together in collaboration holding joint Governing Body meetings on a regular basis. The very first of those joint Governing Body meetings in January of 2007 commissioned and authorised a subcommittee to look at the feasibility of full federation between Hart and Elwick. That subcommittee has done its work carefully and sensitively and at the joint Governing Body Meeting of 8th July 2008, recommended full federation to the Governing Bodies. Their recommendation was accepted enthusiastically and unanimously by the Joint Governing Bodies and plans made to ratify the decision at individual Governing Body meetings in early September 2008, followed by ratification at a Joint Governing Body meeting and consultation, all as required by regulations. Every single Governor of both schools endorsed the decision to proceed to full federation, with no dissenters and no abstentions. In the light of this vote on 8th July 2008, I can confidently say we will proceed to federation as fast as regulation and proper consultation allow, providing that external consultation does not want the federation to take place.

So, against Jim Knight MP's statutory guidance:-

We are a demonstrably popular and fully subscribed school

We are a successful school with 100% of children achieving Level 4

and should, therefore, be supported by the Authority according to the Statutory Guidance

We have been at the forefront of education initiatives for the last ten years with one of the first dedicated Computer Rooms in Hartlepool, fully functional in 2000, funded by the community, and currently one of only 5 primary schools in Hartlepool to join the Communication Project

We are well along the road to shared governance under a full federation with Hart, subject only to consultation and we are a significant element in the community.

It seems to the Elwick Governing Body that not only do we meet and exceed all the criteria for a presumption against closure, but that in our popularity, progress and success we should, together with Hart, be beacons in the settled future of the Local Authority's education system.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "David C. Fanthorpe". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

David C Fanthorpe
Vice Chair of Governors
Elwick Hall Voluntary Aided C o E Primary School
For the Elwick Governing Body

Elwick Action Group A Better Way Forward: Primary Capital Programme A Strategy for Area 2

Summary of Position

Elwick Action Group:

- Fundamentally opposes, under any circumstances, the closure of either Elwick Hall or Hart Primary Schools.
- Appreciates the dedication, professionalism and quality of all staff members associated with both schools and recognises their efforts in retaining normality at this very difficult time.
- Celebrates that both schools continue to be in the top ten performing primary schools in Hartlepool with outstanding results exceeding the national average at Key Stage 2.
- Believes that both schools are at the heart of their communities.
- Understands that the closure of Elwick Hall or Hart Primary goes against a significant amount of local, regional and national policies and guidance.
- Believes that the aims of the Primary Capital Programme can be achieved without closing any school in Area 2.
- Urges Hartlepool Borough Council, the Mayor and his Cabinet to use the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 to amend the requirements of national government to better suit the needs of Area 2.
- Believes, in the interests of transparency, fairness and natural justice, that the Mayor should be mindful of the party political implications arising from the paper "The Way Forward: Primary Capital Programme" produced by the Hartlepool Labour Group.

This document will expand and highlight the reasons why we believe that it is incongruous to close two high performing schools, without surplus places, to achieve a reduction in surplus places and improve standards.

Additionally we will use government policy to demonstrate where Hartlepool Borough Council has opportunities to enhance educational provision in Area 2.

Background

Elwick Action Group was formed as a direct consequence of the threat of closure of the Elwick Hall Church of England Primary School and that of our sister school in Hart, Hart Primary School. It consists of representatives from groups and associations with an affinity to Elwick and Dalton Piercy.

The organisations represented on the Action Group are: Elwick Parish Council, Dalton Piercy Parish Council, Friends of Elwick School, Elwick Millennium Association, Elwick Women's Institute, Elwick Parochial Church Council, Elwick Business Group, Elwick Young Farmers Club, Elwick Art Group, Elwick Flower Club, Elwick Over 60's, Elwick Card Group, Dalton Piercy Village Hall Association, Elwick Parent & Toddler Group, St. Peters Ladies Fellowship.

The threat of closure arises from the Primary Capital Programme (PCP) decision to list within its five options for Area 2, an option to close Elwick and two options to close Hart.

The rationale so far suggested for closure is as ambiguous as *"The Project Board decided as a result of stage 1 consultation" to "assessing the need for a new school in Bishop Cuthbert"*.

We have endeavoured to use source material wherever possible, and have deliberately attempted to steer away from emotive arguments, to offer thought through and reasoned arguments as to why Elwick and Hart should remain open.

We have also taken in good faith, words from Paul Briggs (Director of the Programme) and his colleague Peter McIntosh (Programme Manager) that this is a consultation process and that, as yet, no decisions have been made.

We would, however, like to point out that the Labour Group Paper *"The Way Forward: Primary Capital Program"* is disturbing in that, without any supporting references they state *"The Labour Group believes that in respect of Hart and Elwick closure presents the best option in terms of long term viability of town wide primary school provision"* and we believe this statement potentially prejudices all Labour Group Members.

We therefore call on the Mayor to be mindful of the party political motivations and implications arising from the paper when discussions and decisions about Area 2 take place.

Speaking at the public meetings of 2nd and 3rd July 2008 at Hart and Elwick Primary Schools, we welcome the words of Paul Briggs that there is no requirement to close either school to access the funding and that both schools are viable.

This document seeks to address and revoke any notion that Elwick or Hart should close; we trust it has the desired outcome.

Introduction

Elwick Hall Primary School

Elwick Hall Primary School is a Voluntary Aided Church of England Primary School based in Elwick Village. It has children from a large geographic catchment area including the villages of Elwick and Dalton Piercy, across the westerly side of the A19 with children from our farming communities and other children from throughout Hartlepool, whose parents have exercised their parental preference entitlement for religious and other purposes.

Statistically only a handful of children who are within catchment do not attend the school, for reasons of faith and insufficient places at the school.

The school takes children from 3 years old in the brand new £300k nursery as part of the Foundation Stage and is the only child care provision in the village.

The number on roll is approximately 105 children with no surplus spaces.

The school is performing well and has Key Stage 2 results, above the national average, of 100% for English, 93.3% for Maths and 93.3% for Science at Level 4.

Moreover, as a Church of England School, its pupils are instilled with the Christian ethos of caring, sharing and being good citizens.

The school is valued by many in the community and has the support of the Parish Council, the Elwick Millennium Association and the Friends of Elwick School as well as the Durham Diocese.

Elwick Hall Primary School is the very essence of a successful primary school based at the heart of the community it serves.

Hart Primary School

Although not a Church of England School, Hart Primary School shares with Elwick many of its underlying values. Hart also takes the significant majority of catchment children and again has parents exercising their right to choose Hart as a preferred school.

Hart produces excellent Key Stage 2 results with 92.9% English, 92.9% Maths and 92.9% Science at Level 4.

Joint Working

The two schools have recently moved closer with the sharing of a Head Teacher and a number of cross site activities for children and staff alike.

This sharing of outlook, resources and commitment means more than improved educational achievement for our pupils; it also means increasing financial efficiency.

Given that neither Elwick or Hart are in receipt of additional funding from such sources as NDC, Working Neighbourhoods and Excellence in Cities, and that there isn't the cross subsidy or joint funding opportunities of having a Sure Start or Children's Centre on a common site, this efficiency is paramount in getting the best possible education out of a relatively tight budget.

It can be seen that from stage 1 consultation there is little doubt that the value of Elwick (and similar) schools was already being promoted by the respondents. We can speculate as to how we got to the point we are, where the closures of Elwick and Hart Schools are options for Area 2, however it wouldn't be helpful.

Schools Transformation Project Board

Having analysed all the minutes published on the [www.hartlepool.gov.uk] website, the first comment of note is on 02/04/2008

"PB... It was noted that primary schools being at the heart of the community was a theme that would continue to run right through PCP and option development."

In the meeting of 07/05/2008, despite there being 29 individual points made about individual schools, standards, process and so on there is not one mention of Elwick or Hart.

In the minutes of 02/06/2008, for Area 2, there is only a mention of the Fens.

This lack of transparency as to how Elwick and Hart are options to close requires investigation as, so far, the answers received are, at best, "buck-passing", at worst evasive.

Finally, within the PSFC Master Copy pages 8 and 9

"Area 2 does not have excess surplus places overall, but there is a need to address significant over-capacity in one particular school which also has issues in terms of condition, suitability and standards"... "...we are considering the provision of a new primary school of 11e, 1.5fe or 2fe within the new and developing Bishop Cuthbert area of the town; the size of this school, if provided, will have an impact on the size and viability of other schools in the area."

It is unfortunate that the Local Authority are trying to resolve obvious issues in Jesmond Road School (below average KS2 results and surplus places) and Clavering School (in Special Measures) by closing two highly performing village primary schools.

Policy contradictions

Given that the stated aim of the PCP is to "address the condition and suitability of school buildings, remove excess surplus places and raise achievement..." we will use the following section to demonstrate how the closure of Elwick and Hart will not contribute to this, but moreover how the closure of the schools directly contradicts policy and guidance across a whole range of other issues, which should have been addressed prior to this consultation taking place.

- Elwick and Hart Schools are essentially full; they do not have surplus places.
- The schools are in relatively good physical condition and are easily upgradeable to 21st century standards with funding through PCP.
- Elwick and Hart Schools continually achieve excellent Key Stage 2 results.

Additionally:

i) [GUIDANCE OF LOCAL DECISION MAKING ON STATUTORY PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES IN SCHOOL ORGANISATION] (DfEE)

"The need to preserve access to a local school in rural communities - in effect a presumption against the closure of rural schools. This does not mean that no rural school should ever close, but that the case for closure should be strong and the proposals clearly in the best interests of educational provision in the area.

The transport implications of rural school closures. These include: The welfare of children; the recurrent cost of the LEA in transporting pupils to schools (there is a statutory requirement that free public transport be provided to primary school pupils living more than 2 miles away from the school); the effects on road traffic congestion and finally, the environmental costs of pupils travelling further to school. The guidance states that proposals should not lead to 'unreasonable' extended journey times, and should be considered against Government objectives to reduce traffic congestion and promote alternatives to the car. Re-organisation proposals are required to consider the quality of the transport links between the communities served by the school and the site of the alternative provision. The guidance does not suggest that potential impacts on users (such as the increased travel time for pupils or parents) or environmental costs associated with proposals should be quantified for the purpose of assessing different options.

The overall effect on the community of closure of the village school (particular reference is made to areas receiving regeneration funding)

The effect of the proposed change on the standard of education to be provided

Parental preference (there is a requirement for consultation)

The need for the cost-effective removal of surplus places

Evidence that options for maintaining community facilities in the area have been considered (including that the views of the local police, Government Offices and RDAs with responsibility for the New Deal for Communities have been taken into account)

The need for any additional particular kind of provision

The impact of the closure on the balance on denominational and non-denominational provision

The most effective ways of ensuring that appropriate Special Educational Needs support is delivered to pupils - both in terms of providing access to the curriculum and ensuring that schools are physically accessible.

Specific additional factors are also identified that must be given particular attention in deciding on proposals to close rural schools:

- The accessibility of alternative schools
- The standard of the school and the standards of alternative schools
- The overall supply of school places in the area and the likely future demand for places
- The overall effect of the closure on the local community
- The cost implications of the possible options
- Any points made by the school proposed for closure
- The views of parents and other interested parties
- The effect on the school journey, including long-term transport costs, and whether the closure will result in more pupils experiencing longer journeys to school and more pupils being driven to school by car.

Using the criteria given, Elwick and Hart should not close as they are effectively full, produce excellent results at KS2, provide essential services to the local community and there has been no additional information given to demonstrate a compelling reason for closure.

We question why, given the presumption against closure, two out of the four realistic options for Area 2 include the closure of a rural school and that closure would mean only one rural school remaining in Hartlepool (Greatham), a reduction of two thirds.

ii) [SMALL SCHOOLS: HOW WELL ARE THEY DOING?] (OFSTED)

"When the results of the National Curriculum tests are aggregated for all pupils, the proportions of pupils achieving levels 2 and 4 at the end of key stages 1 and 2 respectively, are significantly higher in small schools compared to all other schools. For example, in the 1999 National Curriculum English tests, pupils in small schools at Key Stage 2 achieved about seven percentage points better than the average score for pupils in all other sizes of school."

"In terms of the overall quality of education, inspections show that pupils in small schools are not disadvantaged in comparison with those in larger schools because of the size of school. Small schools are equally capable of providing an effective education and many are among the most effective in the country."

"Small schools are able to cope with the demands of teaching the full National Curriculum. It is a tribute to the commitment of teachers in small schools that, by and large, they are able to teach the full range of knowledge, skills and understanding required by every subject in the National Curriculum. Teachers in small schools work hard to make sure that their teaching is not impaired by a lack of subject knowledge; they are also extremely adept at harnessing the skills of other adults who can complement the expertise of the permanent staff."

"The mixed-age classes which most larger schools prefer to avoid are, of course, unavoidable in small schools. The teaching in small schools can be just as effective as in larger schools, although it is a particular challenge to provide a high quality experience for the youngest pupils. Small schools usually have smaller classes, a factor which works in the teacher's favour to offset some of the problems of teaching a wide age range, particularly at Key Stage 1. The teachers also know their pupils very well, often teaching them for more than one year, and by working with small groups there is plenty of scope to achieve a good balance of direct teaching and independent working."

"The good ethos of the great majority of small schools is one of their strengths. Inspections invariably describe very good provision for the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils, especially in church schools. Close links with parents and the

community also contribute strongly to the ethos of small schools. The best small schools recognise the dangers of isolation and are energetic in developing educational, cultural and business links with other places and schools, both in the UK and abroad."

"Not surprisingly, the provision for spiritual development is better in small schools with close links with the church. Small schools in less advantaged areas that achieve well are often helped by their strong ethos to handle difficult pupils successfully and enable them to make good progress"

"There is much from the first cycle of inspections to encourage those who work in small schools. Higher unit costs notwithstanding, a good case emerges for the place of small schools in the education system as a whole, when the quality of their educational performance is added to the broader contribution they make to their communities."

Elwick and Hart both produce top class children with top class results; the closure of two outstanding village schools to improve performance is frankly absurd.

iii) [A LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY FOR HARTLEPOOL] (HBC)

p.32 "Main Issues

Public transport is perceived to be inadequate and too expensive. There are also issues of safety and shelter."

"Social exclusion impacts are compounded by poor public transport links."

p.32 "Strategic Actions • Where possible, provide local services at a community level."

p.33 "Safer Routes to School Safer Routes to School is a project aimed at improving safety and reducing casualties on the school journey. It encourages more parents and pupils to walk and cycle to school as alternatives to using the car. Benefits include reduced congestion and pollution, fewer cars on the roads and better long term health and fitness for all concerned."

Most children from the village walk to school; given the poor public transport provision to the village it would be very difficult for children to access extended provision, even if transport was provided to take children to school.

The closure of Elwick or Hart Schools will reduce the sustainability of each village and add to isolation.

iv) [HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP COMMUNITY STRATEGY] (Hartlepool Partnership)

p.8 "Our Principles – Coordination – organising services so that they support each other and are effective, efficient and economic."

p.13 Chapter 2 Lifelong Learning & Skills, Our Objectives

Early Years and Childcare

1. "To increase the quality and availability of **early years** support services, education and childcare."

Closure of either school will mean no nursery facilities in either village. The alternatives will be either to put a 3 year old on a bus or take them by car.

3. To raise achievement of all pupils...

Elwick and Hart are both high performing schools and are consistently in the top ten performing schools in the Borough.

8. To improve local facilities.

Closure of either school will remove facilities.

p.25 "Key Trends There is increasing recognition of the need to value communities in the Borough"

As stated in the Education White Paper, schools need to be at the heart of their communities; Elwick and Hart are already there, closure of either school would destabilise each community.

v) [AIMING HIGH FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: A TEN YEAR STRATEGY FOR POSITIVE ACTIVITIES] (Department for Children, Schools and Families & HM Treasury)

p.58 "4.58 Many young people have difficulty getting to the opportunities or services they want to access. Those who are reliant on public transport, particularly those who are disadvantaged or from rural areas, are often let down by an inadequate service or prohibited by its high cost".

Closing these two local schools will contribute still further to the isolation of young people in rural areas.

v) [PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 7 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS] (Department for Communities and Local Government formerly Office of the Deputy Prime Minister)

p. 7 1: "Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning land use planning. ...

(f) Decisions on development proposals should be based on sustainable development principles, ensuring an integrated approach to the consideration of:

- social inclusion, recognising the needs of everyone;
- maintaining high and stable levels of economic growth and employment."

Closing the schools will fundamentally go against sustainable development and will reduce employment opportunities for the lowest paid members of the school community; a knock-on effect will be to reduce trade in each of the village shops.

p.9 "Community services and facilities

6. People who live or work in rural areas should have reasonable access to a range of services and facilities. Local planning authorities should:

(i) through their LDDs, facilitate and plan for accessible new services and facilities, particularly where:

- planning permission is granted for new developments in country towns or other local service centres; or - settlements, or the population of their rural catchments, are expanding; or - there is an identified need for new or expanded services to strengthen the role of a particular local service centre.

(ii) where possible, ensure that new development in identified service centres is supported through improvements to public transport, and to walking and cycling facilities, provided in partnership with the developer where appropriate;

(iii) identify suitable buildings and development sites for community services and facilities to meet the needs of the whole community, including disabled users;

(iv) support mixed and multi-purpose uses that maintain community vitality; and

(v) support the provision of small-scale, local facilities (e.g. childcare facilities) to meet community needs outside identified local service centres, particularly where they would benefit those rural residents who would find it difficult to use more distant service centres. These local facilities should be located within or adjacent to existing villages and settlements where access can be gained by walking, cycling and (where available) public transport."

How can the closure of two schools be viewed as contributing to the sustainability of the rural areas? We argue that rather than trying to help the sustainability of Hartlepool's rural areas, this plan will accelerate their decline.

vii) [SOCIAL MOBILITY NARROWING SOCIAL CLASS EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT GAPS] [Supporting Materials to a speech by the Rt Hon Ruth Kelly MP Secretary of State for Education and Skills to the Institute for Public Policy Research] (Department for Education and Skills).

p.61 "Faith schools have positive CVA. Non faith have a negative CVA"

FSM pupils in faith schools make better progress than FSM pupils Non-faith schools

This states that Faith Schools have a better outcome for children, irrespective of background, and that Free School Meal children (used as proxy data regarding disadvantage) make better progress in Faith Schools. Closing Elwick would close a successful Faith School.

viii) [FAITH IN THE SYSTEM] [Department for Children Schools and Families]

p. 3 "The Government and the providers of schools with a religious character also recognise that many parents who are not of the faith of a particular faith school seek places in those schools because they value the ethos and character of the school."

p. 4 "the Government welcomes the contribution that schools with a religious character make to the school system – both as a result of their historical role and now as key players in contributing to the more diverse school system with greater opportunities for parental choice that we seek."

There is a real need to keep successful faith schools open to ensure a balance of schools to apply to; Elwick fulfils all the necessary criteria to be judged successful.

ix) [THE STATE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE 2007: LIVING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE] [Commission for Rural Communities]

p. 48 "Educational attainment at school

As in previous years, educational attainment for Key Stage 2 (ages 11 to 13) is slightly higher in rural areas as a whole than for urban. At KS2, the percentage of children achieving level 4 results exceeds the figure for urban areas in each of English, Maths and Science."

This reaffirms the quality of provision offered in village primary schools: Elwick and Hart are no different.

p. 147 "Social, economic and environmental sustainability

In one sense communities are sustainable until they are not sustainable

- "when what is being done cannot carry on indefinitely. Most definitions of sustainability also embed the concept that we should hand on to our children a world that is at least as liveable in as the one we have."

The closure of the two schools will directly lead to unsustainable villages.

x) [THE WAY AHEAD FOR RURAL SERVICES] A guide to good practice in locating rural services [Department for Environment & Rural Affairs]

p.13 "Modelling approaches

Approach 1 Ready reckoner

Use For decisions on smaller facilities, such as local community facilities, e.g. a local primary school.

Method

- 1) Develop a map-based zoning system for the area covering the facility and its catchment, including the location of the relevant alternative outlets.
- 2) Estimate the 'crow-fly' distances from the centre of each zone to the facility whose future is at issue and the alternatives.
- 3) Estimate the numbers from each zone currently using the facility to which the decision relates.
- 4) Calculate the effects of closure on the distances users travel on the assumption that they reassign themselves to the (next) nearest service outlet to their home when a facility closes.
- 5) Calculate the impact on costs per visit on the assumption that costs average £0.24 (figure from 2002 x3?) per km.
- 6) Calculate annual costs to users based on usage of the facility concerned.

Other considerations

Feasibility, cost and convenience of accessing alternative facilities by public transport. Effects on existing public transport facilities, e.g. loss or increase of customer base."

None of this information has been supplied, therefore the Local Authority are not following good practice guidelines.

p.18 "Assessing potential social and economic effects

3.6.1 Recommendations in the Rural White Paper encourage public service providers to consider the social and economic impact of service location decisions on market towns. The closure of a major facility (such as a hospital or school) may affect residents' shopping patterns and/or residential desirability. Local businesses may experience a decline in passing trade."

There has been no demonstration in the documentation that this has been considered, the drastic measure of closing a village school should have only been considered after all relevant studies have been done.

xi) CHOICE FOR PARENTS, THE BEST START FOR CHILDREN: A TEN YEAR STRATEGY FOR CHILDCARE (HM Treasury, Department for Education & Skills, Department of Work & Pensions, Department of Trade & Industry)

p. 4 "1.13 The Government's vision is for childcare services to be available to all families who want to use them. Childcare services will not look the same everywhere. They will need to be shaped by parents' needs which will vary according to whether they live in a rural or urban area, whether their child is pre-school or school age and whether parents work full- or part time. This will require a new approach to planning and delivering services. The role of the local authority will be crucial to ensure that services are developed according to local needs.

Services will be locally accountable, within a national framework."

The Government recognise that there are specific issues for rural communities; the Local Authority should also recognise this and so far they haven't.

p23 "3.17 Although the number of childcare places has increased significantly since 1997, some parents are still not able to find the childcare that they need. Places for pre-school children are more expensive than for school-age children, and places for school-age children are not always available in a way that fits conveniently with the school day and around parents' work patterns. Availability of places is patchy, especially in disadvantaged and particularly rural areas, and there is no guarantee to parents that they will be able to find a suitable childcare place."

This issue has been resolved in Elwick and Hart by having full nurseries within the Foundation Stage; the closure of the schools will remove child care places.

p.32 "4.17 Families with children have diverse needs. Parents may be working full-time, part time or not at all, and will need childcare arrangements that fit around these work and other commitments. They will have particular preferences about what kind of childcare is best for their child, and children may have particular childcare needs. The Government is committed to offering parents choices that respond to this diversity of needs and preferences, for example through offering a range of childcare options like group-based care, childminders, home childcare and after-school clubs."

The closure of Elwick and Hart nurseries will restrict parental choice.

p.70 **"School age children and childcare**

A.25 Evidence suggests that childcare for school age children is associated with improved outcomes for pupils and the wider community. The main evidence focuses on extended schools, which have the potential¹⁷ to generate benefits for pupils, families and communities. These can include improved pupil attainment – particularly at GCSE and Key Stage 3, attendance, behaviour and parental involvement. Co-location of services in schools is particularly important in rural areas, where creative ways of delivering services through schools and post offices can make a huge difference to those living in rural communities. International evidence¹⁹ also shows benefits for children as a result of extended services."

Given the success of Elwick and Hart Schools, it makes far more sense to invest in Elwick and Hart than to close them.

An Alternative Strategy

Whilst much of the information we have shared in this document is to reflect our desire that Elwick Hall and Hart Primary Schools should not close, we believe it is incumbent on all residents of Hartlepool to offer alternatives and to fully explain the rationale for them.

Below we outline our specific aspirations for Area 2.

We fully support the desire of the Local Authority to seek to gain as much of the potential investment of up to £50million to improve the quality of provision in primary education across the borough as possible, however we are mindful that it is not possible to build our way out of the problems we face.

We recommend that the Local Authority learn the lessons from the national Sure Start and Academy School failures, where too much concentration on buildings, and insufficient time (and in some cases resources) was spent on enabling an improvement to what took place within them.

We believe that where capital receipts are secured from the sale of genuinely spare land (recognising the need to retain open space for children to play on) all revenues generated should be ring-fenced for use in primary education, not necessarily to supplement this programme, but to invest in the quality of teaching and learning through the use of smaller class sizes, as the lower the pupil/teacher ratio, the more likely we are to improve standards *cet. par.*

If Hartlepool Borough Council are serious about making sure "*Hartlepool is the best place in the world for our children and young people to grow up*" then a radical re-think is needed, as the simple solution of building our way out of disadvantage and underperformance will not work.

Wherever possible we should duplicate the most successful practises of the best performing schools, not just in Hartlepool but across the world, and that cannot be resolved by new and improved buildings alone. We note that teachers from Hartlepool went to Australia to see their Gifted and Talented programme; we ask, how much of this learning is now being delivered in our schools, to our most gifted and talented children, regardless of their backgrounds?

Our aspiration is for a reduction in the size of primary schools to create class sizes of no more than 15 children. American authors Professors Alan Krueger and Diane Whitmore from Princeton University, state in their paper:

[THE BENEFITS OF CUTTING CLASS SIZES] published in the *Economic Journal*:

"class sizes of around 15 pupils for children aged between 5 and 8 years old (American grades K-3) significantly increase the likelihood that they will end up going to university. What is more, this beneficial effect of smaller classes on aspirations to enter higher education is particularly strong for pupils from minority backgrounds."

They go on to say "children who attended a small class (between 13 and 17 pupils) in the early grades score higher on standardised tests and are more likely to take the ACT or SAT college entrance exam, a standard requirement for most US colleges. The effects are particularly strong for minority pupils and those entitled to a free or reduced-price lunch."

Whilst it is impossible to draw direct comparisons between the US and UK, the basic principal remains obvious, smaller class sizes enable children from all backgrounds, but most significantly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, to perform better.

We share the Prime Minister's (Chancellor at the time) view that "We know the educational benefits of more individual attention, small group teaching and tutoring, and that they are easier to get where the overall pupil-teacher ratio is low." [23/03/2006]

Currently the pupil/teacher ratio has fallen in primaries from 21.8 pupils for every teacher to 21.6 and that pupil/adult ratio (including teachers, teaching assistants and support staff) has fallen in primaries from 12.4 pupils for every staff member to 12. [Department for Children, Schools and Families Pupil Characteristics and Class Sizes in Maintained Schools in England: January 2008 (Provisional)]

Our hope is that we can achieve a pupil/teacher ratio of 1:15 and a pupil/adult ratio of 1:9.

In order to achieve this Area 2 schools must be the size recommended in Option 2. This will reduce surplus places to the preferred 7%, recognising that this is below the government's measure of 10% and potentially will enable additional revenues to be created to reduce the staffing ratios.

We do not believe that the case for a new school at Bishop Cuthbert has been made, given we have surplus places within the Borough. In fact, we believe a large new school would not only close Elwick and Hart, but even a small one could also draw children away from the other Area 2 schools, to their detriment.

Given this position, there is potentially approximately £3million of capital not being spent; we feel that there is scope, using the Sustainable Communities Act 2007, to open new discussions with Government in October 2008.

The Department for Communities and Local Government in their document [SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ACT 2007: A GUIDE] state:

"The Sustainable Communities Act aims to promote the sustainability of local communities. It begins from the principle that local people know best what needs to be done to promote the sustainability of their area, but that sometimes they need central government to act to enable them to do so. It provides a channel for local people to ask central government to take such action. It is also a new way for local authorities to ask central government to take action which they believe would better enable them to improve the economic, social or environmental well-being of their area"

"The scope of the Act is very broad, covering economic, social and environmental issues. It does not limit the type of action that could be put forward, provided the action is within that broad scope. It is for local people to decide what they think needs to be done to promote the sustainability of their area"

We believe that by using this Act, there is the possibility that we could convert some capital funding into revenue funding for long term development of smaller class sizes that will directly contribute to improvements in standards.

We believe that Planning Gain revenues should be used to create a long term endowment policy that will generate additional funding to increase the numbers of teachers and teaching assistants in primary schools.

We believe that the additional income likely to reach the Local Authority from the Tall Ships Race could and should be used to top up the endowment fund.

We believe that the additional income from Council Tax as a result of not building a school at Bishop Cuthbert, as the land will be used for housing, should be ring-fenced for Area 2 schools.

Whilst not having full access to all the facts required to cost the proposals we do believe that there is the possibility of achieving some, if not all the ambitions outlined above.

Of course we recognise that there may be significant difficulties in achieving our ambition of smaller schools, with better pupil/staff ratios, but we are convinced, as in the often quoted examples of Academy Schools, that bigger, newer, brighter, isn't always better; and that the old adage of "*If it ain't broke – don't fix it*" has probably never been more appropriate for Elwick and Hart.

All the schools in Area 2 are doing their best in difficult circumstances, we believe that with the right support, and capital and revenue funding, each school can give a 21st Century education to its pupils.

Summary

The Elwick Action Group believes it has put forward reasoned objections to the closure of either Hart alone or both Elwick and Hart Primary Schools.

We believe that we are also attempting to move the consultation forward by examining potential alternatives and mechanisms that will allow a different use of the funding that would achieve the desired outcome.

Finally we wish to state for the record that as far as we are concerned our preferred option for Area 2 is OPTION 2.

The Elwick Action Group can be contacted through
Elwick Hall Church of England Primary School ☎ 01429 274904

Nº 3. AREA 2

Elwick Hall Primary School
North Lane
Elwick
Hartlepool
TS27 3EG

23rd July 2008

Dear Members of the Schools Transformation Team,

As the dedicated and committed staff group of Elwick Hall Primary School working under the excellent leadership of Mr Steve McDonnell, we write in response to the suggested options for Area Two.

Our school is at the heart of its community and will be celebrating its 50th anniversary next year. We have excellent links with St Peter's Church and a strong Christian ethos.

As a staff we believe that Option Two is the only viable option that achieves the aims of the PCP. We strongly object to the possibility of the closure of Elwick, and our partner school Hart and our reasons are stated below.

We are a small, highly committed staff group that strives to take a leading role in new initiatives. As forward thinking staff we embrace the opportunity to offer an engaging and creative curriculum for our children.

Hartlepool's Primary Capital Program strategy document states a desire to drive up level 4 success in Maths and English to above 65%. This year the pupils at Elwick Hall Primary School achieved 100% Level 4 or higher in English and Science and 89% for Maths. 63% achieved Level 5 in English and Science and 36% of pupils achieved Level 5 in Maths. Clearly, this far exceeds the targets set by the Authority.

Elwick Hall Primary School is oversubscribed. Current trends show that Elwick is a popular choice for parents in and outside of the catchment area who are exercising their right to express a preference of school. The evidence clearly shows that there is a high demand for places at Elwick Hall Primary School.

The PCP wants to 'rebuild or take out of use school buildings in worst condition'. Elwick Hall Primary School does not fall into this category. On the contrary, a new Foundation Stage Unit was opened in 2007 and many physical improvements to the school have either been made or are planned for the imminent future. Crucially these plans are all financed.

We believe Option Two would enable the Authority to invest in deprived areas and address the issue of surplus places without the need for school closures. Other options would severely impact on the rural communities within the borough of Hartlepool. Furthermore, the Authority would demonstrate its commitment to the sustainability of its rural communities.

Elwick Hall Primary School has so many positive aspects which would be lost if it were closed:

- Friendly and welcoming staff and a place where children feel safe, secure and valued.
- A strong Christian ethos set within a close school community.
- Consistently high standards of attainment where learning is tailored to every child's needs.
- The provision of excellent staff/pupil ratios enabling the children to perform to their full potential.
- Staff are dedicated to engaging in new educational opportunities and delivering an enriched curriculum for the 21st Century.

We appreciate the hard work carried out by those involved in the education of children in Hartlepool and hope that the Authority supports our view that Option Two best secures education within the communities served, both in the urban and rural areas of the borough.

Yours sincerely

J. C. Ward *M. P. H. H.*
John D. D. *Chickles & Harvey*
W. A. B. *W. A. B.*
L. Smith *J. P. H.* *G. Wallace*

The Staff Group of Elwick Hall Primary School

Cc Paul Briggs
Cath Hill
Mayor Stuart Drummond
Marjorie James
Jane Shaw
Adrienne Simcock
Rev. Canon Sheila Bamber
Ian Wright
Ed Balls

ELWICK PARISH COUNCIL

Telephone: 01429 864297

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Adrienne Simcock
Director of Childrens Services
Ancrum Bevan House
Avenue Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8HD

Clerk to the Council
Mrs B Bird
Naisberry Farm
Elwick
Hartlepool
TS27 3EA

30th June 2008

- 2 JUL 2008

**Primary Schools in Hartlepool
Options being considered by Hartlepool Borough Council for Area Two**

Elwick Hall CE Primary School

Elwick Parish Council has not been included in the consultation process currently being undertaken on the above topic even though one of the options currently being considered is the closure of Elwick School, a very successful and valued community school.

Elwick Parish Council wishes its views to be heard and considered on this important matter and these are set out below.

Elwick Parish Council strongly opposes the adoption of any plan that will result in the closure of Elwick Hall CE Primary School. In our view any plan that results in the closure of such a successful community school would contradict all statements given out from time to time by both local and national politicians and would be contrary to sound judgement.

There are numerous pronouncements by both local and national politicians and educational bodies which support the maintenance of small rural schools, many of which I'm sure you are aware of. Some of these have been summarised and cross referenced by the Elwick and Hart Action Group, a copy is attached for your consideration. Some of the arguments for the maintenance of Elwick School which the Parish Council would like to emphasise are given below.

Elwick Hall CE Primary School

Paul B to deal
Nº 4 AREA 2

- is successful by any and all the current measures – why consider closure of a successful school?
- has no spare places – parents want to send their children to this school
- is one of many much praised, successful and valued faith schools – parents want to send their children to such schools because of their ethos; the school actually does what some people just talk about doing
- is a small school serving a local community, small schools serving local communities have been shown to offer children a quality of all round education and personal development that is the oft stated aim of our politicians, again, Elwick School is providing what politicians say should be the model
- is a local community school that enables local children to walk to school with and without parents – any closure would mean that very young children would have to be taken by car (which is not what our politicians say they want) or by taxi at public expense.

Hartlepool Borough Council assesses the investment needs of the school at approximately £280,000 (this is the sum of urgent, essential, necessary and desired needs). This is approximately £2,800 per pupil. This is a modest sum and is similar to the investment needs per pupil for all the primary schools in area two. Elwick Parish Council suspects that the cost of providing a new school would be more than 10 times this sum.

Elwick Parish Council trusts that its views will be taken into consideration by the appropriate education committees and looks forward to receiving your response to this letter.

Yours sincerely,



Beryl Bird
Clerk to the Council

CC
Ian Wright MP
Jim Knight Minister for Schools
Ed Balls Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families

These are direct quotes from a number of local, regional and national documents which can be used as reasons why Elwick and Hart Village Schools should not be closed. Please feel free to add your own.

SMALL SCHOOLS: HOW WELL ARE THEY DOING?

A report by OFSTED based on the data from inspections and national test results. (OFSTED)

"When the results of the National Curriculum tests are aggregated for all pupils, the proportions of pupils achieving levels 2 and 4 at the end of key stages 1 and 2 respectively, are significantly higher in small schools compared to all other schools. For example, in the 1999 National Curriculum English tests, pupils in small schools at Key Stage 2 achieved about seven percentage points better than the average score for pupils in all other sizes of school."

"In terms of the overall quality of education, inspections show that pupils in small schools are not disadvantaged in comparison with those in larger schools because of the size of school. Small schools are equally capable of providing an effective education and many are among the most effective in the country."

"Small schools are able to cope with the demands of teaching the full National Curriculum. It is a tribute to the commitment of teachers in small schools that, by and large, they are able to teach the full range of knowledge, skills and understanding required by every subject in the National Curriculum. Teachers in small schools work hard to make sure that their teaching is not impaired by a lack of subject knowledge; they are also extremely adept at harnessing the skills of other adults who can complement the expertise of the permanent staff."

"The mixed-age classes which most larger schools prefer to avoid are, of course, unavoidable in small schools. The teaching in small schools can be just as effective as in larger schools, although it is a particular challenge to provide a high quality experience for the youngest pupils. Small schools usually have smaller classes, a factor which works in the teacher's favour to offset some of the problems of teaching a wide age range, particularly at Key Stage 1. The teachers also know their pupils very well, often teaching them for more than one year, and by working with small groups there is plenty of scope to achieve a good balance of direct teaching and independent working."

"The good ethos of the great majority of small schools is one of their strengths. Inspections invariably describe very good provision for the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils, especially in church schools. Close links with parents and the community also contribute strongly to the ethos of small schools. The best small schools recognise the dangers of isolation and are energetic in developing educational, cultural and business links with other places and schools, both in the UK and abroad."

"Not surprisingly, the provision for spiritual development is better in small schools with close links with the church. Small schools in less advantaged areas that achieve well are often helped by their strong ethos to handle difficult pupils successfully and enable them to make good progress"

"There is much from the first cycle of inspections to encourage those who work in small schools. Higher unit costs notwithstanding, a good case emerges for the place of small schools in the education system as a whole, when the quality of their educational performance is added to the broader contribution they make to their communities"

[Elwick and Hart both produce top class children with top class results, the closure of two outstanding village schools to improve performance is frankly absurd]

A LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY FOR HARTLEPOOL (Hartlepool Borough Council)

p.32 "Main Issues

Public transport is perceived to be inadequate and too expensive. There are also issues of safety and shelter."

"Social exclusion impacts are compounded by poor public transport links."

p.32 "Strategic Actions • Where possible, provide local services at a community level."

p.33 "Safer Routes to School Safer Routes to School is a project aimed at improving safety and reducing casualties on the school journey. It encourages more parents and pupils to walk and cycle to school as alternatives to using the car. Benefits include reduced congestion and pollution, fewer cars on the roads and better long term health and fitness for all concerned."

[The closure of Elwick or Hart Schools will reduce the sustainability of each village and add to isolation]

HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP COMMUNITY STRATEGY (Hartlepool Partnership)

p.8 "Our Principles – Coordination – organising services so that they support each other and are effective, efficient and economic."

p.13 Chapter 2 Lifelong Learning & Skills. Our Objectives
Early Years and Childcare

1. "To increase the quality and availability of early years support services, education and childcare."

[Closure of either school will mean no nursery facilities in either village. The alternatives will be either to put a 3 year old on a bus or take them by car.]

3. To raise achievement of all pupils...

[Ehwick and Hart are both high performing schools and are in the top ten performing schools in the Borough]

8. To improve local facilities.

[Closure of either school will remove facilities.]

p.25 "Key Trends There is increasing recognition of the need to value communities in the Borough"
[As stated in the Education White Paper schools need to be at the heart of their communities. Closure of either school would destabilise each community.]

AIMING HIGH FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: A TEN YEAR STRATEGY FOR POSITIVE ACTIVITIES (Department for Children, Schools and Families & HM Treasury)

p.58 "4.58 Many young people have difficulty getting to the opportunities or services they want to access. Those who are reliant on public transport, particularly those who are disadvantaged or from rural areas, are often let down by an inadequate service or prohibited by its high cost"
[How will closing two local schools address this balance?]

PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 7: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS (Department for Communities and Local Government formerly Office of the Deputy Prime Minister)

p. 7 1. "Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning land use planning. ...
(i) Decisions on development proposals should be based on sustainable development principles, ensuring an integrated approach to the consideration of:

- social inclusion, recognising the needs of everyone;
- maintaining high and stable levels of economic growth and employment."

[closing the schools will fundamentally go against sustainable development and will reduce employment opportunities]

p.9 "Community services and facilities"

6. People who live or work in rural areas should have reasonable access to a range of services and facilities. Local planning authorities should:

- (i) through their LDDs, facilitate and plan for accessible new services and facilities, particularly where:
 - planning permission is granted for new developments in country towns or other local service centres; or - settlements, or the population of their rural catchments, are expanding; or - there is an identified need for new or expanded services to strengthen the role of a particular local service centre.
- (ii) where possible, ensure that new development in identified service centres is supported through improvements to public transport, and to walking and cycling facilities, provided in partnership with the developer where appropriate;
- (iii) identify suitable buildings and development sites for community services and facilities to meet the needs of the whole community, including disabled users;
- (iv) support mixed and multi-purpose uses that maintain community vitality; and
- (v) support the provision of small-scale, local facilities (e.g. childcare facilities) to meet community needs outside identified local service centres, particularly where they would benefit those rural residents who would find it difficult to use more distant service centres. These local facilities should be located within or adjacent to existing villages and settlements where access can be gained by walking, cycling and (where available) public transport."

[How can the closure of two schools be viewed as contributing to the sustainability of the rural areas?]

THE STATE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE 2007: LIVING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE (Commission for Rural Communities)

p. 48 "Educational attainment at school
As in previous years, educational attainment for Key Stage 2 (ages 11 to 13) is slightly higher in rural areas as a whole than for urban. At KS2, the percentage of children achieving level 4 results exceeds the figure for urban areas in each of English, Maths and Science." [This reaffirms the quality of provision offered in village primary schools, Ehwick and Hart are no different]

p. 147 "Social, economic and environmental sustainability

in one sense communities are sustainable until they are not sustainable

- when what is being done cannot carry on indefinitely. Most definitions of sustainability also embed the concept that we should hand on to our children a world that is at least as liveable in as the one we have."

[The closure of the two schools will directly lead to unsustainable villages]

CHOICE FOR PARENTS: THE BEST START FOR CHILDREN: A TEN YEAR STRATEGY FOR CHILDCARE (HM Treasury, Department for Education & Skills, Department of Work & Pensions, Department of Trade & Industry)

p. 4 "1.13 The Government's vision is for childcare services to be available to all families who want to use them. Childcare services will not look the same everywhere. They will need to be shaped by parents' needs which will vary according to whether they live in a rural or urban area, whether their child is pre-school or school age and whether parents work full- or part time. This will require a new approach to planning and delivering services. The role of the local authority will be crucial to ensure that services are developed according to local needs.
Services will be locally accountable, within a national framework."
[The Government recognises that there are specific issues for rural communities, the Local Authority should also]

p.13 "3.17 Although the number of childcare places has increased significantly since 1997, some parents are still not able to find the childcare that they need. Places for pre-school children are more expensive than for school-age children, and places for school-age children are not always available in a way that fits conveniently with the school day and around parents' work patterns. Availability of places is patchy, especially in disadvantaged and particularly rural areas, and there is no guarantee to parents that they will be able to find a suitable childcare place."
[This issues has been resolved in Elwick and Hart by having full nurseries within Foundation stage, the closure of the schools will remove child care places]

p.32 "4.17 Families with children have diverse needs. Parents may be working full-time, part time or not at all, and will need childcare arrangements that fit around these work and other commitments. They will have particular preferences about what kind of childcare is best for their child, and children may have particular childcare needs. The Government is committed to offering parents choices that respond to this diversity of needs and preferences, for example through offering a range of childcare options like group-based care, childminders, home childcare and after-school clubs."
[The closure of Elwick and Hart nurseries will restrict parental choice]

p.70 "School age children and childcare

A.25 Evidence suggests that childcare for school age children is associated with improved outcomes for pupils and the wider community. The main evidence focuses on extended schools, which have the potential¹⁷ to generate benefits for pupils, families and communities. These can include improved pupil attainment – particularly at GCSE and Key Stage 3, attendance, behaviour and parental involvement. Co-location of services in schools is particularly important in rural areas, where creative ways of delivering services through schools and post offices can make a huge difference to those living in rural communities. International evidence¹⁹ also shows benefits for children as a result of extended services."
[It would be far more beneficial to invest in Elwick and Hart than to close them]

SOCIAL MOBILITY NARROWING SOCIAL CLASS EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT GAPS (Supporting Materials to a speech by the Rt Hon Ruth Kelly MP Secretary of State for Education and Skills to the Institute for Public Policy Research) (Department for Education and Skills)

p.61 "Faith schools have positive CVA. Non faith have a negative CVA"
FSM pupils in faith schools make better progress than FSM pupils Non-faith schools
The gap in CVA is lower non-faith schools, but is in favour of pupils not-eligible for FSM"

[This states that Faith Schools have a better outcome for children irrespective of background and that Free School Meal children (used as proxy data regarding disadvantage) make better progress in Faith Schools. Closing Elwick would close a successful Faith School]

FAITH IN THE SYSTEM (Department for Children Schools and Families)

p. 3 "The Government and the providers of schools with a religious character also recognise that many parents who are not of the faith of a particular faith school seek places in those schools because they value the ethos and character of the school."

p. 4 "the Government welcomes the contribution that schools with a religious character make to the school system – both as a result of their historical role and now as key players in contributing to the more diverse school system with greater opportunities for parental choice that we seek."

There is a real need to keep successful faith schools to ensure a balance of schools to apply to, Elwick fulfils all the necessary criteria to be judged successful.]

DfEE's 'GUIDANCE OF LOCAL DECISION MAKING ON STATUTORY PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES IN SCHOOL ORGANISATION'

The need to preserve access to a local school in rural communities - in effect a presumption against the closure of rural schools. This does not mean that no rural school should ever close, but that the case for closure should be strong and the proposals clearly in the best interests of educational provision in the area.

The transport implications of rural school closures. These include: The welfare of children; the recurrent cost of the LEA in transporting pupils to schools (there is a statutory requirement that free public transport be provided to primary school pupils living more than 2 miles away from the school); the effects on road traffic congestion and finally, the environmental costs of pupils travelling further to school. The guidance states that proposals should not lead to 'unreasonable' extended journey times, and should be considered against Government objectives to reduce traffic congestion and promote alternatives to the car. Re-organisation proposals are required to consider the quality of the transport links between the communities served by the school and the site of the alternative provision. The guidance does not suggest that potential impacts on users (such as the increased travel time for pupils or parents) or environmental costs associated with proposals should be quantified for the purpose of assessing different options.

The overall effect on the community of closure of the village school (particular reference is made to areas receiving regeneration funding)

The effect of the proposed change on the standard of education to be provided
 Parental preference (there is a requirement for consultation)
 The need for the cost-effective removal of surplus places
 Evidence that options for maintaining community facilities in the area have been considered (including that the views of the local police, Government Offices and RDAs with responsibility for the New Deal for Communities have been taken into account)
 The need for any additional particular kind of provision
 The impact of the closure on the balance on denominational and non-denominational provision
 The most effective ways of ensuring that appropriate Special Educational Needs support is delivered to pupils - both in terms of providing access to the curriculum and ensuring that schools are physically accessible.

Specific additional factors are also identified that must be given particular attention in deciding on proposals to close rural schools:

The accessibility of alternative schools
 The standard of the school and the standards of alternative schools
 The overall supply of school places in the area and the likely future demand for places
 The overall effect of the closure on the local community
 The cost implications of the possible options
 Any points made by the school proposed for closure
 The views of parents and other interested parties
 The effect on the school journey, including long-term transport costs, and whether the closure will result in more pupils experiencing longer journeys to school and more pupils being driven to school by car.

[Using the criteria given, Elwick and Hart should not close as they are effectively full, produce good results, provide essential services to the local community and the additional costs have not been shown.]

THE WAY AHEAD FOR RURAL SERVICES A guide to good practice in locating rural services (Department for Environment & Rural Affairs)

p.13 *Modelling approaches

Approach 1 Ready reckoner

Use For decisions on smaller facilities, such as local community facilities, e.g. a local primary school.

Method

- 1) Develop a map-based zoning system for the area covering the facility and its catchment, including the location of the relevant alternative outlets.
- 2) Estimate the 'crow-fly' distances from the centre of each zone to the facility whose future is at issue and the alternatives.
- 3) Estimate the numbers from each zone currently using the facility to which the decision relates.
- 4) Calculate the effects of closure on the distances users travel on the assumption that they reassign themselves to the (next) nearest service outlet to their home when a facility closes.
- 5) Calculate the impact on costs per visit on the assumption that costs average £0.24 [figure from 2002 x3?]/per km.
- 6) Calculate annual costs to users based on usage of the facility concerned.

Other Feasibility, cost and convenience of accessing alternative facilities by public transport.
considerations Effects on existing public transport facilities, e.g. loss or increase of customer base.
 [None of this information has been supplied, therefore the Local Authority are not following good practice guidelines]

p.18 *Assessing potential social and economic effects

3.6.1 Recommendations in the Rural White Paper encourage public service providers to consider the social and economic impact of service location decisions on market towns. The closure of a major facility (such as a hospital or school) may affect residents' shopping patterns and/or residential desirability. Local businesses may experience a decline in passing trade.
 [There has been no demonstration in the documentation that this has been considered, the drastic measure of closing a village school ought to have considered it, you may want to ask what work has been done in this area]

Please use as many or as few as these as you wish, what you will see is that for many reasons, the closure of Elwick and Hart Schools is completely unjustifiable.

Thank you in anticipation of your support.

ELWICK & HART ACTION GROUP



N.5 Area 2

The Parish of St. Mary Magdalene, Hart

Secretary Miss M Arthur 31 Arncliffe Gardens, Hartlepool, Cleveland. TS26 9JG
Telephone 01429 221229

30 JUN 2008

26th June 2008

Ms Adrienne Simcock
Director of Children Service (education)
The Civic Centre
Victoria Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Dear Ms Simcock

Proposed closure of Hart and Elwick Primary Schools

The comments below were agreed upon last night following an urgent meeting of the members (who were available) of Hart Parish Church's Parochial Church Council.

- We support the keeping open of both Hart and Elwick Primary School as they are en route to be considered as one school.
- Elwick (a Church of England school) and Hart share the same Head teacher, both schools welcome local clergy to take assemblies, which foster a Christian ethos with the schools. This strengthens links between the church and the school thereby drawing the community together. This goes a considerable way to provide the focus for the community spirit and sense of purpose for the villages
- The school raise the profiles of these villages, which encourage families move house into these areas, offering a sense of renewal to the housing market and to the overall economy of the communities.

In Peace for his sake

where a three-way federation could be created to further unify the people within the geographical area within Hart Parish.

- Hart and Elwick are the only rural schools in Hartlepool for those living in the far reaching rural area stretching to Wynyard and Crookfoot reservoir on the west side of the A19.
- We believe small schools are best able to provide tailored individual learning plans to maximise the learning capacity for each child.

Yours sincerely

M. Arthur

M Arthur (Miss)
Secretary to Hart Parish Church Parochial Church Council

HART

GOVERNORS

30 JUL 2008

Neil Taylor
Parent Governor
Hart Primary School

28th July 2008

Mr Paul Briggs
Director
Primary Capital Project Team

Dear Paul

Primary Capital Project - Area Two

I write to you having been empowered to do so by the Governors of Hart School at the joint Hart and Elwick Governing Body meeting of 8th July 2008. Please accept this letter as our unanimous view of the Options for Area Two.

It is the unanimous view of the Governing Body of Hart School that Option 2 of the five options, presents itself as the option most capable of Transforming Primary Education in Area Two. The Governing Body is unable to recommend or even understand, given The Children's Services in Hartlepool Vision, Options 4 or 5. We expect, given the following reasons, that the 'best place in the world for our children and young people to grow up' will continue to be Hart Primary School.

As you are aware Option 2 meets the Government requirements by removing excess places, modernizing those schools in worst condition and ensuring that schools are as good as they can be. The possibility of a new school at Jesmond Road and/or combination with Sacred Heart addresses the long existing difficulties in Area Two without destroying those flagship schools which currently offer all that you say are required of primary schools. The Governing Body does not believe that any of the other Options adequately meets the government requirements or satisfies the Hartlepool Vision. Indeed we believe that Options 4 and 5 not only breach current legislation and current government policy, but also and, perhaps most importantly, fail to meet the published strategies of Hartlepool Borough Council.

Hart Primary School should be regarded as a beacon school, meeting all the requirements of the 'Vision'. The school is effectively fully subscribed, largely because of its ability to attract pupils from all over Hartlepool, exceeding all the government academic targets, and does not require modernizing or replacing, second lowest Condition Costs in Area Two. Furthermore, Hart Primary has long demonstrated that it is at the heart of the village and therefore community. Nearly all the children in the village attend the school and all use its safe grounds out of school time. Those pupils that do not live in the village attend the school because their parents exercised a preference, namely for their children to attend a rural school with high academic performance, clear identity, and a successful reputation for preparing its pupils for secondary education. Why would anyone contemplate closing such a success?

Hart Primary School is also a designated Rural school and as such relies on the 'presumption against closure'. Jim Knight MP, Minister of State for Schools and Learners, in January 2008 unequivocally confirmed this status and clarified that where a rural school was to be considered for closure other factors such as;

transport availability, alternatives to closure, impact on the community and cost must be examined. Furthermore, the local authorities should support popular and successful schools. Given this guidance and the aforementioned statistics, it is clear, that not only should the school remain open it should be very much supported by the Authority. This Statutory Guidance was more recently, July 2008, confirmed by Ian Wright MP, who also confirmed that Hart Primary School meet all the criteria for the presumption against closure.

It, therefore, seems clear to the Hart Governing Body, that Option 2 not only demonstrates a desire to help those schools with difficulties but also supports those successful schools to continue to improve and provide Hartlepool with strengths that can be utilised in the future as outlined in the Hartlepool Core Strategy of 2007.

Yours sincerely,



Neil Taylor
Parent Governor

Hart Primary School

Magdalene Drive
Hart Village
Hartlepool
TS27 3AP

☎ 01429 273283
Fax: 01429 273283

e-mail: admin.hart@school.hartlepool.gov.uk

Head Teacher: Mr. S.P. McDonnell



For the attention of the Primary Capital Programme Board,

We, the staff at Hart Primary School, write in response to the suggested options proposed for Area 2.

As a staff, from the five options, we would endorse option 2 for the outlined reasons;

- In your report you state that one of the issues to be considered for area 2 is the attainment of pupils. The Government's minimum target is 65% level four in English and Maths. At Hart Primary School, 92.9% of pupils achieved level four or above in 2007 in all core subjects. This high level of achievement has been maintained consistently over a number of years.

- Another issue is concerned with the amount of spare places in schools. At present, Hart School has no spare places and there are people living in the village who cannot attend the school because we are at full capacity. This is a trend that occurs frequently. Parents feel so strongly about their children attending Hart School that they buy property as close to the catchment area as possible to try to ensure that they stand a good chance of getting their children into the school. The pie charts you presented at the meeting did not give a true picture of the situation of all rural schools in Hartlepool. All three rural schools show a similar trend, that a proportion of children living outside the catchment area are attending the schools. This parental choice was demonstrated by the feelings of those parents who attended the meetings at both Hart and our sister school, Elwick. The right of parental choice is a key driver in this Government's education agenda and has been seen as an instrument to push forward the raising of school standards and performance. Parents vote by sending their children to high performing schools.

The condition and suitability of buildings is another issue that has been presented. Other schools in area 2 have been surveyed on site, whereas we have discovered that Hart school was assessed by external means with no involvement of Governors or management. We have no major problems with the condition and suitability of Hart School. At present, Hart School has been earmarked for approximately £113,000 of work to bring the school up to standard. This is the lowest amount of money required for a school in area 2.



CHARTER
STANDARD
SCHOOLS



This shows that the building has been maintained and improved consistently to meet the needs of the changing educational climate.

Of all the PCP promises sent to Government, we feel that we are already meeting or exceeding these pledges. So why do options 4 and 5 involve the closure of Hart which has demonstrated consistently high achievement and delivery of 21st century learning facilities.

We understand and feel that option 1 is not necessarily the most sensible option for area 2 as this would mean that Hartlepool authority would fail to meet PCP targets.

There are no guarantees that the building of a new school would provide the same high level of attainment that we already provide for our children at Hart. Public opinion suggests that parents do not want a new school situated on Bishop Cuthbert.

Therefore, option 3 is not a viable proposition.

Hart School has many positives which would be lost if the school closes.

- Hart School has a welcoming 'family' atmosphere
 - It maintains very high standards of attainment
 - A caring and approachable staff
 - Has an essential role at the heart of the local community
 - Provides an excellent teacher/pupil ratio, helping children to reach their full potential
 - Delivers a rich and varied curriculum in a quality school environment
 - A stimulating and well resourced local environment to support children's learning
- OFSTED 2007 stated that Hart School was 'a good school with outstanding features'

The list is endless, as you will have previously seen from the staff comments which were taken away from the initial PCP consultation meeting dated 1st July at Hart School.

We, the undersigned, believe that we have put forward a strong case for the support of option 2 and we trust that you will take all of the above into consideration during the consultation process.

J. P. Beatham

A. Haul

S. Morton

N. 8

Crab

St. Fisher

A. Wilson

C. Rutherford

A. Haden

St. Michael

HART PARISH COUNCIL

N: 8 AREA 2

Clerk
Ronald Gray
12, John Howe Gardens,
HARTLEPOOL
TS24 9NQ
01429 866667
e-mail: hartvillagePC@aol.com

Chairman
Alan Bell
2, Magdalene Drive,
Hart
HARTLEPOOL
TS27 3BU
01429 275618

9 July 2008

Mr. Adrienne Simcock
Director of Childrens Services
Hartlepool Borough Council
Ansurin Bevan House
Avenue Road,
HARTLEPOOL
TS24 8HD

**Proposal to close Hart C of E Primary School
Primary Capital Programme Strategy for Change**

Dear Mr. Simcock,

At the Parish Council (PC) meeting on Monday last, I was directed to bring to your attention the misgivings of the PC in the way the subject is being handled.

On Wednesday 18th June 2008 the PC met with your deputy Paul Briggs and he stated clearly that no decision had been made as to the future of Hart Primary School. Shortly afterwards an article in the *Hartlepool Mail* dated 3 July indicated that documents on Health and Education had been issued with a statement from Counc. Brash which said these documents gave "a unified position of what all 23 Labour councillors in the town think". This gives a strong impression that, despite the fact that consultation stage 2 is not yet at an end, the party line is already in place.

You are indeed fortunate to have a school in Hart that has an excellent record, meets all the requirements and has first class leadership in place. Numerous pupils live around other primary schools, adjacent in some cases, yet the choice is Hart. The map which Mr. Briggs left, showing all the primary schools in area 2 and overlaid with a scatter graph showing the residences, by post code, of Hart pupils more than supports this.

The present Whitehall administration has been at pains to promote parental choice in education but locally this does not seem to be so, especially when the PCP pin machine rolls a portion of £50m before them. It is a good team which breeds success not money, and money never has bought a good state education.

The PC categorically supports the retention of Hart Primary School.

Yours sincerely,



R. Gray
Clerk to Hart Parish Council

cc: Iain Wright MP, Mayor Stuart Drummond, and Councillor Stan Kaiser

SACRED HEART ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL

This document encompasses the collective response of the Governing Body to the Proposed Options for the school as contained within the Area 2 document.

OPTION 1 - This is the most acceptable out of the "two" options presented in the document.

- No change to size

As demonstrated in the document projected spare places for 2017 is nil. The school is routinely oversubscribed for admissions.

- Improve condition of buildings.

The school is maintained to as high a standard as possible within current financial constraints, however it is accepted that there will be a substantial cost implications to this option. The existing usage of the building and land should be reviewed and evaluated with the possibility of improving facilities. We acknowledge that Sacred Heart is an old building but one which could be considered to be more structurally sound than its modern counterparts. With considered thought and financial input the school could have improved outdoor facilities for the benefit of pupils.

OPTIONS 2/5

- Reduce school capacity

This is an understandable but regrettable option considering the over subscription for admissions.

- Consider building new school on same site as Jesmond Road

When the two officers from Children's Services discussed the options at school on July 8th there was uncertainty on what exactly was meant by this option. Parents, Staff and Governors requested further clarification before comment could be made. The document sent to parents by Adrienne Simcock in early June was also ambiguous as to the reality of the option, namely that Sacred Heart AND Jesmond Road share a new build school on the "reserved" site of Chester Road allotments. The Governing Body consider this as a wholly unacceptable option and strongly oppose any suggestion of a "shared" school for the following reasons:

1. The proposed combined pupil population of a shared school totals 735, with an age range of 3-11 years old. To put such young children in such a large environment begs the question – does every child matter?
2. A large number of Primary school aged children within the catchment areas are taken to school by car. The anticipated traffic congestion and parking at school start and finish times causes concern.
3. The practicalities of “shared” facilities in one building e.g. dining halls, sports halls, outside activities present potentially conflicting interests.
4. How would the school be “shared” or is the option a one of combining schools within classes? The Governors are not opposed to the sharing of “good practice” with other schools, Sacred Heart having already been a Beacon School and continues to maintain high achievement in maths, English and science as shown in the Area 2 document. Teachers and pupils are welcomed into school to learn by sharing facilities, knowledge etc. but this is entirely different to sharing a school in totality.
5. Sacred Heart is a faith school and children are educated within the teachings, beliefs and ethos of the faith, having a clear identity and vision as Roman Catholics.
6. Foundation Governors appointed by the Diocese are required to ensure that the religious character of the school is preserved and developed and are required to comply with Canon Law and the teachings of the Catholic Church. It is felt that co-habiting in one building with a non-Catholic school may compromise the public expression of the faith. Visitors comment on the profound difference in atmosphere and visible signs of the faith when entering Sacred Heart School.

Discussion on the proposed options for Sacred Heart School have taken place at all levels and the Governing Body wish to work with Children's Services in ensuring that the provision of a Catholic education for the children living in the parishes of St Joseph's and St Thomas More's churches is not compromised. We are aware that the Diocese is closely

involved with any decisions made on behalf of catholic Primary schools and we welcome that co-operation.

The Governing Body is committed to supporting the local community and neighbouring schools and wish the following options to be given due consideration in next stage of consultation.

OPTION 1

We propose that a full review of the school fabric and usage is undertaken with a view to improving the facilities of the existing school. There may be a possibility of building another level to free up outside play capacity. Retaining the capacity at 444 would not compromise parental choice of school. School's projected surplus by 2017 of nil places would support this.

OPTION 2

A new build school on Sacred Heart site, we accept, would involve innovative solutions and compromises, however we do not feel that this should prevent this option being given due consideration.

OPTION 3

Whilst we strongly oppose the option of co-habiting with another school we would tentatively support the co-location of a separate new building and play areas on the Jesmond Road reserved site. As previously identified the problems of parking and traffic congestion remain and would require workable solutions.

OPTION 4

As Option 5 for Area 2 indicates that a new school at Bishop Cuthbert may have capacity for 420 places, then a new build school on this site for Sacred Heart would be an acceptable option. Obviously there would be competition for this which on our part would involve additional Diocesan involvement.

OPTION 5

A stand alone new build for Sacred Heart on the "reserve" Jesmond Road site with a capacity for 444 places, demolish and rebuild a smaller school for Jesmond Road on the existing Sacred Heart site (proposed reduction of capacity to 315 as indicated in Area 2 document) which would release the existing Jesmond Road site.

OPTION 6

Explore the development of the existing Catcote School site and relocate Sacred Heart School. As we are a "feeder school" to English Martyrs this would provide closer physical links.

We recognise the restrictions encompassed in the release of funding and the requirement for equitable sharing, but we consider that Sacred Heart School should have a new a new stand alone school or be given substantial refurbishment funding.

From Jesmond Road Governors

1. All Jesmond Road Governors prefer option 2.

2. The majority prefer a modification to option 2 for Jesmond Road which would be to purchase the two houses which divide the car park from the main site and build a new school on this area and pull down the present building and make this an area for play, sport etc.

The total site area, including the area occupied by the two houses is approximately 8680 square metres which, from Bulletin 99, would appear to be large enough for a 315 place JMI school.

The reasons given for this modification are:

- (a) The present school field would be too small for the sighting of two schools with a total of 3 1/2 form entry on it.
- (b) Both Chester and Jesmond Roads are very busy roads at 'rush hours.'
- (c) It keeps Jesmond Road nearer the centre of its catchment area. This may also prevent a change in its socio-economic mix.
- (d) The area allocated to Jesmond Road on the present playing field would be smaller than the present site including the two houses.
- (e) It would have the advantage of allowing Sacred Heart to move to the playing field.
- 3. A minority of governors would prefer the possible suggested move of option 2 to the playing field site along Jesmond Road if more area were available, possibly by compulsory purchase of some of the adjoining allotments.
- 4. One governor has suggested a modification of option 2 in which the two houses would be purchased but the shell of the present building is retained and the interior refurbished. I believe this has been submitted in more detail in a personal response.

I hope this is of use to you.

John Ibbotson

(Chair of Governors, on behalf of Jesmond Road Governing Body)

**PCP Stage 2 Area 3 Response Analysis
(By School / Subject)
(Proformas; E-mails & Text messages)**

Comment	No of same comments
St Cuthbert's Proposed Option 4	
Would propose an alternative Option for St Cuthbert's: Option 4 building a new school on land vacated by the removal of Parish buildings. Maintain present St Cuthbert site and closeness to Parish Church	103
Against Co-location of St Aidan's & St Cuthbert's	
Co-location for St Cuthbert's & St Aidan's is not an option – proposed site too small with restricted access in an already crowded area.	16
No to co-location of St Aidan's & St Cuthbert's – should retain individual sites and individual ethos.	3
Opposed to co-locating St Aidan's & St Cuthbert's schools there is a role for both schools within their own community.	1
For Co-location of St Aidan's & St Cuthbert's	
Not against co-locating St Aidan's & St Cuthbert's providing St Aidan's also gets a new school and traffic issues dealt with.	3
Ward Jackson & St Joseph's Merger	
Opposed to amalgamating Ward Jackson & St Josephs there is a role for both schools within the local community.	4
Ward Jackson should become a Church of England school	2
Ward Jackson School is the heart of this community.	2
Federating with another school should be seriously considered for Ward Jackson.	1
Concerns with closing Ward Jackson School and amalgamating with St Joseph's when St Joseph's needs a lot of money spending on it.	1
Ward Jackson School needs to retain its current size which is more beneficial to the needs of this area.	1
Against closing Ward Jackson and moving pupils to St Joseph's: Not against both schools forming a federation to exchange good practice.	1

For Ward Jackson closure	
There is no need to build a new school at St Joseph's just extend to take Ward Jackson pupils.	1
Close Ward Jackson and expand St Josephs	1
Miscellaneous	
Consultation a waste of time – decisions already made	1
Leave things as they are	1
This is not just about education the impact on local residents should be taken into account and their views listened to	1
Closing schools will make class sizes larger and would be disruptive to children.	2
No need to pull down St Cuthbert's – but it will be as the decision has already been made.	1
Schools with perfectly good buildings should be retained and the PCP money spent on schools which require major work.	3

**Primary Capital Programme – Stage 2 Consultation
Area 3 Letter Analysis**

Comment made in letter	No of same comment
Ward Jackson (10 letter)	
Keep Ward Jackson school open and renovate it step by step.	7
Ward Jackson School is the heart of this community it caters for refuge and circus children and travellers.	7
Small classes at Ward Jackson are better	2
Ward Jackson school needs to retain its smallness which is more beneficial to the uniqueness of this area.	2
Ward Jackson should become a protestant Church of England (Voluntary Aided) School	1
Ward Jackson has very little spare places	1
Standards Issues Ward Jackson	
Ward Jackson Sats results for this year are very good	5
Standards at the school are improving and I am confident that Option 2 is the right option for Ward Jackson School	2
Ward Jackson is an inspiring school with excellent teachers	1
We do not want any change to the size of Ward Jackson	1
Ward Jackson Community Issues	
There are very few community facilities at Burbank not even a corner shop	2
Ward Jackson children are from jobless/unable to work families	1
St Aidan's (1 letter)	
I would like an extra storey above to provide an extra hall at St Aidan's	1
St Joseph's (1 letter)	
I prefer Option 2 for Area 3, as a significant number of surplus places would be eliminated	1
I prefer Option 2 for Area 3, Standard issues would be addressed	1
I prefer Option 2 for Area 3, Ward Jackson supports children from the refuge. Although St Joseph's aspires to be the 'heart of the community' - Ward Jackson already is	1
I prefer Option 2 for Area 3, A new building for St Joseph's is attractive but not at the expense of Ward Jackson School	1
Miscellaneous	
Closing schools would be too disruptive to the children	2

AREA 3 Meeting Summary

St Aidan's

The practicalities if co-location was to go ahead, 500 plus pupils from two schools living cheek by jowl. Parking issues and traffic congestion would be a major problem. Accepting that some issues could be engineered away it must be acknowledged that we are situated in a very mature area with a high proportion of retirement homes.

It is unfair that Cabinet have decided that St Aidan's is a partner primary with Dyke House, which is much farther away than Manor. This would obviously impact on numbers wanting to attend St Aidan's?

Proposed primary partner links have impacted on the number of pupils choosing to go elsewhere. This has resulted in a loss of income, costing jobs and ultimately our ability to provide an education.

Other than being relatively close together why has it been suggested St Aidan's & St Cuthbert's co-locate? They are not natural bedfellows why not Stranton & St Aidan's for amalgamation rather than co-location.

Is it possible to build on the St Cuthbert's site? They are closing the nursery and the church hall has closed, surely that land could be used?

The suggestion of co-location would not sit very well especially with St Cuthbert's getting a new school and at St Aidan having to make do with out of date buildings.

St Cuthbert's

Are there examples of 2 separate faith schools sharing the same site?

We have approached the Diocese to determine whether there would be enough space on the present St Cuthbert's site to build a new school.

The Diocese architect has indicated that there would be enough space on the site (to also include a school field) which could be built around the Church.

The Parish Hall is dilapidated and requires substantial investment to refurbish. The nursing home is empty and the day centre is closing.

We believe the present school field is owned by the Local Authority. The 10% the diocese would have to contribute toward a new build could possibly come from the sale of that land.

Plans for any new build would be 1 form entry (1fe) which is 210 pupils. This would be enough places for all catholic children who apply to be admitted to the school.

There is no way we would consider co-location.

We are in favour of the Diocese option to stay where we are and build around the Church. It is a good idea if you think about the local community and would not want to lose the history of the site.

Integrated services could possibly be provided on the St Aidan's site eg health services. We work closely with St Aidan's. There could be the potential to build community facilities on both sites.

We agree with the numbers dropping to 210 although we still need the nursery attached to the school. It is accepted we do need extra space for resource areas and it goes without saying we will work with Government building guidance

We don't want co-location. Social problems would occur if we had a brand new school and St Aidan's only had refurbishment of their school. There would be even more traffic problems.

Although accepting that this is a consultation exercise we do not feel that interests would be best served if we gave an opinion on what should happen in the other schools.

St Joseph's RC Primary School

With regard to transforming education and supporting Ward Jackson, Ward Jackson takes in a lot of children with very complex problems. How would moving them to a new building help their life chances? Is the problem with Ward Jackson or is it with the children and their complex problems? Will we be able to provide any better services and if so we would need to clarify what the problem is.

How can we guarantee our numbers would stay similar to what they are now if you closed Ward Jackson and move there children into here; Wouldn't it be a case of moving the problem and not solving it. There is also a concern that the pupils from Ward Jackson could impact on standards at St Joseph's.

With regard to option three, we should be celebrating what Ward Jackson does, not closing them down. Their help to this community is incredible and therefore support for Ward Jackson rather than closing would be the best idea.

We have a good school with a good ethos and are pleased there are no options to close St Joseph's. We see Ward Jackson as our neighbours and this gives us a chance to boost Ward Jackson in a big way and we should be supporting them, therefore option two would be our choice. However if option three went ahead we are convinced that this school and its pupils and staff would welcome the children from Ward Jackson

It would be a great challenge for us with the Church's ethos and very exiting to get more involved with the community which we can't do now due to our buildings. However that has to be tempered with the increase in the more challenging pupils.

As long as parents accept our practices we would welcome the challenge.

It would be a challenge as long as people accepted our principles they don't always have to be involved in our practices. At the moment we don't insist children have to join in prayer.

The more collaboration we could do would be mutually beneficial for both schools. Collaboration would also be financially beneficial as we would be sharing resources and facilities and we can all take our eye of the ball working in collaboration with another school would help to keep us both on task..
We would like to see English Martyrs School give our children (catholic) first priority when they are taking in children of other faiths.
Education is not about the building it is about the people in the buildings and the teaching available. Fundamentally it is about our catholic ethos regardless of the building but a new building is a win win situation.
Stranton Primary School
It would be a concern for the school if we had to take pupils from Ward Jackson. The parents/pupils we already have in the school demand a lot of attention. It would be the problems that come with an additional 70-80 pupils that we would have to deal with.
The dual carriageway in between Stranton and Ward Jackson would have a significant effect on attendance and punctuality. In geographic terms it's quite close, but the dual carriageway is a massive barrier.
From a school's point of view we have concerns with option 3. The type of children that would come from Ward Jackson will have many issues. We would worry about our school's ability to cope with an extra 70-80 pupils with this level of need.
The dual carriageway in between Stranton and Ward Jackson would have a significant effect on attendance and this is reflected in that we don't get any families from Ward Jackson area attending the activities at the Children's Centre.
It would be good to be involved with working with Ward Jackson.
A lot of good work goes on at Ward Jackson. We think it's better to support Ward Jackson than to close the school. The nature of the area and pupils benefits from being a small school.
It is a surprise that an option to close the school is even being considered considering its links with the women's refuge.
Ward Jackson
As a staff we are very positive and refuse to consider option three.
School is the most stable part of some of the lives of our children. Some have had many schools but they settle here. The children's self esteem builds here as when they arrive they have little or no expectations.
A lot of our parents do not have any transport but still bring their children here from far and wide because of the learning experience they receive.

The staff asked for the following positive points to be included in the notes of the meeting.

- New Headteacher and senior management team – now making a difference.
- Strong teaching and school improvement plan to continue good standards.
- Guided reading records in line with Assessing Pupils Processes (APP)
- Futuristic and linked to APP
- Implemented individual targets for all children in Mathematics and Literature.
- Science statistics show a big improvement due to the revised timetable
- New material for assessing pupil's writing, helping with moderation.
- Implementation and embedding of new assessment for learning materials.
- Introduced tracking which identifies target groups.
- New marking policy for next step marking.

There has been significant changes within the leadership team and the Governing Body at this school and the last few years are a snapshot in time that is now outdated. There has been a lot of change this year, a new Headteacher, many changes in the Governing Body. Therefore it is a new team with a fresh start.

We want more collaboration, more investment and the possibility of becoming a voluntary aided school under the Church of England. Therefore the Governing Body unanimously would prefer option two.

The deficiency in option three is that because of the nature of St Joseph's they do not just directly serve this community. The deprivation in this area is not highlighted enough.

Closing this school will tear the heart out of this community.

People are willing to travel to both Ward Jackson and St Joseph's so why not close St Joseph's and develop Ward Jackson. A lot of St Joseph's pupils come from Seaton Carew so you could build a Roman Catholic school there.

We are happy that PCP is taking place but feel this is bad timing. If it was another year on we would not be in this position. The difference between this Headteacher and the last one is amazing. The Headteacher was given four years to get this school back on track but has only had 18 months. We have achieved more than we first anticipated and so feel we can keep the momentum going due to the support of the Governing Body, staff and the LA.

Ward Jackson School accommodates the Women's Refuge and took in just over 300 children at short notice last year, if it closes where would these children go? There would be grave concerns about the safety of these children if the school closed.

This school is vitally important to this estate. It has lost so much and if you close this school we will lose the only thing we have left. Standards are rising and will continue to do so under the new Headteacher. Seaton Carew will soon have more pupils coming here (all agree).

There is no better advertisement for Ward Jackson School than the quality of comments made by the young people here tonight.

The predicted SATS scores are as follows:

- English and mathematics combined was 29.4% and is predicted to be 58.4%.
- Mathematics was 35.3% and is predicted to be 86%
- English was 41.2% and is predicted to be 58.8%
- Science scores have also risen to 94%

Doubling or nearly tripling results is more than a one year blip and are very good reasons for us to support this school.

Why spend the money on another school, which would seem immoral when you could make better use of the money and invest in existent schools.

The Church has worked very closely with this school and we are committed to keeping it. To this end the possibility of another option has come to light over the last two weeks. The Church would like to offer to re-launch Ward Jackson School as a church aided school if that is what the parents and the people of this community want. We are committed to the ethos of the school and would strive to drive up standards. The school would remain committed to serving all of the people in the local area (very strong applause).

Ofsted said that we needed to improve, within 18 months we have doubled or tripled our results. In another 18 months we will not be an under achieving school. You want schools to play a new role at the heart of their community; this is not a vision for us it is already happening. Option three is not acceptable.

Strategies are now in place for more collaboration and we are looking to employ an external adviser to help raise standards. We are now exploring the possibility of becoming a church aided school and this will raise ethos, standards and funding.

(Comment from the Headteacher of St Joseph's)

I would like to endorse the fact that St Joseph's are not looking for a new school and are in support of keeping this school and collaborating more closely as this would benefit both schools. However if the decision was made to close Ward Jackson we would welcome all of the children from here. At the St Joseph's meetings that were held last night we went for option two.

You also need to take safety aspects into consideration, if you close Ward Jackson not all parents will want their children to go to St Joseph's. The alternative would be Stranton and getting children across the A179 would be a major concern.

(Comment from the Headteacher)

I have been asked if I was surprised at the number of people that have turned out tonight but I have said no as I expected this many. That is because the parents and people of this community are fully committed to this school and they need to be praised for that.

ST. AIDAN'S CHURCH OF ENGLAND (AIDED) MEMORIAL PRIMARY SCHOOL
LOYALTY ROAD
HARTLEPOOL
TS25 5BA

ST. AIDAN'S RESPONSE TO PCP FROM THE GOVERNING BODY

The following response was put together by the governing body of St. Aidan's on July 10th 2008.

The Governing Body is NOT in favour of any of the three options put forward by the Local Authority for the future of St. Aidan's School as all three include the suggestion of co-locating St. Cuthbert's RC Primary School onto the St. Aidan's site.

The Governing Body is against the co-locating of St. Cuthbert's onto the St. Aidan's site for the following reasons.

- a. The amount of traffic in Loyalty Road would be effectively doubled and we have enough traffic problems already.
- b. The number of children on site would be greater than the number suggested (420) for the largest primary schools.
- c. The building of a new school for St. Cuthbert's would reduce drastically the amount of field space, especially if over 500 children were on the same site.
- d. Parents would be attracted to a new school build and numbers in St. Aidan's could continue to fall.
- e. The parents of St. Aidan's CE Memorial (Aided) Primary School and the parents of St. Cuthbert's RC Primary School are all against the idea of co-location as was seen at both Public meetings recently.

The Governing Body are aware that current thinking would suggest that because of the conditions of the building we would not have a new St. Aidan's

built and that a refurbishment is the best we could hope for. The Governing Body would like it to be known that if that were the case they would want to be involved in the planning of the refurbishment and not have it imposed upon them.

However, both the Chair of Governors and the headteacher are of the opinion that in order to meet the needs of the community and the education of the children in the 21st century the present building is NOT suitable and a purpose built school would be more appropriate than a refurbishment.

THE PARTNER PRIMARY SCHEME

It is also apparent that if certain schools were to be closed then there would have to be a re-think of the Partner Primary scheme which at the present time has our children going to Dyke House School. This is not the favoured option for many of our parents who would prefer a nearer school.

From attendance at an Admissions Forum meeting I know that from current numbers, Manor School will be oversubscribed for the next eight years and in one year could have as many as 60 appeals. From the same information I am also aware that English Martyrs are undersubscribed for the next eight years and if St. Cuthbert's were to have a new smaller one form entry school built that would produce more available places at English Martyrs.

The Governing Body would like the Partner Primary Scheme to be looked at again and to look at the possibility of St. Aidan's children attending English Martyrs for their secondary education. This along with other ideas was presented to Cabinet in September 2007 and we wish it again to be given serious consideration.

We would be happy to discuss any of these points in greater detail if you wish us to.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Railton, Headteacher on behalf of the Governing Body.

Nº 20
AREA 3

St Cuthbert's Staff response to PCP Stage 2 Consultation

We accept that a reduction in places from 308 to 210 pupils is realistic based on pupil number projections, and in view of baptisms in the parish. A number of staff are clearly concerned about how this will affect their jobs, but we accept that surplus places need to be tackled.

Despite the current buildings 'strong points' such as large classrooms and a great roof garden, the limitations are much greater - no adjacent field, no car park, condition and accessibility issues.

We do not believe that a co-location at St Aidan's is a possibility. We believe the site is too small to allow sufficient playing space, there are already major traffic problems, and we want St Cuthberts to remain a distinctive community, on the current site.

We are concerned that there are a number of obsolete buildings surrounding the St Cuthberts site - a Parish Hall, a huge house for the Priest, a Day Centre and St Brigid's Nursing Home. We asked our Diocesan consultant to investigate whether, if such buildings were demolished, there would be enough space for a one form entry school, with playing field and car park. We have attached some initial drawings that indicate that this is possible, and the current building would be able to remain open until the new building was complete.

To build a new school whilst tackling the removal of another group of buildings is an exciting opportunity to transform our school/church community, learning and sharing in different ways to use the space effectively.

Whilst there is enough space on site for the school, there is not a lot of extra space - there isn't much scope to consider space for extended services/community facility. We currently have an excellent partnership with St Aidans for breakfast club and after school care, based at St Cuthberts. As part of the remodelling of St Aidans, community facilities and space for wrap around care, before and after school care, for both schools working in partnership, would be an excellent way forward. The two

schools have proved that they are committed to partnership working - it makes sense to continue that partnership in terms of extended services.



St Cuthbert's RC Primary School
Site Plan As Existing,
SC: 1/1000



St Cuthbert's RC Primary School
 Site Plan As Existing, Area: 6156 Sq.m.
 SC: 1/1000





St Cuthbert's RC Primary School
Site Plan As Proposed - Option (2),
SC: 1/1000



St Cuthbert's RC Primary School
Site Plan As Proposed - Option (3),
SC: 1/1000

All Saints Church Stranton

01429 263190

www.stranton-church.org.uk

God's Light on a Hill



in the Heart of the Town

29 July 2008

The Schools Transformation Team
Aneurin Bevan House
Avenue Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8HD

Transforming Primary Education: Stage 2 Consultation Ward Jackson Primary School

I am writing on behalf of the Parochial Church Council of Stranton Church in response to the Stage 2 Consultation document. The main purpose of our response is to support Ward Jackson Primary School, which lies in this parish, and to propose that in order to secure the future of the school, consideration should be given to re-launching it as a Church of England (Voluntary Aided) School.

The Burbank estate, where the school is situated, is a very distinct area of Hartlepool. Although it is close to the town centre it remains geographically and socially very isolated, surrounded by a busy dual carriageway to the west, the sea to the east, industrial estates to the south and the pubs and clubs of Church Street to the north. It has long been recognized that the estate has particularly acute social and economic problems. For example, over 58% of households are classed as low income compared with 40% in Hartlepool and 24% nationally (ONS 2001), and the worklessness rate on the estate is 43% compared with 33% borough wide and 25% nationally (JSU 2006). There are very few facilities on the estate: there are no shops and the Bridge Youth Centre has just been demolished. Burbank faces huge difficulties and closing the school would have a major negative impact on the life of the estate as a whole, far beyond the children and families most immediately affected.

As the consultation document shows, Ward Jackson School has faced difficulties over recent years. However, the community values the school very much indeed, as shown by the strong and committed turnout at the public meeting at the school on 9 July. At that meeting, the overwhelming and unanimous message from parents, children, ex-students,

Vicar The Revd Dr Michael Gilbertson,
34 Westbourne Road, Hartlepool, TS25 5RE
Tel: 01429 263190, Fax: 01429 400118,
michael.gilbertson@durham.anglican.org

Associate The Revd Kate Brooke, The Rectory, Church Lane,
Minister Redmarshall, Stockton-on-Tees, TS21 1ES
Tel: 07980 676018, kate@revd.co.uk

HOPE

in Hartlepool

governors and staff (and the head and other staff from St Joseph's School, who came to offer their strong support) was that the school should remain open. It is performing a hugely valued service to the local community, in the face of very considerable challenges (such as accommodating all of the children from the women's refuge, who come often for very short periods and from difficult circumstances). This year's SATS results show a very significant improvement on recent years, and should be built upon for the future.

Stranton parish has had a long-standing commitment to the Burbank estate, going back decades. We employ a community worker (Clive Hall) who lives on the estate, and we run the Burbank Community Church, which currently meets in the Havelock Centre. Clive and our youth and children's worker Peter Hart are often in the school taking assemblies and other activities. The school comes to church each Christmas and Easter for services. I personally chair the Burbank Community Forum, which brings residents and service providers together on a monthly basis to discuss issues affecting life on the estate. Given these links, and mindful of the context of the Burbank estate, we are therefore, as a parish, very committed to supporting the school into the future. We also have similarly close relationships with the other primary schools in the parish (Stranton, Eldon Grove and St Joseph's).

For all these reasons, we are therefore putting forward the suggestion that Ward Jackson School might be re-launched as a Church of England (Voluntary Aided) School, to give the school a fresh start with increased involvement from the local community. As a Church of England VA school, the admissions policy of the school would remain very much centred on serving the children of the local community, of all faith backgrounds and none. The idea of moving to VA status has been discussed with the head and the current governors of the school, who are very keen to explore it, and are responding to the consultation in these terms. The Board of Education of Durham Diocese is also strongly supportive of exploring this possibility further, and is writing separately. I raised the idea at the public meeting on 9 July and have had nothing but positive comments about it since.

We note the comment in the consultation document that 'because of pupil performance issues at Ward Jackson Primary School, it would be essential to have very strong plans to support the school if it is to stay open.' We believe that re-launching the school as a VA school would help to achieve this. The school is also working on developing partnerships with other local schools and institutions, all of which would be very compatible with a change in status. We would be very keen to forge partnerships with others for the good of the school and the community. This certainly includes St Joseph's School, with whom we already work closely, and with whose sponsoring church, St Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, we are linked in a Local Ecumenical Partnership.

We very much hope that the Project Board and the Cabinet will wish to pursue the option of a change of status for the school, as a way of securing its future.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Gilbertson

Michael Gilbertson
Vicar

*Copies: Paul Briggs, Children's Services, HBC
Sheila Bamber, Board of Education
Jan Brough, Ward Jackson School*



N. 24
AREA 3

Ward Jackson Primary School

Clark Street • Hartlepool • TS24 7LE • Tel: (01429) 293777 • Fax: (01429) 293899

www.wardjackson.hartlepool.sch.uk

Headteacher: Mrs. J. Brough

18th July 2008

Dear Mrs Hanson,

The governors of Ward Jackson Primary School would like to thank your Headteacher, Mr Dave Dobson, and your staff for sharing their outstanding knowledge of school leadership and school improvement in order to help raise standards at our school.

This support has been so successful we would like to employ Mr Dobson as an Executive Consultant for Ward Jackson Primary School from September 2008 to July 2009.

The areas of development we would like him to focus on include:

- Develop the role of the senior management team.
- Performance Management.
- Continuing to improve teaching and learning.

Finally, because we want to give our Headteacher, staff and children the best support possible, we would like to ask if it is possible for this consultancy to include some form of development for governors.

We look forward to your reply.

Yours faithfully

Olwyn Little
Chair of Governors





Ward Jackson Primary School

Clark Street • Hartlepool • TS24 7LE • Tel: (01429) 293777 • Fax: (01429) 293899

www.wardjackson.hartlepool.sch.uk

Headteacher: Mrs. J. Brough

18th July 2008

Reverend Cannon Sheila Bamber
Carter House
Pelaw Leazes Lane
Durham
DH1 1TB

Dear Reverend Canon Sheila Bamber,

The Governing Body of Ward Jackson Primary School would very much like to explore the possibility of our school becoming a Church of England Aided school.

This idea is a result of everyone concerned with the school coming together to talk about its future particularly in relation to Primary Capital Programme proposals. Meetings have recently taken place with staff, parents, community stakeholders and Reverend Mike Gilbertson from Stranton Church, with whom we have very close links.

It is clear that the community want Ward Jackson Primary School to remain open and the Governing Body have written a formal response to the Primary Capital Team which clearly sets out strategies for continued improvement. Please read enclosed document.

We would like proposals to include the option of a "Fresh Start" for Ward Jackson Primary School. Reverend Gilbertson has informed us that the PCC of Stranton Church is strongly in favour of exploring this option also.

Ward Jackson Primary is a hard working school at the heart of the community and we look forward to your reply.

Yours Sincerely

Olwyn Little
Olwyn Little

Chair of Governors



Governor signatures

Parent Governor

Mrs O Little (Chair) *P. Little*
Mrs C Longmoor *C. Longmoor*
Mrs A Hall *A. Hall*
Mrs J Stoker *J. Stoker*
Miss J A Wainwright *J. Wainwright*

Local Authority Governor

PC M Hetherington *P.P. Little*
Councillor J Brash *P.P. Little*
Miss A Reed *P.P. Little*

Staff Governor

Mrs T Devonshire *T. Devonshire*
Mrs M Tucker *M. Tucker*
Mrs J Brough *J. Brough*

Community Governor

Mrs A P Smith *P.P. Little*
Mrs J Dodd *J. Dodd*
Mr I M Devonshire *I. M. Devonshire*

Ward Jackson Primary School

KS2 SAT results for 2008

Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in English at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	82%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in Maths at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	88%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in English and Maths at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	82%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in Science at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	94%

Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Reading at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	36%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Writing at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	6%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Maths at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	18%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Science at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	42%

The governors would like to highlight a statement from our recent Ofsted report from February 2008:

“Leadership and management are good. The head teacher’s very good leadership provides a clear vision and direction to school improvement. Her drive and determination are leading to rapid improvement in provision and standards she is well supported by the two assistant head teachers and enjoys the full confidence of the school community. The school has a reputation locally of being a caring and happy school and of supporting families. The staff are dedicated in helping every child realise his or her best and the head teacher has instilled her determination to raise standards. Staff moral and optimism is high because of good relationships, mutual respect and an ethos of school improvement.”

↓ **Improve the condition of the building.**

- All essential work that has been identified in the consultation documents is due to be completed by September 2008.

For the future we would welcome:

- Additional funding to enhance the school building for example the children have suggested a separate dedicated sports hall which could also be used for the community.

We as Governors will continue to support the community use of the building:

Toddler group

- Toddler group use the facilities during the week.
- Burbank parents forum provide support for 22 parents/carers and 15 children on a weekly basis, providing healthy lunch, and opportunities for children to develop their social and communication skills and both groups ease the transition into our nursery.

Children's Centre

- The Governors to explore the use of the Sure Start building with the Integration Support Manager.

Bridge builders

- Community link workers to continue their church and local community group. This group is over subscribed and could expand if Ward Jackson had available space.

Cool Club

- Belle Vue use Ward Jackson School as a base for this valuable club for children aged 10-13 years.

Fire Station

- Ward Jackson will continue its links with the fire station through by allowing its members to use the facilities.

- Accommodate the needs of the local community considering the following points:
 - 55 children attend from the community as opposed to only 22 children from the community attending St Josephs.
 - 57 children's families choose to attend Ward Jackson some of the reasons are set out below.
 - Small class sizes
 - Womens refuge
 - Sensitivity of staff
 - Support for children with SEN
 - Every child matters
 - Support for GAT children
 - Children attend the nursery and were impressed with the ethos of the nursery so attend the school.

For the future as governors we will ensure that this is enhanced by:

- **Collaborating** with a range of local partnership schools (ie St Josephs RC Primary, Kingsley Primary Dyke House and Hartlepool College) to continue to improve standards of teaching and learning.
- **Employing** the skills and experience of Mr Dave Dobson a national School leader as Executive Consultant for our School.
- **Liaising** with other Governing bodies.
- **Forming** a Governor committee to work on raising standards.
- **Exploring** the possibility of becoming a Church of England Aided school as proposed by Reverend Mike Gilbertson of Stranton Church.
 - The first meeting was on Monday 14th July 2008.
 - On the 18th July a formal letter of request was sent to the Diocesan Director of Education Miss Sheila Bamber.

The views of the governors of
Ward Jackson Primary School
Regarding Primary Education Stage 2
Consultation July 2008

The governors have voted unanimously for Option 2.

↓ **No change to size:**

We want to keep the same capacity to ensure that the ethos and identity of the school is maintained.

↓ **Support School to meet government targets in English and Maths.**

The governors will continue to advocate current level of support provided by Primary Strategy Team (L.A) and the close links with Kingsley Primary a beacon school in Hartlepool.

We as governors will continue to:

- Monitor children's progress by the rigorous procedures put in place by the comprehensive tracking system.
- Be actively involved in their relevant curriculum areas. Including scrutiny of children's work and teachers planning.
- Have input to the annual School Improvement Plan.
- Attend relevant governor training.



Nº 27 Area 3

Ward Jackson Primary School

Clark Street • Hartlepool • TS24 7LE • Tel: (01429) 293777 • Fax: (01429) 293899
www.wardjackson.hartlepool.sch.uk
Headteacher: Mrs. J. Brough

Aneurin Bevan House
Avenue Road
TS24 8HD

23rd July 2008

Dear Mr Briggs.

Please find enclosed a staff response booklet which all our staff have taken the time to contribute to.

As Headteacher I feel that Ward Jackson Primary School has made great improvements since the start of my leadership in January 2007. The successful Ofsted report in February 2008 and the outstanding KS2 SAT results which have just been published show that new strategies for improvement that myself and the senior management team have introduced are having a positive impact on children's learning. Standardised scores (which are included in the response booklet) show that standards are increasing across the year groups and 2008 is not a stand alone year.

After reading the staff response booklet, parent letters and children's responses as well as considering the strong messages given at the PCP meeting, I hope you will agree that Ward Jackson Primary School is a school of the future because we:

- ✓ Create strategies to improve.
- ✓ Show a capacity to innovate/introduce new ideas.
- ✓ Promote a culture in which change is the norm.
- ✓ Translate our school vision into actual practice:

"At Ward Jackson Primary School we seek to treat children individually in a secure, caring but intellectually challenging environment where children are valued and rewarded for their achievements"

With the support of a very forward thinking Governing Body, committed staff, a unified community including parents, friends and external partners and such happy responsive children I am confident that Option 2 is the right option for Ward Jackson Primary School.

Yours Sincerely

J. Brough

Mrs Jan Brough
Headteacher



Staff is united in the view that Option 2 in the PCP Consultation 2 document, to keep Ward Jackson Primary School open with additional support, is the most viable option for the school.

Since her appointment in January 2007 our Headteacher, Jan Brough, has ensured that the raising standards agenda has been at the forefront of our school improvement plan.

Strategies that are proving successful in raising standards and which we will be continuing to develop in our strategic plan for the future include:

- Implementation of the Renewed Frameworks in Literacy and Maths.
- New Maths Assessments linked to the new framework.
- Separate year group classes.
- Rigorous self evaluation in Literacy and Maths – lesson observations every term, planning/ book scrutinies and writing moderation every half term.
- New Assistant Headteacher and Literacy Coordinator.
- Effective collaboration with successful primary schools: Kingsley and St Joseph's.
- Consistent planning format (Review, Practise, Apply) Praised by Ofsted February 2008.
- Improved liaison with Primary Strategy Advisors i.e. Debbie Brown's focused work with Y6 and her INSET work.
- Individual targets for Literacy and Maths for children.
- Tracking of individual children with focused intervention quickly implemented for those not on track i.e. Catch Up – ALS, ELS, FLS and Booster groups – Springboard, Jump Ahead.
- Performance Management objectives linked to tracking.
- Whole school marking policy. Next step marking ensures children aware of what is necessary to improve. Praised by LA Review September 2007 and Ofsted February 2008.
- Big Write the results of which are moderated using Ros Wilson assessment.

- Letters and Sounds for all KS1 and Y3 with target groups in Year 4, 5 and 6.
- Results of analysis of assessments/tests/pupil questionnaires informing practice. Examples of success here include our new Calculation Policy (which is used in staff moderation meetings), Basic Skill sessions, Data Handling focus and games in Maths lessons.
- Guided Reading records.
- Assessment for Learning. Using WALT and WILF children are able to use self and peer assessment to inform their learning.
- Termly GAT review. Liaising with schools to improve provision for GAT. Ordering of new resources in the core subjects.
- Targets for SEN provision i.e. Beat Dyslexia and Speech and Language.
- Appraisals for Teaching Assistants. Identification of training needs. PD on Guided Reading, Renewed Frameworks and Guided Reading.
- Review and structure weekly timetable according to the needs of the children. For example more time is allocated for Science.
- A higher profile for Science including a new scheme of work with ICT and assessment links.
- Improved integration within early years.
- Transformation of nursery garden into an outdoor learning environment.
- Improving standard of display to inform and support learning as well as to celebrate children's achievements.
- Healthy Schools Status. Achieved and maintained via Golden Time/Golden Rules, PSHCE, Active Mark, and Playground Pals.
- Breakfast, Lunch and After School Clubs.
- Increased use of the Sure Start room/facilities by school and the community.

It is because of this continued drive for improvement that recent assessments and tests show good progress across all year groups.

KS2 SAT results for 2008

Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in English at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	82%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in Maths at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	88%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in English and Maths at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	82%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 4+ in Science at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	94%

Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Reading at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	36%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Writing at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	6%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Maths at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	18%
Percentage of pupils achieving Level 5 in Science at end of Key Stage 2 (age 11)	42%

Average Point Score for cohorts 2007 – 2008

Year	Number in cohort	Reading APS			Writing APS			Maths APS		
		June 07	June 08	Average	June 07	June 08	Average	June 07	June 08	Average
2	21	13.2	16.3	3.1	12.2	14.6	2.4	12.7	16.4	3.7
3	14	12.4	18.2	5.8	12	15.1	3.1	14.9	17.8	2.9
4	15	17.9	21.3	3.4	4.3	18.2	3.9	17.6	20.3	2.7
5	9	20.1	26.1	6	18.8	21.2	2.4	21.2	24.5	3.3
6	16	23.6	28.4	4.8	21.3	27.3	6	24.9	28	3.1

The above strategies are continuing to be embedded within our practice.

New strategies in our school improvement plan for 2008-2009 to continue to raise standards further include:

- Sharing good practice within school to improve teaching and learning. For example Big Write and Guided Writing to improve standards in Writing.
- Introduction of the Learning Platform.
- Involve parents in the learning process i.e. Maths trail for parents and children.
- Weekly French lessons in KS2. (Supported by specialist teacher from Dyke House)
- Implementation of the new Early Years Foundation Stage Framework.
- Familiarisation and introduction of the new APP materials. (Supported by Primary Strategy Advisor Debbie Brown)
- Teach the higher achieving Year 5 alongside Year 6 pupils.
- Review of attendance/punctuality policy.

● "The staff are dedicated to helping every child realise his or her best and the Headteacher has instilled a determination to raise standards."

Ofsted February 2008

●

Name	Position	Signature
CHRIS PARKER	CARE TAKER	C Parker
JAN BROUGH	Headteacher	J. Brough
Nicky Westgarth	Y6 teacher	N. Westgarth
Kelly James	Teaching Assistant	K. James
Ann McIlwraith	Assistant headteacher	A. McIlwraith
LYNETTE GRAHAM	Y4 TEACHER	L. Graham
CHRISTINE CASS	Teaching Assistant	C. Cass
CHRISTINE THOMPSON	Teaching Assistant	C. Thompson
MORAG TUCKER	Y2 TEACHER	M. Tucker
JOANNE GRAHAM	Teaching Assistant	J. Graham
TRACEY DEVONSHIRE	TEACHING ASSISTANT	T. Devonshire
SAMINA SHAN	Y3 TEACHER	S. Shan
CATHERINE PRATT	PPA TEACHER	C. Pratt
LOUISE HARGREAVES	ASSISTANT HEADTEACHER	L. Hargreaves
JULIE KING	Teaching Assistant	J. King
MARGARET SOUTHWATE	TEACHING ASSISTANT	M. Southwate
JULIE WHITLOCK	TEACHING ASSISTANT	J. Whitlock
SUSAN ALLEN	Foundation Stage Teacher	S. Allen
Lesley Carroll	Nursery Nurse	L. Carroll
Julie Day	Administration Assistant	J. Day
P. Shore	Secretary	P. Shore
DENISE SIMPSON	LUNCHTIME SUPERVISOR	D. Simpson
Leanne Webb	Lunch supervisor	L. Webb

**All Saints Church
Stranton**

01429 263190

www.stranton-church.org.uk

God's Light on a Hill



in the Heart of the Town

22 July 2008

The Schools Transformation Team
Aneurin Bevan House
Avenue Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8HD

Transforming Primary Education: Stage 2 Consultation

I am writing to respond to the consultation in my capacity as chair of the Burbank Community Forum. This is the group which meets monthly to discuss the problems and challenges of the Burbank estate. It draws together residents from the estate, many of whom are actively involved in various residents' groups; service providers (such as Hartlepool Borough Council, Housing Hartlepool, HVDA, Cleveland Police, the Primary Care Trust, and the local schools); and the local councillors from Stranton Ward. Administrative support is provided by the central area town care manager and her staff. The Forum is the body charged with monitoring the implementation of the Neighbourhood Action Plan and making judgements about allocation of funds under the Working Neighbourhoods Fund.

At its July meeting, the Forum considered the Transforming Primary Education consultation document, in particular as it relates to the future of Ward Jackson School. The residents on the Forum agreed unanimously to put forward their strong view that the school should remain open. The school is much valued by the community and is offering very good education and care for local children in difficult circumstances. The Burbank estate has major long-term problems, exacerbated by the fact that although it is relatively close to the town centre, it is geographically and socially isolated. There are precious few community facilities on the estate, and the youth centre has just been demolished. Closing Ward Jackson School would therefore have a major negative impact on the estate as a whole, not just on children and their families.

At the request of the resident members of the Forum, I am therefore writing to express their very strong support for Ward Jackson School, and their desire for the Local Authority to pursue options which would keep the school open.

Michael Gilbertson

Michael Gilbertson
Vicar

Vicar: The Revd Dr Michael Gilbertson,
34 Westbourne Road, Hartlepool, TS25 5RE
Tel: 01429 263190, Fax: 01429 400118,
michael.gilbertson@durham.anglican.org

Associate Minister: The Revd Kate Brooke, The Rectory, Church Lane,
Redmarshall, Stockton-on-Tees, TS21 1ES
Tel: 07980 676018, kate@revd.co.uk



in Hartlepool