

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Tuesday 14th April 2009

at 4.00pm

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

MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Akers-Belcher, Barker, R W Cook, Coward, Cranney, Fleming, McKenna, Worthy and Wright

Resident Representatives: John Cambridge, Mary Green and Brenda Loynes

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd March 2009

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

4.1 Portfolio Holder's Response - Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool – *Joint Report of the Director of Neighbourhood Services and Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities*

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

No items.

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

No items.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- 7.1 Draft Final Report - Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in
Hartlepool – *Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum*

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Date of next meeting – to be confirmed

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

2 March 2009

The meeting commenced at 4.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Stephen Akers-Belcher (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob Cook, John Coward, Kevin Cranney, Tim Fleming and Gladys Worthy.

Resident Representatives:

John Cambridge, Mary Green and Brenda Loynes

Officers:

Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services

Alan Coulson, Engineering Manager

Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer

Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also in attendance:

Councillor Peter Jackson, Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities

Ian Hodge, Environment Agency

Stewart Rowe, Scarborough Council

Sally Atkinson, Scott Wilson Consultants

88. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Caroline Barker, Christopher McKenna and Edna Wright.

89. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

90. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2009

Confirmed.

91. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum

None.

92. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

None.

93. Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities was in attendance to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation into 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool'. The report suggested a number of key questions to the Portfolio Holder and detailed below were the responses.

(a) *What are your roles and responsibilities in relation to the protection of Hartlepool's coastline?* The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Local Authority was the Coastal Protection Authority with responsibilities as defined in the 1949 Coastal Protection Act. This act placed a certain duty upon Hartlepool Borough Council and broadly this was as follows:

"A coast protection authority shall have the power to carry out such coast protection work, whether within or outside their area, as may appear to them to be necessary or expedient for the protection of any land in their area".

(b) *What are your views on the current approach to coastal protection and shoreline management in Hartlepool?* The strategic approach to shoreline management was dictated by the Environment Agency's hierarchical approach that started with a broad based strategy document called the Shoreline Management Plan. This was followed by more focused documents called Strategy Studies and where the criteria had been met, these lead on to more detailed Project Appraisals. This process which could be very lengthy and dictated which projects were eligible for grant aid.

Coastal protection breaches now typically cost £90k to repair although the last one at Seaton Carew did in fact cost circa £200k including the

placement of protective rock armour.

It can be seen that whilst Hartlepool has a very good record of making successful applications to Defra / Environment Agency for grant aid, there was a large legacy of life expired assets that were not eligible for grant aid.

This placed a financial burden on the Council that cannot be fully met and in the near future, it was very likely that a major breach of our coast protection structures would take place that would threaten the stability of land behind them.

- (c) ***What areas of improvement if any, would you suggest to help prevent the future erosion of Hartlepool's coastline?*** The Portfolio Holder commented that the Council should continue to be proactive and innovative to maximise the receipt of grant aid. In connection with this, there were signs that some of the projects that were being evaluated as part of the Seaton Carew Strategy Study may be eligible for grant aid although there was a lot of work to complete before this was confirmed.

The Council would have to continue to commit as much funding as it can into the area of coast protection in order to carry out maintenance work in the worst areas before major breaches occur.

There were two pieces of major legislation out for consultation that will affect coast protection and coastal flooding. These proposed transferring powers to local authorities and thus increasing their responsibilities.

It was not known whether additional central government funding would be available in order to implement this legislation but there was a real possibility that this would place even greater financial pressure on local authorities such as Hartlepool.

In response to a Member's question, the Engineering Manager confirmed that the Environment Agency were providing the funding for the coastal protection works at the Town Wall and that this was over and above the coastal protection revenue budget.

A resident representative questioned how funding was made available should urgent works be required. The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities indicated that funding would be sought by applications for grant aid along with any available Council funding. However, Members were asked to note that there were limited projects that could be funded under the banner of grant aid.

A Member sought clarification on the risk management strategy in place should the necessary coastal protection improvements not be undertaken. The Portfolio Holder commented that there was a risk management strategy in

place but added that not improving the coastal protection would increase the risk. The Director of Neighbourhood Services commented that any development along the Seaton Carew coastline would need to be built at a raised height due to the risk from potential flooding, which was a management of risk.

The Portfolio Holder was thanked for his attendance and for his informative presentation.

Decision

That the report and information received from the Portfolio Holder be noted.

94. Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Evidence from Key Stakeholders *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

Representatives from the Environment Agency, Scarborough Council and Scott Wilson Consultancy Firm were in attendance to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool'.

The representative from the Environment Agency gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation which looked at the delivery of coastal protection strategies. It was noted that in April 2008 the Environment Agency was given coastal supervisory oversight powers and was the lead organisation for all sea flooding and risk management. In addition the allocation of grant aid for capital works, coastal erosion, flooding and surface water management were all the responsibility of the Environment Agency. The representative confirmed that the primary role of the Environment Agency was to work closely with local authorities in relation to planning, procuring and maintaining coastal protection.

The national funding allocation from the Environment Agency was £53.6m – 2009/10, £49.6m 2010/11 and £55.7m 2011/12. Members were informed that the Council's medium term plan included a bid for funding to the Environment Agency of £40,158,000.

The representative from the Environment Agency informed Members that the priority system for grant aid operated across 5 outcome measurements, and bids were prioritised in accordance with this criteria. It was confirmed that funding had already been received in the sum of £482k for the Town Wall and £716k for the Seaton Carew Strategy.

The representative from Scarborough Borough Council gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation which highlighted that coastal protection was about reducing the threat to people and property through long term investment.

Scarborough Council were undertaking a number of studies looking at the sustainability of coastal protection, but funding was also an issue with only a small national pot of grant funding available for a significant amount of need across the Country.

The representative from Scott Wilson gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation which examined in detail the Seaton Carew Strategy and Town Wall Study. The studies would be undertaken in three stages with Stage A assessing the existing coastal defences and how they perform. Stage B would then propose a preferred solution to improve the coastal protection after the consideration of a wide range of options along with detailed consultation with various stakeholders including residents. This consultation would include the distribution of leaflets and questionnaires and exhibitions/public meetings. Finally, Stage C would produce a report which would form the basis of a funding application to Government for Grant Support. Both studies were currently at Stage A.

All the representatives were thanked for their attendance and for their very informative presentations.

Decision

That the report and all information received from the invited representatives be noted.

95. Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool: Feedback from Site Visit to Coastal Sites in Hartlepool *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of the investigation into 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool' a site visit was held earlier today to a variety of coastal sites in Hartlepool and attended by Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

The Chair wished to pass on his thanks to all officers involved as the site visit had helped Members understand the kind of problems that were faced due to coastal erosion.

Decision

The feedback from the site visit was noted.

96. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents - Corporate Plan Update for 2009/10: Proposed Outcomes and Actions *(Director of Neighbourhood Services)*

The Corporate Plan covered 2009/10 to 2010/11 which coincided with the Local Area Agreement and the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review. It was noted that as in previous years, the Corporate Plan would be considered by each Scrutiny Forum early in March, reported back to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 20 March 2009 and used to formulate the formal Scrutiny response to Cabinet in April.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation which provided Members with the opportunity to consider the proposed outcomes and actions for inclusion in the Corporate Plan 2009/10 and 2010/11. A number of successes were highlighted including the increased recycling across the town with over 40% of all household waste being recycled; there had been an improved perception with street cleansing across the town, and; the Integrated Transport Unit was bringing all transport issues across the Council together which had already resulted in over £200k of savings.

A number of challenges facing the Council were also highlighted including the requirement to find 3% budget efficiencies, Business Transformation and the forthcoming arrangements for the Tall Ships in 2010.

A discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:

- (i) There was concern from Members that lack of resources was a significant issue. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that this was an issue with some significant challenges to be faced but there were also opportunities to be achieved through Business Transformation. As discussed in the previous items on the agenda, coastal protection was a major challenge for the Authority but prevention of coastal erosion was imperative.
- (ii) There was a discussion on health eating in schools and it was noted that the schools' menus were created by the school's Head Cook in conjunction with the Head Teacher and had a huge range of health eating options available for pupils should they choose them.
- (iii) A resident representative raised concerns about transport within the town for residents during the Tall Ships event. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that a number of options were being considered to achieve successful management of the transport during this period.
- (iv) A Member commented that further examination should be undertaken to support local organisations to create co-ops where healthy food was available for local residents at reasonable prices.
- (v) Members considered community involvement as imperative to

strengthening services and communities, especially in areas where there has been a loss of provision/facilities. A Member commented that community involvement in the Neighbourhood Action Plans was working really well including the allocation of resources to areas of concern for residents.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services was thanked for his attendance and his informative presentation.

Decision

- (i) That the proposed outcomes and actions for inclusion in the 2009/10 Corporate Plan as attached at Appendix A, be supported.
- (ii) That the report be finalised by the Scrutiny Support Officer in conjunction with the Chair of the Forum incorporating Members comments above.

The meeting concluded at 5.35 pm

CHAIRMAN

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

14 April 2009



Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services and Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities

Subject: PORTFOLIO HOLDER'S RESPONSE - CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum with feedback on the recommendations from the investigation into the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool, which was reported to Cabinet on 23 February 2009.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The investigation into the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool conducted by this Forum falls under the remit of the Neighbourhood Services Department and is, under the Executive Delegation Scheme, within the service area covered by the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio Holder.
- 2.2 On 23 February 2009, Cabinet considered the Final Report of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum into the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool. This report provides feedback from the Portfolio Holder following Cabinet's consideration of, and decisions in relation to this Forum's recommendations.
- 2.3 Following on from this report, progress towards completion of the actions contained within the Action Plan will be monitored through the newly created Scrutiny Monitoring Database, with standardised six monthly monitoring reports to be presented to the Forum. In addition to this, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will also receive a breakdown of progress against all Scrutiny Forums' recommendations on an Annual basis (July).

3. SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXECUTIVE DECISION

- 3.1 Whilst it is acknowledged that some of the recommendations are already being undertaken by the Neighbourhood Services Department, the Cabinet approved the recommendations of the Forum, with the exception to recommendations (h) and (i) unless additional budget provision can be identified.
- 3.2 Details of each recommendation and proposed actions to be taken following approval by Cabinet are provided in the Action Plan attached at **Appendix A**.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members note the proposed actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to this report (**Appendix A**) and seek clarification on its content where felt appropriate.

Contact Officer:- Dave Stubbs – Director of Neighbourhood Services
Neighbourhood Services Department
Hartlepool Borough Council
Telephone Number: 01429 523301
E-mail –dave.stubbs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's Final Report the 'Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool' considered by Cabinet on 23 February 2009.
- (ii) Decision Record of Cabinet held on 23 February 2009.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: February 2009

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
(a)	<p>That the Council develops a strategy to achieve a planned approach to highways maintenance as opposed to a reactive approach;</p> <p>Strategy to be developed to give Council options to provide a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum service level • Fair service level • Good service level or • Excellent service level. <p>Council to select appropriate strategy dependant on affordability.</p>	Preparation of the strategy will have no further implications. The strategy itself may have implications depending on the option selected.	Paul Mitchinson	June 2009
(b)	<p>That the Council strengthens existing working relations with the Utility Companies and continues to facilitate regular meetings to focus on common objectives aimed at improving standards;</p> <p>The existing working relationship with the Utilities is determined by the Traffic Management Act 2004. It includes regular meetings to exchange programmes and other information to enable roadworks to be coordinated. Since 1/4/2008, the HBC has been obliged to treat the utility work and its own work with parity. This means that Hartlepool Borough Council (HBC) is subject to the same noticing regime as the Utility companies. Although there will be no financial implications for transgressions by HBC, they will be recorded and reported to the</p>	None	Mike Blair	February 2009

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: February 2009

RECOMMENDATION		EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
		Department for Transport as a performance indicator.			
(c)	That the Council develops a formal working arrangement with contractors to involve them at an earlier stage in the design, planning and preparation processes for future highway maintenance and scheme works;	Client Officers to contact Highway Services at scheme inception. Contractor involvement to run in conjunction with Consultant involvement. Decisions on materials and working methods to be made jointly between Client, Consultant and Contractor.	None	Jon Wright	February 2009
(d)	That the Council explores the possibility of using re-cycled materials in schemes to reduce tender prices and to minimise the environmental impact;	This is already integral to the existing service, but in conjunction with recommendation (c) above, recycling requirements to be written into all new scheme briefs. Clients, Consultants and Contractors to contribute to developing scheme specific requirements.	No financial implication in exploring the possibilities, but potential implication dependant on the selected scheme implemented.	Jon Wright	February 2009
(e)	That the Council explores opportunities to further promote / publicise the future maintenance works of both the Council and	Publicity is already provided informing ward members and members of the public of forthcoming works as part of the	Minor implications with respect to printing costs but relatively	Jon Wright	February 2009

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: February 2009

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
(f)	<p>the Utility Companies to raise public awareness including the distribution of the Planned Maintenance Programme to Public Libraries / Buildings;</p> <p>That Ward Councillors are provided with advance notification of any future maintenance and utility works due to be carried out in their respective Wards;</p>	<p>service delivery package. In future, the annual portfolio report which identifies the forthcoming year's programme will be publicised as soon as it is approved to raise public awareness.</p> <p>Advance notification is already provided informing ward members and members of the public of forthcoming works as part of the service delivery package. In future, the annual portfolio report which identifies the forthcoming year's programme will be provided to ward members as soon as it is approved to give longer term advanced warning.</p>	<p>insignificant.</p> <p>None.</p>	Jon Wright
(g)	<p>That the Council consults with local support groups and the public at set times of the year to improve the positioning of drop kerbs / tactile pavements;</p>	<p>Programme of meetings to be confirmed.</p>	None.	Jon Wright
				<p>March 2009</p> <p>April 2009</p>

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: February 2009

	RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
(h)	That the income generated from the charges imposed on the Utility Companies be redirected into the highways maintenance budget;	Any income generated from charges imposed on the Utilities are used to part fund the Street works service. The use of the monies in any other way would require the Road and Street Works Act (RASWA) service to be alternatively funded.	Would need to identify additional Technical Officer Salary to pay for Road and Street Works Act (RASWA) service.	Mike Blair	March 2009
(i)	That the Council reviews the 2009 / 2010 financial contribution from the Highways Service to the Insurance Fund and any reduction in such contribution be redirected to the highways maintenance budget; and	The current funding arrangement is designed to provide an overall fund to cover liabilities over a long term. The current level is set to smooth the peaks and troughs that occur over time. Before a reduction could be agreed to the highway contribution, an alternative source of funding would be needed to make up the shortfall or an alternative strategy would be required.	Would need to identify an alternative fund to charge to make up the lost income to the insurance pot.	Mike Ward	March 2010
(j)	That the Council integrates the highways software system, 'Confirm' with the Customer Relationship Management	Hartlepool Connect is currently in the process of identifying an appropriate middleware solution, which will allow the Customer Relationship	Indicative costs are between £10 to 40k (dependent upon approach).	Ralph Young	March 2010

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

NAME OF FORUM: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: February 2009

RECOMMENDATION	EXECUTIVE RESPONSE / PROPOSED ACTION	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE
	<p>System in order to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the monitoring and feed back arrangements for customer enquiries relating to highways maintenance.</p> <p>Management System to integrate to other Council systems, including the Highways "Confirm" system. The Council's e-Government Team, in conjunction with the Contact Centre, are reviewing the options available. Considering system integration in isolation will increase overall costs and on that basis "Confirm" will be considered as part of that options process.</p>			

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

14 April 2009



Report of: Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum

Subject: DRAFT FINAL REPORT – COASTAL DEFENCES
AND SHORELINE MANAGEMENT IN HARTLEPOOL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the draft findings of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool.

2. SETTING THE SCENE

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 11 July 2008, Members determined their Work Programme for the 2008/09 Municipal Year. The topic of 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool' was agreed as the second topic for investigation for the Forum's 2008/09 work programme. This investigation was conducted over a shorter period of time than usual; hence the approach adopted gathered evidence from key stakeholders only.
- 2.2 Hartlepool has 9.6km (6 miles) of coast line which is made up of both Council land and privately owned land with one length of coast protection structure in shared ownership with PD Ports who make a contribution to the maintenance and repair of the structure. The basic structure of the coast determines the use of the coast, the interest in the coast and the associated risks and therefore this all influences the management of the shoreline. The geology of the coastline provides the opportunity for education, awareness and scientific research as to how the environment has changed. This awareness underpins the understanding of how the coast works and how it may develop in the future.
- 2.3 The Coast Protection Act 1949, established the regulatory framework for England's coastline and the Coast Protection Authorities all around the coast. Hartlepool Borough Council is the designated Coast Protection Authority which "shall have such powers and perform such duties in

connection with the protection of land” to ensure the adequate ‘coast protection’ of the Borough.

- 2.4 By way of background information, Shoreline Management is a broad term used for the subject areas of coastal processes and sea defences. Shoreline management is an essential element of coastal protection and development.
- 2.5 A coast protection structure is a structure that protects the land from eroding due to the action of the sea. This happens where the natural land form is higher than high tide levels and if left unprotected would erode and wash away over a period of time. The statutory duty for coast protection rests with the Local Authority who also has permissive powers to deal with privately owned structures.
- 2.6 A sea defence is defined as a barrier between the sea and the land, which acts as a defence from flooding of land where the natural land form is below the high tide levels and would flood from the sea if left undefended. For example, rock armour or a sea wall. Natural formations can also act as sea defences, for example, sand dunes and salt marshes, which have now become more widely recognised. The statutory duty for sea defence rests with the Environment Agency, not the local authority. However, there are not many sea defence structures in Hartlepool.
- 2.7 A coast defence structure provides protection against both flooding and erosion. Most of the structures that Hartlepool Borough Council are responsible for are of this type. Historically, where there is this dual role, the Council has led on project / maintenance issues to ensure that the requirements and priorities of Hartlepool were best met.

3. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 3.1 The overall aim of the scrutiny investigation was to investigate the problems caused by coastal erosion to Hartlepool's coastline and assess the long term viability of the existing sea defences evaluating how shoreline management and strategy studies can help prevent future coastal erosion.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 4.1 The following Terms of Reference for the investigation were as outlined below:-
- (a) To identify areas of coastal erosion along Hartlepool's coastline;
 - (b) To identify the problems and risks associated with coastal erosion along Hartlepool's coastline;
 - (c) To examine the existing coastal defences to assess their effectiveness and long term viability;

- (d) To examine the financial implications to Hartlepool Borough Council of maintaining its coast protection / defence structures;
- (e) To examine local plans / strategies of relevance to evaluate the Council's approach to shoreline management and how these, along with risk management can prevent future coastal erosion;
- (f) To compare Hartlepool's approach to shoreline management with other local authorities / organisations by consulting to seek good practice; and
- (g) To consult with key stakeholders on the Council's approach to shoreline management.

5. MEMBERSHIP OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

5.1 Membership of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum for the 2008/9 Municipal Year was as outlined below:-

Councillors Akers-Belcher (Chair), Barker, R W Cook, Coward, Cranney, Fleming, McKenna (Vice – Chair), Worthy and Wright

Resident Representatives: Mary Green, John Cambridge and Brenda Loynes

6. METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

6.1 The Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum met formally from the 19 January 2009 to 14 April 2009 to discuss and receive evidence directly relating to their investigation into Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool. A detailed record of these meetings is available from the Council's Democratic Services or via the Hartlepool Borough Council website.

6.2 A brief summary of the methods of investigation are outlined below:-

- (a) Presentations and reports from Hartlepool Borough Council Officers;
- (b) Evidence from the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities;
- (c) Evidence from the Environment Agency;
- (d) Evidence from Scarborough Borough Council;
- (e) Evidence from Scott Wilson Consultancy Firm; and
- (f) Site visit by Members to a selection of coastal defences in Hartlepool.

FINDINGS

7. COUNCIL'S CURRENT APPROACH TO COASTAL PROTECTION AND SHORELINE MANAGEMENT

- 7.1 In relation to the issues associated with the current approach to coastal protection and shoreline management, Members received evidence from a variety of sources as outlined below:

Evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities

- 7.2 The Forum was pleased to receive evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities relating to the Council's approach to the protection of Hartlepool's coastline, his views are summarised below:

- (a) Hartlepool Borough Council is the Coast Protection Authority and has responsibility for all coast protection work along with the responsibility for the maintenance / repair of all coast protection structures that the Council owns. All lengths of coastline also have to be inspected in line with the Environment Agency's High Level Targets.
- (b) Hartlepool's current approach to coastal protection and shoreline management is dictated by the Environment Agency's hierarchical approach that starts with a broad based strategy document called the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP). This is followed by more focused documents called Strategy Studies which can lead onto more detailed Project Appraisals if certain criteria are met. This process can be very lengthy but indicates which projects are eligible for grant aid. The outputs of the Headland Strategy Study identified the strategy for the coast protection structures over the next 100 years. However, only one project met the criteria for grant aid, this was the Town Wall project. Members raised concerns that the Headland has life expired assets which need maintaining but there are no prospects of external funding. A conservative estimate for the replacement of these structures is £24m. Members were informed that in response to this position, the Council's coast protection budget, that was £70k, has been increased by £250k per annum and a project strategy will soon be put in place to renew the structures on a gradual basis over a number of years. Although, it will take almost a hundred years to complete.
- (c) In order to prevent the future erosion of Hartlepool's coastline the need to be both proactive and innovative is essential to ensure that grant aid from the Environment Agency is maximised. The Council would have to continue to commit as much funding as it can into the area of coast protection in order to carry out maintenance work in the worst areas before major breaches occur. Members were informed that there are two pieces of major legislation out for consultation that will affect coast

protection and coastal flooding. These propose transferring powers to local authorities and increasing their responsibilities. However, it is not known whether additional central government funding would be available in order to implement the legislation. Therefore, there is a real possibility that this would place even greater financial pressure on local authorities.

- 7.3 Members questioned the Portfolio Holder about how money is made available for urgent works. The Portfolio Holder indicated that funding is sought by applications for grant aid along with any available Council funding. However, Members noted that there are limited projects that can be funded under the banner of grant aid.
- 7.4 The Forum asked the Portfolio Holder to clarify whether there is a Risk Management Strategy in place should the necessary coastal protection improvements not be undertaken. Members were informed that there is a Strategy in place but by not improving the coastal protection would increase the risk.

Evidence from Elected Members of the Scrutiny Forum – Site Visit to Coastal Sites / Defences in Hartlepool

- 7.5 Members of the Forum thought it would be beneficial to the undertaking of their investigation if they visited a selection of coastal defences in Hartlepool to gain an understanding of coastal erosion. During the course of the site visit Members were shown a variety of sites including the Town Moor Twin Ramps, the Heugh Breakwater, South Pier, Newburn Bridge and Seaton Beacon steps / North Shelter
- 7.6 The site visit took place on 02 March 2009 and the feedback from Members can be summarised as follows:-
- (a) That historical sites, such as the Town Wall cannot be lost and it is therefore essential that they are protected;
 - (b) That the loss of infrastructures, such as the Heugh Breakwater would be disastrous;
 - (c) Members were astonished by the cost of coastal defences; and
 - (d) That some of Hartlepool's coastline is in serious disrepair.

8. COASTAL EROSION ALONG HARTLEPOOL'S COASTLINE AND THE EFFECTIVENESS AND LONG TERM VIABILITY OF EXISTING COASTAL STRUCTURES / DEFENCES

- 8.1 Members of the Forum were keen to examine the extent of the erosion along Hartlepool's coastline and the effectiveness and viability of the existing structures / defences. The Forum welcomed evidence from the Director of Neighbourhood Services and the Engineering Manager on the extent of the erosion along the coastline.

Evidence from Hartlepool Borough Council

- 8.2 The Forum was informed that in terms of erosion the coastline is in major need of repair, with the rising sea levels and loss of sand from the town's beaches leaving sections of the coast in serious danger of collapse. The erosion of Hartlepool's coastline has really deteriorated over the past 5 years.
- 8.3 Members heard that the North Pier is in danger of suffering a serious collapse and the highest priority for repairs. The Pier needs another £400 - £500k worth of repairs just to stop it disintegrating and placing the Marina infrastructure at risk.
- 8.4 *Photograph 1: North Pier Inner Wall*



- 8.5 The Forum was also concerned to hear that if no repair work is carried out to the Town Moor area, then this would lead to the eventual loss of the Town Moor over a 40 to 50 year period. However, if a major breach is to occur, the Town Moor would disappear very quickly.

8.6 Likewise, the Forum was concerned that if no repair work is carried out to the Cemetery area, the coastline up to and including the Cemetery area will continue to erode and over a 50 to 100 year period will disappear.

8.7 The Promenade area in Seaton Carew including the ramps and steps will see a quick closure of assets, unsightly fences and loss of access to beaches if no repair work is carried out to this area.

8.8 *Photograph 2: The Collapse of a Section of the Seaton Carew Promenade*



8.9 The above photograph illustrates the serious consequences that can occur as a result of natural causes of coastal erosion. A member of the public walking their dog along the promenade was injured as she stood on the path which suddenly opened beneath her.

9. LOCAL PLANS AND STRATEGIES OF RELEVANCE

9.1 Members of the Forum heard evidence from the Director of Neighbourhood Services and the Engineering Manager on how local plans and strategies can help prevent the future erosion of Hartlepool's coastline.

Evidence from Hartlepool Borough Council

9.2 Members were informed that the Council has to carry out statutory inspections in line with the Environment Agency's High Level Targets. The Environment Agency has a hierarchy of plans and strategies, starting with the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP), followed by Strategy Studies, Scheme Appraisals and Scheme Construction.

- 9.3 The SMP is a 'living' document which is used by all operating authorities and other organisations, for example, the Environment Agency, Natural England, North York Moors National Park, Durham Heritage Coast and others. The SMP covers a long length of coast line; in Hartlepool's case this covers the coastline from Tynemouth to the Humber. The document considers the planning and implementation of coast protection / sea defences and other maritime works. The SMP investigates the overall coastal processes and assesses the impacts of these for up to a hundred years. Usually an SMP has a series of outputs and this will include the recommendation for a Strategy Study covering a much smaller length of coastline.
- 9.4 Members were informed that an SMP also focuses on other significant influences such as environmental processes and on the Nature Conservation designated coastal areas, which are special protection areas and Ramsar sites; sites of special scientific interest; sites of nature conservation interest; and regionally important geological sites. These designations severely limit the options that are available for replacement of coast protection works
- 9.5 The current SMP II was adopted by the Council in April 2007 and will be reviewed five years from this date. The SMP splits up the coastline into smaller lengths called management units and the SMP outputs a series of recommendations for each management unit.
- 9.6 For most management units, the SMP output is the recommendation that a Strategy Study be carried out. This study investigates a much smaller length of coastline, typically one or two management units in length. The study looks in detail at the coast line, it can include intrusive testing of existing structures and builds up a complete condition survey and translates this into a life expectancy of all existing structures.
- 9.7 The Strategy Study formulates potential solutions in line with the Environment Agency's criteria for grant aid providing costs over the hundred year period for renewing / repairing existing structures prioritising the highest risk structures. Where a potential scheme meets the Environment Agency's funding criteria, it can recommend seeking funding for a specific scheme appraisal.
- 9.8 Members of the Forum heard that the Headland Strategy Study was an example of a study which was adopted by the Council in February 2006. This had been an output of the first SMP. Following the outputs of the Headland Strategy Study, the only length of coastline that met this cost / benefit criteria on the Headland was the Town Wall. This is now subject to a Scheme Appraisal by Scott Wilson Consultancy and if successful it will be submitted to the Environment Agency for grant aid to construct a protection structure. The current SMP has also recommended a Strategy Study covering Seaton Carew and this is currently being carried out.
- 9.9 After the completion of a Strategy Study, a Scheme Appraisal takes the output of that study and progresses the outline solution into a full cost effective engineering design that can be constructed. Sometimes this type

of appraisal will need a hydraulic model. There is a great deal of consultation / agreement with statutory bodies and the design information is formatted in line with the Environment Agency's requirements so that it can be submitted for grant aid.

- 9.10 In order to bid for funds at each of these three stages, officers must put together a formal application document and go to the Environment Agency's Regional headquarters in Leeds. They must make a presentation to a Project Appraisal Board and then be subjected to vigorous questioning by the assembled regional experts. Following this, they are advised if their submission has been successful. Members were pleased to hear that the Council was the first local authority in the country to go through this process and be successful in the award of monies for the Town Wall Project.
- 9.11 The output of a Scheme Appraisal is a submission to the Environment Agency for grant aid called Scheme Construction. If grant aid is approved in principle, then it is a case of waiting for a funding stream provision and waiting until finance is made available. The design and construction details then go out to tender and the preferred tenders are forwarded to the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency will then formally approve the tender price. The grant aid is then confirmed and a contractor is appointed. Construction starts typically up to 5 years after the project is identified and this is based upon a positive response at each stage of the process.
- 9.12 In order to gain approval to all Strategy Studies and Appraisals for schemes over £2m in value, it is necessary to send the submissions to the Environment Agency's national headquarters' in London. Officers will then provide a presentation in London to the National Review Group and as above, be subjected to vigorous questioning by the assembled national experts.
- 9.13 The Forum was updated of the current position in Hartlepool, as outlined below:
- (a) The SMP was approved in 1999;
 - (b) The Headland Strategy Study was approved in February 2006;
 - (c) The SMP II was approved in April 2007;
 - (d) The Seaton Carew Strategy Study commenced in August 2008; and
 - (e) The Town Wall Scheme Appraisal Study commenced in October 2008.

10. THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF MAINTAINING THE COUNCIL'S COASTAL PROTECTION / DEFENCE STRUCTURES

- 10.1 Members of the Forum were keen to explore the financial implications that the Council face in maintaining the existing structures and whether additional Government funding can be secured.

Evidence from Hartlepool Borough Council

- 10.2 The current revenue budget for maintenance of the Council's coastal defences is £320k but this has to also clean and maintain becks and watercourses and fulfil the Council's obligations under the Land Drainage Act. This budget also pays for promenade and fencing repairs.
- 10.3 The Forum was informed that the estimated cost to carry out the major work that will secure the long-term future of certain sections of the coastline is almost £41 million. Members expressed serious concerns about this amount and also that if the repairs are not carried out then some of the Town's historical areas would be lost.
- 10.4 In addition to planned maintenance, there has in recent years been an increase in incidences of coast protection breaches that have needed emergency repairs. These have occurred both on the Headland and at Seaton Carew. These breaches typically cost £90k to repair although the one at Seaton Carew did in fact cost approximately £200k including the placement of protective rock armour.
- 10.5 The Forum was informed that there is a real financial burden on the Council that cannot be fully met and in the near future, it is very likely that the Council will suffer a major breach of the coast protection structures that will threaten the stability of land behind them. The favoured and cheapest method of protecting the six miles of coastline that the Council is responsible for is by installing rock armour. However, Members were informed that it costs £10,000 for every 3ft of rock armour.
- 10.6 The cost of repairing certain coastal structures was outlined to the Forum and is detailed below:
- (a) North Pier:
- £600k repair - Stabilise fabric of the structure
 - £2,500k repair – Stabilise plus prevent wave overtopping
 - £17,000k repair – Complete repair and open to the public
- (b) Cemetery Area:
- £120k – Appoint a specialist consultant to consider innovative solutions

(c) Town Moor Area:

- £2,600k – Short term repairs, stabilise for 5 to 10 years
- £21,000k – Reconstruction of structures, protection for 100 years

(d) Seaton Carew Promenade / Ramps / Steps :

- £1,100k – gradual repairs, lifespan of assets increased to approximately 8 – 10 years
- £2,800k – reconstruction and repair, lifespan of assets increased by approximately 25 years

11. GOOD PRACTICE EVIDENCE FROM SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

- 11.1 Members of the Forum were very interested in hearing evidence from a good practice Local Authority in order to gain an insight into how they effectively protect their coastline. On this basis, Members of the Forum received evidence from Scarborough Borough Council (SBC) as they have been seen for many years as a lead authority on coastal protection issues, both regionally and nationally, with officers from the Council sitting on many influential groups with concern for coastal issues both at home and abroad.
- 11.2 Scarborough lies along a coastline of approximately 42 miles stretching from Skaithes in the north to Speeton Cliffs in the south, of which 9.5 miles of this coastline is defended by either natural or man-made structures to protect it from the sea. Members were informed that for the original SMP, the north east coastline was split into three units and the length of coastline including Easington / Hartlepool / Redcar and Cleveland was led by Hartlepool. Sunderland led in the north and Scarborough led in the south. These three units were combined for the SMP II and SBC led on this combined project.
- 11.3 SBC confirmed that all coastal authorities are in the same position as the Council regarding the difficulties when trying to access funding as there is only a small national pot of grant funding available for a significant amount of need across the Country. SBC, over the past few years has been successful in attracting grant aid to fund major coastal protection schemes, such as the East Pier, Castle Headland and the Holms, Scarborough, which was completed in 2005 at a cost of £51 million. At the time it was the largest coastal protection scheme underway in Europe.
- 11.4 It was emphasised by SBC that it is important to work from an understanding of how the coast may evolve and make decisions led by objectives working within what may be technically achieved, what may be realistically afforded, and what is environmentally acceptable and sustainable. Coastal protection is about reducing the threat to people and property through long term investment.

12. RESPONSIBILITIES OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS TO COASTAL DEFENCES AND SHORELINE MANAGEMENT IN HARTLEPOOL

- 12.1 Members agreed that a number of important stakeholders should be invited to provide evidence, in relation to the Forum's investigation into Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool. The evidence of key stakeholders is outlined below.

Evidence from the Environment Agency

- 12.2 A representative from the Environment Agency clarified to Members that the Agency is a public body, with around 60 percent of its funding coming from Central Government, (The Department for Food and Rural Affairs) and the remainder coming from various charging schemes. The Agency is independent of the Government but does work closely with them to get the best possible results for the environment.
- 12.3 In April 2008, the Agency was given coastal supervisory oversight powers and became the lead organisation for all flood and erosion risk management around the coastline of England. The Agency's primary role is to work closely with coastal authorities to develop strategic plans and support the delivery of the plans through grant aid funding and oversee the work carried out.
- 12.4 The national funding allocation from the Agency for all coastal authorities in England is as follows; £53.6m for 2009/10, £49.6m for 2010/11 and £55.7m for 2011/12. Members were informed that the priority system for grant aid operates across 5 outcome measurements and bids are prioritised in accordance with this criteria. Members raised concerns that this amount is not sufficient to satisfy the needs of all coastal authorities in England.

Evidence from Scott Wilson Consultancy Firm

- 12.5 Scott Wilson is an international consultancy group providing expert, sustainable, integrated solutions to meet the planning, engineering, management and environmental needs across the transportation, property, environment and natural resources market sectors. Scott Wilson are currently acting as consultants for the Council conducting two coastal studies, these are the Seaton Carew Coastal Strategy and the Town Wall Coastal Model Study.
- 12.6 Members were informed that the Seaton Carew Strategy was recommended by the SMP and is required for the strategic management of the coastal defences in the future and to implement solutions for the recent damage to the coastline. The study is being carried out from Newburn Bridge to the Tees Estuary and the current coastal defences in place are rock revetment, vertical seawalls, sand dunes, breakwater and reinforced sand dunes.

- 12.7 The problems that the Council are faced with along the Seaton front are the increased pressure on the existing defences as a result of climate change; the reducing beach levels potentially causing future instability of the coastal defences; future erosion of the dunes; and the maintenance of the existing defences.
- 12.8 The Study will be carried out in three stages, A to C. Stage A is an assessment of the existing condition and performance of the coastal defences. Stage B is a technical and environmental assessment to develop options for the future management of the defences and Stage C is a report which forms the basis of a funding application to Government for grant aid. Currently, the study is at stage A, where the condition of the coastline and performance of the existing defences is being assessed through a range of site investigations and coastal process studies including data reviews, ground investigations and coastal processes modelling. This study will cost £720k and commenced in August 2008 and should take 15 months to complete.
- 12.9 The other study which Scott Wilson is conducting is the Town Wall Coastal Model Study with the hope that the study will lead to a scheme to improve the existing coastal protection provided by the Town Wall. The study is a recommended output from both the Headland Coastal Strategy Study carried out in 2006 and the SMP in 2007. The Town Wall provides protection to the highway and residential properties behind the Wall from coastal erosion and coastal flooding but is itself at risk from coastal erosion.
- 12.10 Members were informed that the Town Wall is currently in reasonable condition, however, reducing beach levels are leading to stretches of the wall's foundations becoming exposed potentially causing future instability of the wall and wave overtopping during storms, which is likely to become worse in the future with climate change leading to rising sea levels. The Town Wall Study commenced in October 2008 and is currently in Stage A. It will take approximately 24 months to complete with a cost of £470k.
- 12.11 The Forum was pleased to hear that the public and interested organisations have the opportunity to comment and provide input at all stages of the studies. Examples of engagement include:
- (a) Questionnaires at the start of studies requesting information and feedback about issues of concern;
 - (b) Public exhibitions to present work on stage A and collect feedback;
 - (c) Public exhibitions to present work on Stage B (the preferred options), the report will be revised following the exhibition to take account of the feedback; and
 - (d) Public exhibitions to provide information on the outcome of the study.
- 12.12 The Forum noted that over 500 questionnaires had been issued to individuals and organisations for the Town Wall Coastal Model Study and 75 had been returned at the end of February 2009.

13. CONCLUSIONS

13.1 The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum concluded:-

- (a) That it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Council to obtain grant aid for capital projects;
- (b) That it is impossible for the Council to maintain coast protection assets and public access to the coast without grant aid from the Environment Agency;
- (c) That the process to try and secure grant aid from the Environment Agency is complex and prolonged;
- (d) That even if funding is made available, there is still a very lengthy and prescribed process to actually construct a new structure;
- (e) That there is money available from the Environment Agency but it does not equate to a large amount when all coastal authorities in England can apply for the funding;
- (f) That the coastline needs to be protected to ensure that it is safe for the public to use today but also to ensure that it can still be enjoyed by future generations; and
- (g) That the Officers from the Engineering Department within the Council have a wealth of knowledge on the subject area and are dedicated to their role.

14. RECOMMENDATIONS

14.1 The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum has taken evidence from a range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations. The Forum's key recommendations to the Cabinet are as outlined below:

- (a) That the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities lobby the Government to increase the funding available for coastal protection works;
- (b) That the Council undertakes a further assessment of the potential funding streams available for coastal protection works and considers whether further funding can be obtained from other sources;
- (c) That the Council continues to promote climate change and involves local residents in raising awareness of the effects it has on Hartlepool's coastline;

- (d) That the Council establishes the potential risks and implications associated with the loss of the Heugh Breakwater infrastructure and communicates this to members of the public to alleviate concerns;
- (e) That the Council continues to evaluate the risks of developing on sites which could potentially be at risk of coastal erosion in order to ensure the sustainability of future building developments and establishes the potential loss of funding in areas where erosion is occurring; and
- (f) That the Council continues to consult extensively with local residents on current / future coastal studies and where appropriate holds such consultation events in the locations covered by the relevant study.

15. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 15.1 The Forum is grateful to all those who have presented evidence during the course of the Scrutiny Inquiry. We would like to place on record our appreciation for all those witnesses who attended the Forum. In particular the Forum would like to thank the following for their co-operation during the Scrutiny Investigation:-

Hartlepool Borough Council:

Councillor Peter Jackson – Cabinet Member Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities.

Dave Stubbs – Director of Neighbourhood Services

Alastair Smith – Head of Technical Services

Alan Coulson – Engineering Manager

Dave Thompson - Principal Engineer

Dennis Hancock – Senior Engineer

Resident Representatives

External Representatives:

Ian Hodge - Area Flood Risk & Operations Delivery Manager, Environment Agency

Stewart Rowe - Principal Coastal Officer, Scarborough Borough Council

Sally Atkinson – Principal Engineer, Scott Wilson Consultancy Firm

Members of the Public

**COUNCILLOR STEPHEN AKERS-BELCHER
CHAIR OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

Contact Officer:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background papers were used in preparation of this report:-

- (a) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Scoping Paper' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 January 2009.
- (b) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management – Setting the Scene Presentation – Covering Report' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 January 2009.
- (c) Presentation of the Director of Neighbourhood Services entitled 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Setting the Scene' Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 January 2009.
- (d) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool – Verbal Evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities – Covering Report' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 02 March 2009.
- (e) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Feedback from Site Visit – Covering Report' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 02 March 2009.
- (f) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Evidence from Scarborough Borough Council – Covering Report' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 02 March 2009.
- (g) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Evidence from the Neighbourhood Services Department' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 02 March 2009.

- (h) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Coastal Defences and Shoreline Management in Hartlepool – Evidence from Scott Wilson Consultancy Firm' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 02 March 2009.
- (i) Minutes of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 January 2009, 02 March 2009 and 14 April 2009.