

CABINET AGENDA



Friday, 14 November 2008

at 9.00 am

**in Committee Room B,
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

- 3.1 To receive the Record of Decision in respect of the meeting held on 27 October 2008 (previously circulated)

4. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

No items

5. KEY DECISIONS

No items

6. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 6.1 Groundwork In Hartlepool - *Director of Neighbourhood Services*
6.2 Request For Grants From Contingency Funds - *The Mayor*
6.3 Stagecoach Services 1, 6, 7 And 7a - Supported Contracts and the Health Bus Service - *Director of Neighbourhood Services*

- 6.4 Review Of Schools Transformation Project Board - *Director of Children's Services*
- 6.5 Consultation Response – The Strategic Siting Assessment Process for New Nuclear Power Stations In The UK - *Director Of Regeneration And Planning Services*

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

No items

8. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- 8.1 Local Area Agreement – Annual Review And Refresh 2008/09 - *Head of Community Strategy*

9. REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS

No items

9. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

EXEMPT ITEMS

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

10. EXEMPT ITEM REQUIRING DECISION

- 10.1 Senior Management Review - *Chief Personnel Officer*

CABINET REPORT
14 November 2008



Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: **GROUNDWORK IN HARTLEPOOL**

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek Council's approval for entering into a Partial Partnership with Groundwork to be reviewed in 12 months and to consider the creation of a Groundwork in Hartlepool Delivery Board and to examine the potential to enter into a Full Partnership.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Options for establishing a formal Groundwork in Hartlepool partnership model is not a new concept, its potential having been considered by the Council only a couple of years ago in 2005/06. At that time it was decided not to proceed with the partnership model proposed. However, in the current climate of reducing resources, increased demands on staff and budgets and the need to find new and alternative solutions to meeting customer needs, discussions have recommenced and potential ways forward have been re-examined.

At this time also, Groundwork has been challenged by partners, including the Department of Communities and Local Government, to extend coverage out of existing boundaries to be able to offer environmental regeneration solutions across the region.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Affects the whole town.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet 14 November 2008

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

It is recommended that Council:

- i) enter into a Partial Partnership with Groundwork with a review of this position to be completed within 12 months to assess progress,
- ii) consider the creation of a Groundwork in Hartlepool Delivery Board and to examine further the potential to enter into a Full Partnership.

Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: **GROUNDWORK IN HARTLEPOOL**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek Council's approval for entering into a Partial Partnership with Groundwork to be reviewed in 12 months and to consider the creation of a Groundwork in Hartlepool Delivery Board and to examine the potential to enter into a Full Partnership.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Groundwork is a leading Federation of Charitable Trusts delivering environmental, social and economic regeneration in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Each Trust works with their partners to improve the quality of the local environment, the lives of local people and the success of local businesses in areas in need of investment and support.
- 2.2 Each Groundwork Trust is a partnership between the public, private and voluntary sectors with its own Board of Trustees. The work of the Trusts is supported by the national and regional offices of Groundwork UK and Groundwork Wales. Groundwork works alongside communities, public bodies, private companies and other voluntary sector organisations to deliver programmes that bring about concurrent social, economic and environmental benefits.
- 2.3 Groundwork's vision is of a society made up of sustainable communities which are vibrant, healthy and safe, which respect the local and global environment and where individuals and enterprise prosper.
- 2.4 Groundwork nationally has a turnover of approximately £120m and employs around 2,000 staff. Groundwork is supported by the Department of Communities and Local Government and other Government departments, Welsh Assembly, Northern Ireland Executive, Regional Development Agencies, European Union, Lottery, Private Sector and over 100 Local Authorities.
- 2.5 In the North East Groundwork is active in all sub regions of County Durham, Northumberland, Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear. Groundwork began working in the North East in 1990 in County Durham and on average now delivers over 600 projects across all four sub regions.

2.6 Projects aim to deliver benefits:

- For People :
Creating opportunities for people to learn new skills and become more active citizens.
- For Places :
Delivering environmental improvements that create cleaner, safer and greener neighbourhoods.
- For Prosperity :
Helping businesses and individuals fulfil their potential.

2.7 Groundwork's approach is always to work with others to add value to wider plans and strategies and our role is to find ways of helping local people get practically involved in making decisions and managing improvements in their neighbourhood. Local programmes and services are tailored to the needs of partners and communities in that locality.

3. CURRENT POSITION

3.1 There were five established Groundwork Trusts in the North East which covered East Durham, West Durham, South Tyneside, South Tees and Northumberland. This left some significant gaps in regional coverage but over the past two years there has been significant progress with Newcastle City Council and Darlington Borough Council recently agreeing to become part of the Groundwork family.

3.2 Groundwork East Durham has been tasked with exploring options for extension into Hartlepool and has successfully applied to the Charity Commission to extend coverage to encompass this new area. Initial discussions have taken place with myself to consider options for establishing a partnership model for Groundwork in Hartlepool and potential areas of work have been identified and discussed within an Officer Steering Group to ensure a co-ordinated and agreed list of potential pilot projects. A meeting has also taken place involving HVDA and OFCA to discuss the potential for Groundwork activity in Hartlepool which will add value to existing voluntary and community sector activity.

4. OPTIONS

There are a number of potential governance models available if a partnership is to be established:

4.1 **i) Full Partnership** - The local authority becomes a 'Company Member' of the Groundwork Trust. This is a limited company committing

members to the contribution of £1 in the case of a winding up. There is a commitment to an ongoing relationship through a three year strategic plan and annual business plan which would identify both Groundwork and potential local authority resources.

This relationship provides for the opportunity of two places for Council Members on the Trust Board with the support of a nominated link officer at the Council (usually a senior officer with a junior). The Board meets quarterly to offer scrutiny and overview against the business plan. A geographically focused working group (or a Delivery Board) can operate outside of the Strategic Board where Members and officers have the opportunity to develop programmes of work with a Groundwork Senior Manager.

This model has served the Trust well in their existing coverage for many years and would be the preferred model for Hartlepool. It is entirely possible to either strengthen or water down this example, and there are many instances of this both up and down the Country.

- 4.2 **ii) Partial Partnership** – this would provide no Board membership but a planned programme of activity at an officer level would be agreed on an annual basis. Groundwork would develop its own projects with partners and work with the Council at a less strategic level. This model could attract significant resources but would be less well co-ordinated with Council priorities. Groundwork would be more of an independent regeneration agent directed by other partners operating within the Borough.
- 4.3 **iii) Informal Partnership** – there would be no agreed relationship with Groundwork but each party will be happy to work together if any specific opportunities arise. This option would have no ability to inform or direct the way a programme of work is instigated in the Borough, a programme would develop and this would engage, at a completely uncoordinated way, with Council officers and provide limited scope for development.

Groundwork East Durham has recently secured £17,500 of funds each year for three years from Department of Communities and Local Government to assist in the development of Groundwork activity in Hartlepool. Following discussions with myself, it has been suggested that this opportunity would best be deployed, in the first instance, in the establishment of a small project development budget, matched with Council resources, to identify an agreed number of pilot schemes to be progressed.

5. POTENTIAL SCHEMES

- 5.1 A list of potential pilot schemes identified to date to develop and implement in partnership with the Council are:

Thorpe Street

This small scale environmental improvement scheme to improve the area at the top of Thorpe Street has secured a budget of £10k split equally between Headland NAP Forum and Housing Hartlepool. A sketch proposal has been developed following work with children from St Bega's Primary School and will be taken to the wider community for consultation.

Jutland Road Play area

This project will involve a community consultation and production of sketch scheme proposal to consider ideas for improvements to an existing vandalised play area. £60k has been secured for this scheme to date and includes £30k (s106), £10k (HBC minor works budget), £5k (Mayor's capital contingency), £5k (South Joint Action Group) and £10k (Housing Hartlepool).

Burbank Commemorative Garden

This potential scheme is to be led by residents interested in creating a memorial garden. Funds for the project will need to be attracted from external sources (Community Spaces/ Heritage Lottery may be appropriate).

Thornton Street

Following on from the creation of a linear park at this location, the potential for further work is to be investigated with residents to further enhance the area.

Central Estate Community Garden

Groundwork has been requested to be part of a steering group to facilitate the creation of a community garden and wildlife area. The group will consist of community members, Council officers, staff from Surestart and Housing Hartlepool.

Middleton Road Estate (For Information)

Following a successful tender presentation, Groundwork has been commissioned by Housing Hartlepool to develop a master plan for environmental improvements to Middleton Road estate following extensive consultation with residents.

- 5.2 To facilitate and monitor the development and implementation of the proposed pilot schemes whilst a formal partnership arrangement is considered, an Officer Steering Group has been established to work with Groundwork staff. It is hoped that this officer steering group could eventually develop/expand into a Groundwork in Hartlepool (GiH) Delivery Board with responsibility for overseeing the development and delivery of a programme of activity for Groundwork in Hartlepool. A draft Terms of Reference for this potential Delivery Board is attached.
(Appendix I)

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Groundwork has the resources and ability to deliver partnership working in Hartlepool and strongly believes can add significant value and bring additional resources to the partnership. A proposed programme for Groundwork in Hartlepool would develop in a targeted way, addressing deprivation through the delivery of sustainable environmental improvement projects which would protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.
- 6.2 It is anticipated that over time the Trust will grow to meet more of the needs of the people of Hartlepool, this growth driven by a "bottom up" rather than "top down" approach to needs, facilitating increased partnership with the voluntary sector. During the early period, it is anticipated that stronger partnerships will emerge with key strategic and statutory bodies to ensure a co-ordinated approach to sustainable development that will lead to the improved health and well being of the Hartlepool community, the creation of safer, stronger and inclusive communities with opportunities for children, young people and adults to achieve their full potential and maximise their education and skills.
- 6.3 The key principle of Groundwork is that it meets local needs, which means detailed project descriptions can only be drawn up once there has been involvement of the communities and other local partners. It is strongly believed that Groundwork can support many key strategic objectives in Hartlepool to create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion to match the ambition of all stakeholders.

7. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council:

- i) enter into a Partial Partnership with Groundwork with a review of this position to be completed within 12 months to assess progress,
- ii) consider the creation of a Groundwork in Hartlepool Delivery Board and to examine further the potential to enter into a Full Partnership.

6.1 APPENDIX 1

Groundwork in Hartlepool Delivery Board

DRAFT Terms of Reference

The Delivery Board will be responsible for overseeing the development and delivery of a programme of activity for Groundwork in Hartlepool. It will report to the Strategic Board of Trustee Directors of Groundwork (***subject to establishing a full partnership model the Strategic Board would include Members from Hartlepool***) and be accountable to the company members. It will also be responsible for ensuring that Groundwork is accountable to a wide range of stakeholders, partners and funders involved in supporting the programme in the Borough.

Specifically the Delivery Board will:

- Agree an annual business plan and programme of work for Groundwork in Hartlepool and monitor progress in delivering this against agreed milestones.
- Ensure that resources (including staff and finance) are appropriate to deliver the proposed activity and that financial arrangements are closely monitored.
- Ensure that agreed outputs and outcomes are being achieved and effective evaluation is carried out demonstrating value and quality of work being done.
- Ensure that projects are being delivered in accordance with recognised standards, procedures and best practice, including those set out by Groundwork UK, Hartlepool Borough Council and other relevant partners.
- Suggest development opportunities and help identify future work by sharing expertise and knowledge about Borough issues and environmental, social and economic regeneration needs, ensuring appropriate links are made with partners, other facilitators and where relevant, service providers.
- Advocate on behalf of Groundwork and endorse the approach to community led environmental regeneration.
- Prepare an annual report on achievements for Hartlepool Borough Council Members at appropriate scrutiny and where relevant, Cabinet meetings.

6.1 APPENDIX 1

Chairperson

The Chairperson should be elected by the members of the Delivery Board and appointed at the first meeting. The Chairperson should be (re) elected annually in line with good governance practice. It is intended that the Chairperson of the delivery board also serves as a Trustee Director on the Groundwork Strategic Board. ***(subject to establishing a Full Partnership model)***

Term of office

Members of the Delivery Board will be invited to serve a two year term. They can be re-appointed to serve a further two year term, although it is proposed that at least two members of the Delivery Board stand down after two years and further nominations are invited and considered. We will need to take account of local authority elections and will also need to take account of natural succession and turnover. We are aware that not all Delivery Board members may be able to fulfil the full term.

Membership

The Delivery Board will be made up of partners with an interest in supporting the development and delivery of Groundwork activities in Hartlepool. Initially the membership will comprise:

- 2 Hartlepool Borough Council Members
The majority party or party running the administration of the Borough Council will have the right to nominate a Member to serve as a Groundwork Director and Trustee on the main board.
- 2 representatives from the Groundwork Strategic Board
There needs to be a direct link between the Delivery Board and Strategic Board. Two serving Trustee Directors, with an interest in Hartlepool issues, will sit on the Hartlepool Delivery Board.

We aim to also include representation from the following:

- Housing Association
- Private Sector
- Community & Voluntary Sector
- Public Sector organisations including police and/or health service.

Membership of the Delivery Board should be endorsed by both Hartlepool Borough Council and the Trustee Directors of Groundwork.

Recruitment

We will recruit and appoint Board Members by:

- Nomination
- Invitation

6.1 APPENDIX 1

- Advert

Hartlepool Borough Council will nominate and appoint individual councillors. We will invite representation from specific organisations and the housing and private sectors and recommend, subject to discussion with HVDA and other representative bodies, a combination of advertising and personal invitation to representatives from the Community and Voluntary sector.

CABINET REPORT

14 November 2008



Report of: The Mayor

Subject: REQUEST FOR GRANTS FROM CONTINGENCY FUNDS

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request Cabinet to authorise the amount of £1000 pounds from contingency funds to help with the costs of travel for looked after young people and staff from the Young People's Team to attend an awards ceremony for which they have been shortlisted for two awards

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report describes the awards the looked after young people have been nominated for.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

This type of funding needs Cabinet permission

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet 14 November 2008

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to authorise the payment of this request

Report of: The Mayor

Subject: REQUEST FOR GRANT FROM CONTINGENCY FUNDS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek agreement of Cabinet to release £1000 from the contingency fund to help towards the costs of looked after young people and staff to attend an award ceremony in London

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Children and Young People's Service Awards 2008 was ran by the magazine Children and Young People Now.
- 2.2 The Head of the Young People's Team nominated the young people for two award for which they have been shortlisted:

a) The Active Citizen Award

The most innovative project or initiative that has enabled children and young people to make a difference in their communities or to their peers through activities such as volunteering, campaigning, lobbying or participation in decision making. The judges will look for entries where children and young people have taken the lead in planning and organising the work as well as delivering it.

b) The Learning Award

For the project or initiative judged to have made the best contribution to improving educational achievement among disadvantaged groups such as looked-after children, black and ethnic pupils, disabled children and young people, young Travellers or young carers. Entries are open to local authorities, or other agencies, independent providers of education services, schools or individual projects.

3. THE PROJECTS

- 3.1 The YP Smile Award project was put forward for the Active Citizen Award (see 2.2 a) above). The project was initiated for the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire, which is a Government led project for 4 – 16 years old and looked at how the questionnaire could be 'rolled out' to young people as well as involving them in developing services for young people.

- 3.2 A panel was formed and made up solely of young people who represented all the teams in the Children and Families Department i.e. Children Looked After, Children in Need, Disability, leaving Care and Family Placement Teams. The YP Smiles Award is at three levels – bronze, silver and gold. They are awarded for the involvement of children and young people in services/documents which affect them. There are also YP Smiles awarded once a year for young people who take part in decision making.
- 3.3 This scheme is an innovative and imaginative way of promoting the culture of participation across all areas of work and at all levels.
- 3.4 A joint initiative between Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP) and the Young Person's Team to deliver accredited training to vulnerable young people for 'Recruitment and Interviewing'. This project was put forward for the Learning Award (see 2.2 b) above).
- 3.5 A course was designed and accredited as an Open College Network (OCN) Level 2. This was delivered and verified by PAYP staff, with support from the Young Person's Team. Six young people successfully completed the initial course. They have since taken part in staff interviews, both within the council and independent agencies, as full and equal members of the panel. Following this success the teams have been working together on more accredited courses from Entry Level to Level 2 depending on the needs of the group. Plans are being made to develop the young people's skills further to become trainers on future interview courses and for the induction and general training of Children's Services staff.

4 THE AWARDS EVENING

- 4.1 The Evening will take place in London on the evening of Thursday 20th November 2008 and it is proposed to take two members of the Children's Services Department who support both activities and three PAYP staff who deliver the course together with 5 young people, 10 people in total. This will allow for one full table to be booked exclusively for Hartlepool Borough Council.
- 4.2 These young people form the YP Smiles Panel and two of these are also becoming young trainers for the next interview training. There is some cross over of young people who attend both.
- 4.3 The cost of tickets for this black tie event is £104 per person and the total cost, including travel, is £2,200.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 That consideration is given to granting £1000 from contingency funds towards the cost of the trip to the Children and Young People's Service Awards 2008. The rest of the total cost (£2,200) will be made up from departmental budgets.

CABINET REPORT

14 November 2008



Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: STAGECOACH SERVICES 1, 6, 7 AND 7A-
SUPPORTED CONTRACTS AND THE HEALTH BUS
SERVICE

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide an update on the recent decision to support the above services in respect of funding availability and contract periods

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report will summarise the current situation in respect of the services and provide details of possible funding sources.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Relevant to more than one Portfolio.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet on 14 November 2008.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Confirmation of required contract period and method of payment for services.

Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: STAGECOACH SERVICES 1, 6, 7 AND 7A-
SUPPORTED CONTRACTS AND THE HEALTH BUS
SERVICE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To provide an update on the recent decision to support the above services in respect of funding availability and contract periods.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 On 4 August 2008 a report was submitted to Cabinet detailing proposals from Stagecoach to withdraw elements of the 1, 6, 7 and 7A services from 23 August 2008, those being Sundays to Thursdays after 18:30hrs and, in the case of Service 1 on every evening after 18:30hrs and all day on Sundays.

2.2 Stagecoach expressed their concern at the ongoing decline in the adult fare-paying market which they say has struck at the heart of the viability of their present network.

2.3 At this meeting Members expressed their grave concerns at what they saw as manipulative practices by Stagecoach in withdrawing services as being unprofitable and looking to the Local Authority to pick up the base cost of the service through a contract.

2.4 Members also noted that Stagecoach were reporting a downturn in patronage of 4% and requested that the Director of Neighbourhood Services should seek to “claw-back” an equivalent amount of the sum paid at the beginning of the financial year to fund supported services.

2.5 At the meeting it was indicated that the bulk of the supported services in the town were contracted until 31 March 2009, however these contracts actually run until August 2009. Members agreed that it was prudent to keep all of the supported contracts on the same timescale and hence agreed to support these additions until 31 March 2009.

2.6 The costs provided by Stagecoach for these services were for a period of one year, up until August 2009, hence bringing them in line with the rest of the supported bus contracts.

2.7 It was also indicated that “claw-back” be sought for the concessionary fare payments made to Stagecoach for the reduction in the services and their own statement of a reduction in passenger figures.

2.8 It was requested that a report be brought back setting out how the additional costs to support these services could be met.

2.9 Health Bus Service

2.9.1 Hartlepool Primary Care Trust and North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Trust announced that they would be temporarily relocating Consultant Lead Maternity Services and in-patient Children's Services from the University Hospital of Hartlepool to the University Hospital of North Tees on the 17 December 2007. With maternity services to be relocated back to Hartlepool following a three month period to facilitate the refurbishment of the existing unit.

2.9.2 The PCT, NHS Trust and Hartlepool Borough Council agreed to fund the provision of a free bus service for the period 17 December 2007 to the 31 March 2008, to provide vital access to the outpatient appointments and visiting times for the residents of Hartlepool.

2.9.3 Following the initial three month service, the transport provision was extended as the works being carried out at the hospital had not been completed within the time scales expected, the NHS Trust agreed to solely fund the service until the 30 April 2008.

2.9.4 With the agreement of the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities and the Mayor the service has now subsequently been extended until the 31 December 2008, with joint funding agreed between the NHS trust/PCT and HBC.

3 CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES

3.1 In order to bring together all of the supported bus contracts it would be necessary to agree to support these services for a period of one year up until August 2009. This will allow Officers to achieve the best possible value from the budgets, by the analysis of existing services in respect of the cost, the numbers of people using them and relevant consultation. A report will be submitted to the Neighbourhood and Communities Portfolio for approval of suggested alterations to the existing supported services.

3.2 With regard to "clawing-back" monies already paid towards supported services, due to the reported 4% down-turn in patronage, it should be noted that bus operators, when tendering for a particular service, do so on the basis of the full cost of running a vehicle along the required route at the required frequency, **minus** an amount for the anticipated income generated by fare paying passengers. Therefore a down-turn in patronage would have an adverse affect on the operators' financial margins and it is likely, in the long term, that the cost to the Local Authority to maintain these services will increase.

- 3.3 With regard to payments to the bus operators for concessionary fares this is an agreed figure at the beginning of the year, based on the anticipated number of concessionary journeys in the financial year. Although the total number of passengers has dropped (by about 4%) the number of concessionary journeys has actually increased more than anticipated and therefore the agreed figure is currently to the Council's benefit.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Supported Contracts

- 4.1 The following quotations were received from Stagecoach to retain the services on a supported basis up until 24 August 2009

Service 1	£42,971
Service 6	£20,148
Service 7/7A	£16,502

- 4.2 Payments are made to the Operators in 13 monthly instalments. This being the case if the services are supported until March 2009, the total payment required will be £48,998, with a further £30,623 needed if the services continue to August 2009.
- 4.3 As Members are aware it is anticipated there will be an over-spend on departmental budgets at the year end. In addition, whilst the Council will benefit from increased investment income in the current year this amount has provisionally been allocated within the budget strategy report to offset the loss of income, then for additional costs in relation to Building Schools for the Future and Tall Ships. Therefore, it is not anticipated there will be resources available from the current year's budget to fund bus service payments and an alternative funding source will need to be identified.
- 4.4 As reported to Cabinet on 13 October 2008 the level of uncommitted General Fund Balances is £0.79m. This amount, together with other one off funding, has provisionally been allocated within the budget strategy report to partly fund the budget deficits over the next three years. These one off resources will not fund the whole of the budget gap. Cabinet could determine to seek Council's approval to use these one off resources to fund the cost of supporting bus services. This proposal would reduce the funds available to support the revenue budget over the next three years, which would make balancing the budget more difficult.

Health Bus Service

- 4.5 HBC funding for the months December 2007 to end of April 2008 was provided by the Mayors Contingency fund at a cost of £13,033.00. The NHS Trust funded the service solely from the 1 April - 30 April 2008. The cost of the provision of the service for the period 1 May 2008 to the 31 December 2008 will be £64,809.85, with a contribution of £32,404.93 from HBC.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 That confirmation is given as to the period of time that Members wish these services be supported.
- 5.2 That Cabinet seeks approval from Council for the use of General Fund Balances for the funding of these services.

CABINET

14 November 2008



Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: REVIEW OF SCHOOLS TRANSFORMATION
PROJECT BOARD

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To invite members to review the Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

This report briefly summarises the history of the Building Schools for the Future Project Board that was established in August 2006 and became the Schools Transformation Project Board in November 2007. It provides Cabinet with an opportunity to review the Terms of Reference of the Board in response to the potential future development of the Schools Transformation Programme.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

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

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key.

5. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) Review the current Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board
- b) consider options for the future governance of the Schools Transformation Programme:
 - 1) Create separate Boards for Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme, with appropriate Terms of Reference and Membership.
 - 2) Retain a single Project Board with revised Terms of Reference.

Report of: Director of Children's Services

**Subject: REVIEW OF SCHOOLS TRANSFORMATION
PROJECT BOARD**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To invite members to review the Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board.

2. BACKGROUND

The original Building Schools for the Future Project Board was established by Cabinet in August 2006. The Membership and Terms of Reference of the original Board were approved by the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services in September 2006 and are set out in **Appendix A**.

The Remit and Terms of Reference of the Building Schools for the Future Project Board were reviewed in November 2007 and it became the Schools Transformation Project Board. The revised Membership and Terms of Reference are set out in **Appendix B**.

As the Schools Transformation Programme enters a new phase, as described in Section 3 below, a further review of the governance arrangements for the programme is timely.

3. THE SCHOOLS TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME – UPDATE AS AT NOVEMBER 2008

Building Schools for the Future

The initial strategic phase of the Building Schools for the Future project is due to be concluded in December 2008, when the Outline Business Case (OBC) is submitted to Partnerships for Schools. Earlier strategic work on Building Schools for the Future included:

- Preparation and submission of Readiness to Deliver document
- Four stages of public consultation
- Statutory proposal to discontinue Brierton Community School
- Preparation and submission of Strategy for Change (Parts 1 & 2)

Inevitably the workstreams outlined above required detailed involvement of the Project Board in the planning process. Once the OBC has been approved, the procurement phase will begin, requiring less of a strategic input, but a great deal of attention to operational detail.

Primary Capital Programme

The initial strategic phase of the Primary Capital Programme concluded in October 2008 when Cabinet decided the outcomes of the second stage of public consultation and agreed a potential shortlist of projects for early investment from the programme. The initial strategic work on the primary Capital Programme included:

- Preparation and submission of Primary Strategy for Change
- Two stages of public consultation

The Project Board played a significant role in the initial strategic work outlined above. The Primary Capital Programme has now moved into the delivery phase, as initial projects are planned and procured.

4. FUTURE FUNCTIONS OF PROJECT BOARD

As both the Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programme projects change from strategic to procurement phases, it is logical that the work of the governing Project Board should also change. The Project Board should ensure that the agreed strategic direction is followed and that any barriers to success are removed. In other words, the Project Board should maintain a strategic focus on the projects while the operational teams, supported by their advisers, ensure that the planned and agreed transformation is achieved.

5. OPTIONS FOR CHANGE

In recent months the Schools Transformation Project Board has spent a considerable amount of time on both Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme. It has been difficult to conduct all the Board's business within the time allocated to meetings, mainly due to the volume of matters to be considered. There is a risk that, unless the work of the Board is re-focused, the Board will be unable to function effectively, due to the volume of issues to be considered.

As Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme move into very detailed operational phases, there is a need for Cabinet to re-consider the Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board. Two potential options are worth considering:

- 1) Create separate Boards for Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme, with appropriate Terms of Reference and Membership
- 2) Retain a single Project Board with revised Terms of Reference

Option 1) would present a number of advantages and disadvantages. It would allow Project Board members to continue to be involved in the detail of project planning and delivery. It would, however, put additional pressure on the Project Team with potential resource implications. It would also lead to some

inevitable duplication of membership, particularly for key elected members, chief officers and strategic partners such as the Dioceses. If Cabinet wishes to adopt Option 1, the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, as Chair of both Boards, would be able to consider membership and terms of reference of each individual Board, consistent with the approach to the establishment of the original BSF Project Board in 2006.

Option 2) would have the benefit of maintaining the current Project Board membership, simply adjusting the Terms of Reference to reflect the transition from the strategic to the operational phase of the Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programme projects. A suggested re-wording of the **Powers and Responsibilities** paragraph of the current Board's Terms of Reference is presented below:

"The Project Board shall maintain a strategic overview of the Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programme projects. The Board will receive monthly reports from the Project Team. The key business of Board meetings will be to:

- *Review progress against key milestones within the Project Plans*
- *Review the key risks to the projects and action taken to mitigate such risks*
- *Adjust the strategic approach to the projects, where appropriate, in light of changes to government guidance or changes to local circumstances*
- *Recommend significant changes to Cabinet as appropriate*

If Option 2) is to be successful it will require Board members to agree to maintain a strategic overview function, rather than to discuss detailed operational issues during Project Board meetings. More detailed briefings can be provided outside of Board meetings, in order to ensure that the core business of the Board is successfully completed

6. DECISIONS REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) Review the current Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board.
- b) Consider options for the future governance of the Schools Transformation Programme:
 - 1) Create separate Boards for Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme, with appropriate Terms of Reference and Membership.
 - 2) Retain a single Project Board with revised Terms of Reference.

**Contact Officer: Paul Briggs, Assistant Director of Children's Services
(01429) 284192**

CABINET

14 November 2008



Report of: Director of Children's Services

Subject: REVIEW OF SCHOOLS TRANSFORMATION
PROJECT BOARD

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To invite members to review the Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

This report briefly summarises the history of the Building Schools for the Future Project Board that was established in August 2006 and became the Schools Transformation Project Board in November 2007. It provides Cabinet with an opportunity to review the Terms of Reference of the Board in response to the potential future development of the Schools Transformation Programme.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

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

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key.

5. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) Review the current Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board
- b) consider options for the future governance of the Schools Transformation Programme:
 - 1) Create separate Boards for Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme, with appropriate Terms of Reference and Membership.
 - 2) Retain a single Project Board with revised Terms of Reference.

Report of: Director of Children's Services

**Subject: REVIEW OF SCHOOLS TRANSFORMATION
PROJECT BOARD**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To invite members to review the Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board.

2. BACKGROUND

The original Building Schools for the Future Project Board was established by Cabinet in August 2006. The Membership and Terms of Reference of the original Board were approved by the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services in September 2006 and are set out in **Appendix A**.

The Remit and Terms of Reference of the Building Schools for the Future Project Board were reviewed in November 2007 and it became the Schools Transformation Project Board. The revised Membership and Terms of Reference are set out in **Appendix B**.

As the Schools Transformation Programme enters a new phase, as described in Section 3 below, a further review of the governance arrangements for the programme is timely.

3. THE SCHOOLS TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME – UPDATE AS AT NOVEMBER 2008

Building Schools for the Future

The initial strategic phase of the Building Schools for the Future project is due to be concluded in December 2008, when the Outline Business Case (OBC) is submitted to Partnerships for Schools. Earlier strategic work on Building Schools for the Future included:

- Preparation and submission of Readiness to Deliver document
- Four stages of public consultation
- Statutory proposal to discontinue Brierton Community School
- Preparation and submission of Strategy for Change (Parts 1 & 2)

Inevitably the workstreams outlined above required detailed involvement of the Project Board in the planning process. Once the OBC has been approved, the procurement phase will begin, requiring less of a strategic input, but a great deal of attention to operational detail.

Primary Capital Programme

The initial strategic phase of the Primary Capital Programme concluded in October 2008 when Cabinet decided the outcomes of the second stage of public consultation and agreed a potential shortlist of projects for early investment from the programme. The initial strategic work on the primary Capital Programme included:

- Preparation and submission of Primary Strategy for Change
- Two stages of public consultation

The Project Board played a significant role in the initial strategic work outlined above. The Primary Capital Programme has now moved into the delivery phase, as initial projects are planned and procured.

4. FUTURE FUNCTIONS OF PROJECT BOARD

As both the Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programme projects change from strategic to procurement phases, it is logical that the work of the governing Project Board should also change. The Project Board should ensure that the agreed strategic direction is followed and that any barriers to success are removed. In other words, the Project Board should maintain a strategic focus on the projects while the operational teams, supported by their advisers, ensure that the planned and agreed transformation is achieved.

5. OPTIONS FOR CHANGE

In recent months the Schools Transformation Project Board has spent a considerable amount of time on both Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme. It has been difficult to conduct all the Board's business within the time allocated to meetings, mainly due to the volume of matters to be considered. There is a risk that, unless the work of the Board is re-focused, the Board will be unable to function effectively, due to the volume of issues to be considered.

As Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme move into very detailed operational phases, there is a need for Cabinet to re-consider the Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board. Two potential options are worth considering:

- 1) Create separate Boards for Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme, with appropriate Terms of Reference and Membership
- 2) Retain a single Project Board with revised Terms of Reference

Option 1) would present a number of advantages and disadvantages. It would allow Project Board members to continue to be involved in the detail of project planning and delivery. It would, however, put additional pressure on the Project Team with potential resource implications. It would also lead to some

inevitable duplication of membership, particularly for key elected members, chief officers and strategic partners such as the Dioceses. If Cabinet wishes to adopt Option 1, the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, as Chair of both Boards, would be able to consider membership and terms of reference of each individual Board, consistent with the approach to the establishment of the original BSF Project Board in 2006.

Option 2) would have the benefit of maintaining the current Project Board membership, simply adjusting the Terms of Reference to reflect the transition from the strategic to the operational phase of the Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programme projects. A suggested re-wording of the **Powers and Responsibilities** paragraph of the current Board's Terms of Reference is presented below:

"The Project Board shall maintain a strategic overview of the Building Schools for the Future and Primary Capital Programme projects. The Board will receive monthly reports from the Project Team. The key business of Board meetings will be to:

- *Review progress against key milestones within the Project Plans*
- *Review the key risks to the projects and action taken to mitigate such risks*
- *Adjust the strategic approach to the projects, where appropriate, in light of changes to government guidance or changes to local circumstances*
- *Recommend significant changes to Cabinet as appropriate*

If Option 2) is to be successful it will require Board members to agree to maintain a strategic overview function, rather than to discuss detailed operational issues during Project Board meetings. More detailed briefings can be provided outside of Board meetings, in order to ensure that the core business of the Board is successfully completed

6. DECISIONS REQUIRED

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) Review the current Terms of Reference of the Schools Transformation Project Board.
- b) Consider options for the future governance of the Schools Transformation Programme:
 - 1) Create separate Boards for Building Schools for the Future and the Primary Capital Programme, with appropriate Terms of Reference and Membership.
 - 2) Retain a single Project Board with revised Terms of Reference.

**Contact Officer: Paul Briggs, Assistant Director of Children's Services
(01429) 284192**

School Provision for Hartlepool: Major Capital Development

Building Schools for the Future (BSF)

Project Board

Membership and Terms of Reference

Membership

Membership of the Project Board will be as follows:

Group A – Elected Members

Portfolio Holder for Children's Services
Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency
Portfolio Holder for Culture, Leisure and Tourism
Chair of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee
Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Forum
Chair of Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

Group B - Officers

Chief Executive
Director of Children's Services
Chief Finance Officer
Director of Neighbourhood Services

Group C – Key Partners

Director of Education, Diocese of Durham
Director of Education Services, Diocese of Hexham and Newcastle
Chief Executive, Tees Valley Learning and Skills Council
Secondary Headteacher, nominee of all secondary headteachers
Primary Headteacher, nominee of all primary headteachers
College Principal, nominee of all college principals

Terms of Reference

Membership

Membership of the Project Board will be determined by Cabinet, on the recommendation of the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services. Membership of the Board will be reviewed at least annually.

Alternates

Any member of the Project Board who is unable to attend a particular meeting may nominate an alternate for that meeting. An alternative must be nominated

6.4 APPENDIX A

on the basis that he/she fully represents the substantive member and can fully participate in the work of the Board.

Chair

The Chair of the Project Board shall be the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services.

Quorum

In order for a meeting of the Project Board to be quorate, at least two members (or their alternates) from each of groups A, B & C shall attend.

Frequency and conduct of meetings

The Project Board shall meet at least monthly. There shall be an agenda for each meeting and this will be circulated to members at least three working days before the meeting takes place. The Project Administrative Support Officer shall attend each meeting, to record decisions and produce draft Minutes. The Project Director and Project Manager shall attend each meeting in an advisory capacity.

Powers and responsibilities

Subject to the overall strategy for Building Schools for the Future being determined by Cabinet, most decisions relating to BSF will be made at Project Board level. The Project Board will report all decisions to Cabinet on a monthly basis.

Decision Making Process

In order that decisions can be made at Project Board level, with delegated authority from Cabinet, it will be necessary for a consensus to be achieved. Consensus will be achieved if a majority of the members present from each of the groups A, B & C agree on the issue to be decided. Where no such consensus exists, the matter will be referred to Cabinet for further consideration. Where there is a consensus, the Chair of the Board will formally make the decision, in the capacity of Portfolio Holder, in accordance with the Council's constitution.

School Provision for Hartlepool: Major Capital Development

Schools Transformation

Project Board

Membership and Terms of Reference

Membership

Membership of the Project Board will be as follows:

Group A – Elected Members

The Mayor
The Deputy Mayor
Portfolio Holder for Children's Services
Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency
Chair of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee
Chair of Children's Services Scrutiny Forum
Chair of Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum
Elected Member Nominated by Council

Group B - Officers

Chief Executive
Director of Children's Services
Chief Finance Officer
Director of Neighbourhood Services
Director of Regeneration and Planning

Group C – Key Partners

Director of Education, Diocese of Durham
Director of Education Services, Diocese of Hexham and Newcastle
Chief Executive, Tees Valley Learning and Skills Council
Secondary Headteacher, nominee of all secondary headteachers
Primary Headteacher, nominee of all primary headteachers
College Principal, nominee of all college principals
Project Director, Partnerships for Schools

Terms of Reference

Membership

Membership of the Project Board will be determined by Cabinet, on the recommendation of the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services. Membership of the Board will be reviewed at least annually.

Alternates

Any member of the Project Board who is unable to attend a particular meeting may nominate an alternate for that meeting. An alternative must be nominated on the basis that he/she fully represents the substantive member and can fully participate in the work of the Board.

Chair

The Chair of the Project Board shall be the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services.

Quorum

In order for a meeting of the Project Board to be quorate, at least two members (or their alternates) from each of groups A, B & C shall attend.

Frequency and conduct of meetings

The Project Board shall meet at least monthly. There shall be an agenda for each meeting and this will be circulated to members at least three working days before the meeting takes place. The Project Administrative Support Officer shall attend each meeting, to record decisions and produce draft Minutes. The Project Director and Project Manager shall attend each meeting in an advisory capacity.

Powers and responsibilities

Subject to the overall strategy for Building Schools for the Future being determined by Cabinet, most decisions relating to BSF will be made at Project Board level. The Project Board will report all decisions to Cabinet on a monthly basis.

Decision Making Process

In order that decisions can be made at Project Board level, with delegated authority from Cabinet, it will be necessary for a consensus to be achieved. Consensus will be achieved if a majority of the members present from each of the groups A, B & C agree on the issue to be decided. Where no such consensus exists, the matter will be referred to Cabinet for further consideration. Where there is a consensus, the Chair of the Board will formally make the decision, in the capacity of Portfolio Holder, in accordance with the Council's constitution. In any situation where the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services is unable to make a particular decision, that decision can be made by the Mayor or the Deputy Mayor.

CABINET REPORT

14 November 2008



Report of: DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES

Subject: CONSULTATION RESPONSE – THE STRATEGIC SITING ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS IN THE UK

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider and respond to the consultation document issued by the Department for Business Enterprise & Regulatory Reform (BERR) on the Strategic Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report brings to the attention of Cabinet the consultation document in relation to the Strategic Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK and recommends the appropriate response from a Hartlepool Borough Council perspective.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

The Executive has responsibility for matters deemed to be sensitive which are non key decisions.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non - key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet 14 November 2008

6. DECISION REQUIRED

To agree the contents of this report as the basis of a Hartlepool Borough Council response to the consultation document in relation to the Strategic Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK.

Report of: DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES

Subject: CONSULTATION RESPONSE – THE STRATEGIC SITING ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS IN THE UK

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider and respond to the consultation document issued by the Department for Business Enterprise & Regulatory Reform (BERR) on the Strategic Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In the White Paper on Nuclear Power (January 2008) the Government has set out its belief that it is in the public interest that new nuclear power stations should play a role in the UK's future energy mix alongside other low-carbon sources of electricity
- 2.2 Also set out in the White Paper on Nuclear Power were certain facilitative actions in relation to planning and siting, including running a Strategic Siting Assessment (SSA) process to develop criteria for determining the suitability of sites for new nuclear power stations and then assessing nominated sites against the criteria.
- 2.3 That is the main purpose of the current SSA consultation which, amongst other things, proposes certain criteria for assessing the suitability of sites, and provides for comment an overview of the SSA process.
- 2.4 Alongside the SSA consultation, the Government has published a study of the environmental and sustainability effects of constructing new nuclear power stations on sites which have been identified through the application of the proposed SSA criteria, and asks whether there is agreement to the study findings
- 2.5 A copy of the full SSA consultation document has been placed for information in the Members Library and can also be accessed electronically at :

<http://www.berr.gsi.gov.uk/nuclear-whitepaper/consultations/page44523.html>.

A copy of the associated environmental and sustainability study is also available within the Members Library and can be accessed electronically at :

<http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/nuclear-whitepaper/consultations/page44523.html>

2.6 A summary of the consultation document is set out below.

3. SUMMARY : TOWARDS A NUCLEAR NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT – CONSULTATION ON THE STRATEGIC SITING ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND SITING CRITERIA FOR NEW NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS IN THE UK

Aim of the Consultation

3.1 The aim of the consultation is to present and seek views from interested parties on the proposed :-

- Process for inviting and accepting nominations for sites
- Process for assessing nominated sites and
- Criteria for assessing sites for potential new nuclear power stations (“the SSA criteria”)

Purpose of the Strategic Siting Assessment

3.2 The purpose of the SSA is to identify sites which are strategically suitable for deployment of new nuclear power stations by the end of 2025. The list of the sites identified through the SSA will eventually be included in a National Policy Statement (NPS) for nuclear power to be published under the new planning regime to be established under the Planning Bill.

3.3 The SSA process will comprise four key stages :-

Stage 0

- Views (have already been) sought on the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report from statutory SEA consultation bodies and other bodies with a role in regulating nuclear facilities.

Stage 1

- The Government is currently consulting on the SSA process and on the criteria for assessing the suitability of sites (i.e. the subject of this Cabinet Report. Further Cabinet reports will cover the next stages of the SSA process outlined below).

Stage 2

- The Government will publish the final SSA criteria (expected early 2009) and invite third parties to nominate sites for deploying new nuclear stations by 2025
- The Government will assess nominated sites against the criteria (expected spring – early summer 2009)

Stage 3

- The Government will consult on a draft list of sites as part of a consultation on a draft Nuclear NPS (expected mid 2009)
- The Government will publish the final list of suitable sites as part of the Nuclear NPS (expected early 2010)

3.4 The SSA is not a process by which the Government will select or rank candidate sites for new nuclear power stations. Rather it will allow the Government to conduct a strategic site assessment of sites that third parties have nominated.

Planning process

3.5 The list of sites included in the Nuclear NPS will set the framework for the independent Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) to determine the appropriateness of the siting of any proposal for development and will reduce the need – as far as possible – for the IPC to consider alternative sites since the suitability of alternative sites will already have been considered through the SSA. In considering individual planning applications, the Government expects the IPC to approve only those applications for sites approved through the SSA process and included in the Nuclear NPS. Applications for development consent on sites listed in the Nuclear NPS will not, however, guarantee planning consent.

Environmental assessment

3.6 The Government is conducting a Strategic Environmental Assessment in relation to the proposed Nuclear NPS which will include an assessment of the list of strategically suitable sites. SEA is a process for identifying and assessing the impacts of proposed plans or programmes and ensuring that those effects are considered during the development of a plan or programme.

3.7 As part of the process of developing the SEA, the Government has produced a study into the environmental and sustainability effects of constructing new nuclear power stations on sites which have been identified through the application of the proposed SSA criteria set out in the consultation document. The Government is also seeking views on the environmental study.

3.8 The environmental study finds that certain features of the criteria, including the discretionary nature of some of the criteria, mean that adverse environmental and sustainability impacts cannot be ruled out. However the study also found that using the proposed SSA criteria to identify suitable sites for new nuclear power

stations is likely to lead to outcomes which are broadly in line with the principles of sustainability and environmental protection.

Proposals for the nomination and assessment process

3.9 Anyone can nominate a site for consideration in the SSA. However, the Government considers it to be in the public interest to ensure that nominated sites are credible candidates for new nuclear build by the end of 2025 by fulfilling certain conditions :-

Condition 1

- The site nomination must either be accompanied by a letter of support from a “Credible Nuclear Power Operator” (CNPO) or the nominator must be able to demonstrate that it is a credible site for deploying new nuclear power stations by the end of 2025.

Condition 2

- The nominator must be able to demonstrate that they or, where applicable, the CNPO have taken steps to engage local communities living in the vicinity of the nominated site (including the owners of the nominated sites), and inform them of the intention to nominate the site.
- Such engagement might for example involve publicising the proposed nomination and inviting views from local communities or holding meetings to discuss the proposed nomination.
- In respect of existing nuclear sites this might include the station’s site stakeholder group - and in relation to timing, it may be appropriate for this engagement to proceed the formal nomination period.
- The Government will publish final SSA criteria and invite nominations after considering responses to this consultation. The window for making site nominations will be open for 8 weeks.

3.10 The purpose of the assessment will be to test the nominated sites against the SSA criteria. The Government proposes two types of criteria :-

Exclusionary criteria are those that for safety, regulatory or other reasons will exclude a site from further consideration in the SSA.

Discretionary criteria are those that the Government considers for various reasons may, at a strategic level, make a site unsuitable for the development of a new nuclear power station.

3.11 In addition, the Government has identified a number of **local criteria** which, largely due to the need for detailed site-specific investigations and data, are more

appropriately assessed at the local level – and it expects that the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) will consider these criteria alongside other potentially adverse impacts of a particular planning application.

3.12 The proposed Exclusionary and Discretionary criteria are as indicated in the Table below :-

TABLE - SSA PROPOSED CRITERIA

Criteria related to nuclear safety Status		Status
1.1	Seismic risk (vibratory ground motion)	Exclusionary
1.2	Capable faulting	Exclusionary
1.4	Flooding	Discretionary
1.5	Tsunami, storm surge and coastal processes	Discretionary
1.7	Proximity to hazardous industrial facilities and operations	Discretionary
1.8	Proximity to civil aircraft movements	Discretionary
1.10	Demographics	Exclusionary
1.12	Proximity to military activities	Exclusionary and Discretionary
Criteria related to environmental protection		
2.1	Internationally designated sites of ecological importance	Discretionary
2.2	Nationally designated sites of ecological importance	Discretionary
Criteria related to societal issues		
3.1	Areas of amenity, cultural heritage and landscape value	Discretionary
Criteria related to operational requirements		
4.1	Size of site to accommodate construction, operation and decommissioning	Discretionary
4.2	Access to suitable sources of cooling	Discretionary

- 3.13 The proposed local criteria too are as indicated in the Table below, but are not intended to be an exhaustive list of issues that the IPC or the safety, security or environmental regulators will consider at a site-specific planning application stage.

TABLE – SSA LOCAL CRITERIA

Issues related to nuclear safety	
1.3	Non-seismic ground conditions
1.6	Meteorological conditions
1.8	Proximity to civil aircraft movements
1.9	Proximity to mining, drilling and other underground operations
1.11	Emergency planning
Societal issues	
3.2	Significant infrastructure/resources
Issues related to operational requirements	
4.3	Access to transmission infrastructure

The next steps

- 3.14 After considering the responses and evidence gathered during this consultation, the Government will:
- Publish the final exclusionary and discretionary criteria to be used in the SSA and invite nominations for potential sites, which may be strategically suitable for new nuclear power stations; and
 - Assess nominations against the exclusionary and discretionary criteria and consult on a list of sites strategically suitable for new nuclear power stations in a draft nuclear NPS.
- 3.15 The Consultation paper states that the Government is committed to ensuring transparency and openness throughout this process. The assumption is therefore that the Government will make public all information provided by nominees as part of the nomination process except where there is a particular need to maintain confidentiality (for instance due to data protection, security or commercial confidentiality).

4. SUGGESTED RESPONSE FROM HARTLEPOOL BC

4.1 In seeking views on this SSA consultation the government has identified a series of questions which it is inviting respondents to consider. These are as outlined below, together with a suggested proposed response to each of the questions from a Hartlepool perspective :-

- **Question 1 – Do you agree that, at this time, the SSA should focus only on sites that are nominated as being suitable candidates for deploying new nuclear power stations by the end of 2025 ? If not, why not ?**

Proposed Response (HBC) – Yes, concentrating on sites deemed as suitable candidates for deployment by the end of 2025 is considered appropriate. A timescale of that order might well be necessary given the lead-in period that could be associated with major infrastructure projects of this nature. (This does however raise considerations for those sites where there are already existing power stations in operation but which may (as per Hartlepool) have a current planned life expectancy shorter than 2025. The SSA should clarify how the current technical, economic and feasibility considerations around the potential of life-extending such existing facilities relate to the criteria for new stations.)

- **Question 2 – Do you agree that the overall SSA process provides an appropriate mechanism for identifying and assessing those sites which are strategically suitable for the deployment of new nuclear power stations by the end of 2025 ? If not, how should the process be changed ?**

Proposed Response (HBC) – No, the SSA in its current form gives insufficient attention to, and should be identifying as part of the SSA process best practice towards, effective methods of public engagement and consultation that could appropriately be used in relation to the nomination stage and subsequently the draft list of suitable sites and other aspects of the draft Nuclear NPS. Such engagement needs to be thoroughly and independently informed. (The Council and Hartlepool's Local Strategic Partnership are currently reviewing and commissioning studies examining the local economic and, in broad terms, the environmental impacts arising from the existing and potentially new nuclear power station in Hartlepool – including quality jobs / high wage employment / local employment and contract initiatives and supply chain analysis considerations. In our view this is considered highly appropriate and desirable towards informing the debate about the relative merits and / or otherwise to the local and wider sub-regional / regional economy associated with nuclear power).

- **Question 3 – Do you have any other comments on the practicalities of the proposed SSA process, such as the timetable for nominations and the duration of the nomination period ?**

Proposed Response (HBC) – The timetable for nominations and the duration of the nomination period (8 weeks only) seem very restrictive, especially given the nature of the subject in question and the need to be seen to be accountable and transparent through the SSA process. We have raised comments in Question 2 above about the need for greater emphasis upon what is deemed to be good consultation. Any single consultation event for example would require a lead in period of, say, at least 6 – 8 weeks, suggesting that a longer time period overall for nominations and consultation around these should be built into the SSA procedures.

- **Question 4 – Do you agree that the proposed exclusionary and discretionary criteria are appropriate for the assessment of a site’s suitability at a strategic level? If not, how should the criteria be changed to achieve this objective and, specifically, are there any additional criteria that should also be used? Should the classification of any of the exclusionary criteria, discretionary criteria, or issues for local consideration be changed?**

Proposed Response (HBC) – Yes the exclusionary and discretionary criteria do seem appropriate. However, from a local authority perspective, the local criteria are also likely to prove to be particularly significant. In particular we would wish to see greater recognition of potential socio-economic impacts, especially in relation to employment and training impacts, supply chain issues, strategic fit within the regional/sub-regional/ local economy, multiple deprivation implications, any community costs and benefits (we note that these are briefly acknowledged in the environmental/sustainability study but feel that they warrant specific recognition as an important local criterion). We would welcome the opportunity to consider any new local criteria that may materialise out of this current (Stage 1) consultation process. In terms of those local criteria that are currently listed it is felt that 3.2 “Significant infrastructure / resource” warrants further clarification in terms of its meaning and content.

- **Question 5 – Do you agree that the proposed SSA is appropriate to produce a list of strategically suitable sites for the purposes of setting the framework for the Infrastructure Planning Commission’s decisions? If not, how should the process be changed to achieve this objective?**

Proposed Response (HBC) – As highlighted in our response to Questions 2,3 and 4 the SSA process needs to give far greater emphasis to public engagement and methods of public consultation, extend the time periods within the overall SSA framework accordingly to accommodate such changes, including additional emphasis upon socio-economic considerations within the overall SSA process.

- 4.2 As indicated above, alongside this consultation the Government is seeking views on the study of the environmental and sustainability effects of constructing new

nuclear power stations on sites which have been identified through the application of the proposed SSA criteria set out in this consultation document. An additional question that is being asked in relation to that study is :-

- **Do you agree with the findings of the study of the potential environmental and sustainability effects of applying the proposed SSA criteria? If not, what additional environmental and sustainability effects, if any, should be considered and how should these issues be reflected in the SSA criteria ?**

Proposed response (HBC) - Yes, the study is generally comprehensive, but could make more of the socio-economic dimensions of sustainability.

- 4.3 The deadline for consultation responses is 11th November 2008. Officers have considered the Consultation from a Hartlepool perspective and, at the time of writing this report, are sharing these views with the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit and other TV Local Authorities via the Tees Valley Planning Managers Group. In addition, British Energy representatives are liaising informally with relevant Council officers and the Mayor to ensure appropriate sharing of knowledge on the full range of energy review implications.
- 4.4 The various considerations outlined above have all helped inform the suggested proposed Council response to the consultation as detailed in this section of the report.
- 4.5 Members should also bear in mind that this is only the first stage in a SSA process which extends, currently, up until the beginning of 2010, during which time there will be further opportunities for consultation that will allow Hartlepool to influence the debate around new nuclear power site provision.

5. DECISION REQUIRED

To agree the contents of this report as the basis of a Hartlepool response to the consultation document in relation to the Strategic Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK.

Background Papers

1. Towards a Nuclear National Policy Statement. Consultation on the Strategic Siting Assessment Process and Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK. (BERR – July 2008)

2. Towards the draft Nuclear National Policy Statement. Applying the proposed Strategic Siting Assessment Criteria : A Study of the potential environmental and sustainability effects. (BERR – July 2008)

CABINET REPORT

14 November 2008



Report of: Head of Community Strategy

Subject: LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT – ANNUAL REVIEW
AND REFRESH 2008/09

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To outline the process and timetable for the LAA 2008/09 review and refresh.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Local Authorities have a statutory duty to prepare a LAA in partnership with the Local Strategic Partnership. The report presents the progress made and the next stages in the process of the annual review and refresh.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

Hartlepool's new LAA was agreed by Council in May and is a three year agreement (2008-11) based on the Community Strategy that sets out the priorities for Hartlepool. It forms an agreement between Central Government and a local area represented by Hartlepool Borough Council and other key partners through the Hartlepool Partnership.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key. This report is for information and sets out the timetable and process for the Annual Review and in preparation for a future decision on the refresh that will be made by Council in February 2009 in advance of the Government's submission date for the refresh (26 March 2009).

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Hartlepool Partnership 24 October 2008
Cabinet 14 November 2008

6. DECISION REQUIRED

To note the progress made and next stages in this process.

Report of: Head of Community Strategy

Subject: LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT – ANNUAL REVIEW
AND REFRESH 2008/09

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To outline the process and timetable for the LAA 2008/09 review and refresh.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 A LAA is a three year agreement based on local Community Strategies that sets out the priorities agreed between Central Government (represented by the regional Government Office) and a local area (represented by the local authority and other key partners through Local Strategic Partnerships). Hartlepool's LAA is structured around the themes of the Community Strategy and sets out agreed priorities that the Local Strategic Partnership will progress.

2.2 Hartlepool's new LAA was agreed by Council at its meeting in May and subsequently signed-off by Government in June 2008.

3.0 REVIEW PROCESS

3.1 It is the Governments intention that each new LAA will be subject to an annual review as has previously been the case under the old LAA regime. The main purpose of the review is to identify the contribution the LAA is making in the delivery of better outcomes and this year will focus mainly on local capacity and delivery arrangements to ensure future delivery. Government Guidance issued in September indicates the main elements to consider include:

- arrangements with partners and their commitments
- performance management systems
- joint commissioning and citizen engagement

3.2 The review procedure will be a process rather than a one-off event. Initially Government Office North East (GONE) will be in contact with the Partnership Support Team to agree the scope of the review followed by a series of discussions with local partners as appropriate. Detailed arrangements for the review will be confirmed by the end of October with discussions taking place between October and January 2009, before GONE submits the review conclusions to Central Government.

4.0 REFRESH PROCESS

4.1 The annual review process also allows the opportunity to revise designated targets and set targets for those indicators where it has not been possible to set targets and also to consider any emerging priorities and potentially any new targets.

4.2 The table below identifies the indicators that GONE wish to look at as part of this process.

National Indicator	Brief Indicator Definition	GONE Rationale for Review
NI 5	Overall/General satisfaction with local area	Baseline and Y2 and 3 targets to be developed when Places Survey data available (Jan 2009)
NI 6	Participation in regular volunteering	Y2 target to be agreed once Places survey baseline available (Jan 09)
NI 9	Use of public libraries	Proxy indicators on MORI household survey – need to set baseline & review targets when Active People Survey available (Oct 2008)
NI 10	Visits to museums & Galleries	Proxy indicators on MORI household survey – need to set baseline & review targets when Active People Survey available (Oct 2008)
NI 11	Engagement in the Arts	Target set is a % improvement on baseline still to be confirmed via active people survey (Oct 2008)
NI 17	Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour	Complies with TNB. Y1 and 2 targets taken from existing LAA so agreed. Y3 target to be reviewed (Places Survey Jan 2009)
NI 38	Drug related (class A) offending rate	Indicator deferred until 2009 by department. Target to be agreed in 2009 but locality wishes to keep indicator as a place holder
NI 110	Young Peoples participation in positive activities	No targets set as yet. A C4 indicator deferred until 2009 by department. Tellus3 Survey
N 116	Proportion of Children in Poverty	DWP have advised that Jobcentre Plus cannot be lead partner.
NI 152	Working age people on out of work benefits	DWP have advised that Jobcentre Plus cannot be lead partner.
NI 153	Working age population claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods	DWP have advised that Jobcentre Plus cannot be lead partner.
NI 155	Number of Affordable Homes delivered	Complies with TNB. Locality and GO have agreed this target which is consistent with Regional Spatial Strategy. – This position may have changed since June. – Reality check needed in view of the current economic climate & position on house building.
NI 171	New business registration rate	A C4 indicator deferred until 2009 by department. Target to be agreed in 2009 but locality wishes to keep indicator as a place holder

5.0 RESPONSES FROM THEME PARTNERSHIPS

- 5.1 Theme Partnership have been tasked with identifying indicators to reconsider as part of the refresh by the end of October.
- 5.2 The Economic Forum have observed that due to the current economic climate, it is clear that there will be significant challenges ahead in relation to the LAA Jobs and the Economy national and local improvement targets. Therefore, it is suggested that the following LAA targets should be re-considered:

Indicator	Theme Partnership Rationale for Review
NI 151 Overall Employment Rate	Through the economic slow down, it is anticipated that there will be a reduction in the number of major regeneration projects and inward investment which will see less job opportunities being created for local residents,
NI 166 Average Earnings of employees in the area	Due to the uncertain economic outlook, this may impact on the targets being achieved.
NI 152 Working age people on out of work benefits	Will need reviewing due to the anticipated increase in the number of adults becoming unemployed.
NI 153 Working age population claiming out of work benefits in the worst performing neighbourhoods;	
Youth Unemployment rate, youth unemployment rate (narrowing the gap) and the unemployment rate	Again, this is due to the anticipated increase in the number of adults becoming unemployed.

- 5.3 Colleagues at the Learning and Skills Council have identified the following indicators:

Indicator	Theme Partnership Rationale for Review
NI 161 Learners achieving a Level 1 qualification in literacy	When setting the original targets for the LAA, The Learning and Skills Council regional data team produced historical data for indicators 161 and 162 to help in the LAA target setting process, in advance of robust data being published by the LSC nationally. We had hoped that by now that we would have a national data set but this is still work in progress. While we wait for this we have refreshed the regional data set for these indicators using an improved methodology for counting Skills for Life and it therefore make sense to review the current targets.
NI 162 Learners achieving a Entry Level 3 qualification in numeracy	

<p>NI 164 Working age population qualified to at least level 3</p>	<p>As a % of the working population in Hartlepool the LAA shows a Baseline in 2006 of 42.6%. 08/09 target = (1.6% increase) 44.2% 09/10 target = (1.8% increase) 46.8% 10/11 target = (2% increase) 48.8%</p> <p>The most recent estimate from the Annual Population Survey 2008, is indicating that 41.9% of the Hartlepool working population is qualified to a level 3. This is 2.3% behind the target for 2008/09 and the trend is falling from the baseline in 2006.</p> <p>When the initial target was submitted we were required by GONE to increase this and ended up with the revised increases of 1.6%, 1.8% and 2% for the 3 years in question.</p> <p>We acknowledge that even our initial submission for targets would not have been hit due to the fall in achievement levels.</p> <p>We cannot account for why the % of the working age population with a level 3 qualification has fallen - other than to refer to the ONS Annual Population Survey methodology used to estimate the 'local' achievements, which we know is indicative.</p> <p>A 1% increase in the working age population with a level 3 would equate to 510 additional qualifications a volume which we consider to be unrealistic based on current performance levels.</p>
--	--

- 5.4 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership agree to negotiate NI 38 - Drug related (class A) offending rate (when details are available) and NI 17 - Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour, if appropriate, after Place survey results known as per the rationale given by GONE.

6.0 TIMETABLE

- 6.1 The time table below details the key stages of the review and the refresh process.

Task	By When
Review	
Agree arrangements for annual review	October 08
Review discussions	October-January 09
GONE review conclusions sent to Government	January 09
Refresh	
Theme partnerships, lead officers and outcome owners to identify any proposed changes	October 08
Draft refresh submission to Scrutiny, Partnership and Cabinet	Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee 28 Nov Hartlepool Partnership 23 Jan 09 Cabinet 26 Jan 09
Members Seminars	December 08
Theme Workshops	January/February 09
Refresh Submitted to GONE	2 March 09
Final versions agreed by Partnership and Council	Hartlepool Partnership 13 March 09 Council TBC (before 26 March)
Submission of adopted LAA to Secretary of State	27 March – 1 April 09
Secretary of State Approval	Early April 09

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To note the arrangements for the annual review and refresh process and the progress made

FURTHER BACKGROUND PAPERS

Hartlepool's new Local Area Agreement 2008-11 and the LAA Delivery and Improvement Plan 2008/09 are available at www.hartlepoolpartnership.co.uk

Contact Officer

John Potts – Principal Policy Officer

Email: john.potts@hartlepool.gov.uk

Tel: 01429 284320