

# **TRANSPORT AND NEIGHBOURHOODS PORTFOLIO DECISION RECORD**

20<sup>th</sup> July 2009

The meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

**Present:**

Councillor Peter Jackson (Transport and Neighbourhoods Portfolio Holder)

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services  
Denise Ogden, Head of Neighbourhood Management  
Alastair Smith, Head of Technical Services  
Gemma Clough, Principal Regeneration Officer  
Richard Starrs, Neighbourhood Renewal and Strategy Officer  
Paul Robson, School Transport Consultant  
Steve Hilton, Public Relations Officer  
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

## **1. Throston Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP), Final for Endorsement** *(Head of Regeneration)*

**Type of decision**

Key – test ii applies

**Purpose of report**

To seek agreement to the final draft of the Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) for Throston.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The report described the background to NAPs with specific focus on the Throston NAP. It outlined the consultation process undertaken to develop the NAP from the initial community consultation event to the consultation process on the draft NAP, all of which had enabled the final version to be produced.

The report also outlined the implementation procedure. This had been streamlined and would involve the circulation of a commissioning template, a prioritisation event and the establishment of a NAP Forum open to residents, ward councillors, local community/voluntary organisations and service providers. Progress would be monitored through the Covalent system with

annual reports to the Hartlepool Partnership Performance Management Group and Theme Partnerships. The financial implications and risk were highlighted.

The Portfolio Holder requested that his thanks be passed on to the team for their hard work particularly in respect of the partnership work undertaken in the area.

**Decision**

That the Throston NAP be endorsed.

**2. Dyke House/Stranton/Grange Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) Refresh** *(Head of Community Strategy)*

**Type of decision**

Non-key

**Purpose of report**

To seek Portfolio approval that the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange (DHSG) NAP should be the next NAP to be updated.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The first Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy for Hartlepool was agreed in 2002 and from that Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) were developed for the 7 priority neighbourhoods. The DHSG NAP was the first to be produced and was last updated in 2006. Recent consultation with the service providers had shown a general consensus that revision was required given the significant changes to the area since 2006. NAP consultation could commence in September 2009 with completion scheduled for Spring 2010. The Portfolio Holder requested that the Ward Councillors be approached prior to the consultation.

**Decision**

That the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange NAP be the next NAP to be updated.

**3. Neighbourhood Action Plans – The Way Forward Action Plan** *(Head of Community Strategy)*

**Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To update the Portfolio Holder on the progress made to date on the NAP Way Forward Action Plan

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) had been developed for 7 identified priority neighbourhoods. The process was reviewed in October 2006 and late 2007 when the Portfolio Holder considered a NAP Way Forward discussion paper. In May 2008 a number of changes were agreed to the process and an Action Plan was agreed by the Portfolio Holder. Details on the progress made on this were appended to the report. The majority of actions had been completed with only three actions outstanding, one of which would be further evaluated within a forthcoming NAP delivery review. The scope of this review would be reported to a future meeting.

### **Decision**

That the progress made on the NAP Way Forward Action Plan be noted.

## **4. North Hartlepool Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) Projects** *(Director of Neighbourhood Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To seek the Portfolio Holder's views on the future maintenance of two SRB sponsored projects

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

SRB projects throughout the town are almost entirely funded through SRB monies. However in very few of these projects was there any revenue funding put in place to ensure their future maintenance with funding only designated for the initial project work. Several schemes, sponsored by the north Hartlepool Partnership, had been causing maintenance problems. Two in particular were causing major difficulty, the Celtic Cross outside St Hilda's Church and the Durham Street Cobble Stones.

Recently the Celtic Cross had been vandalised and virtually destroyed. The initial purchase and erection had cost £2,500. It had been vandalised within 24 hours of its erection in 2008 with the repairs on that occasion funded by the SRB. However the recent damage had left it beyond repair. The cost for replacement would be £1,600 with an additional cost for relocation of £400. This was felt essential to prevent further vandalism, although this could not be guaranteed. A Councillor had recently insisted that the work be carried out

and the Director of Neighbourhood Services felt that funding to cover these repairs should be sought from current budgets.

In respect of the Durham Street cobble stones there were two issues: The nature of the construction and the availability of replacement tiles. To date no supplier had been found with a stock of replacement tiles therefore these had been formed using small blobs of insitu concrete, trowelled to mimic the pattern of the surrounding area. Any permanent repairs would be dependent on sourcing the appropriate materials and therefore it was felt that in the short term the current maintenance method should continue. In the longer term it might be more cost effective to replace the material however this was felt to be a minor issue compared to the state of the York Road footways. Last year funding for these repairs had been put rejected as a budget pressure.

The Portfolio Holder felt it was extremely important to replace the Celtic Cross and that the money must be found. In terms of the cobble stones he asked when work would be able to commence should funding be found. The Director of Neighbourhood Services advised that it could begin in April 2010 if funding were available. The Portfolio Holder asked that lessons be learned for future projects of this type and that maintenance costs would be considered in the future.

#### **Decision**

- I. That the Celtic Cross be replaced and funding sought from current budgets
- II. That a scheme be prepared for the replacement of the Durham Street Cobble Stones and a bid be submitted to the Council in 2010/11 for this and other unfunded schemes to be maintained.

## **5. Data Quality Visit for the Landfill Allowances and Trading Scheme** *(Head of Neighbourhood Management)*

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key

#### **Purpose of report**

To inform the Portfolio Holder of the outcome of a recent inspection by the Environment Agency, the monitoring authority for the Landfill Allowances and Trading Scheme (LATS) in England.

To seek approval of the associated action plan to improve the existing system for the recording and reporting of LATS data through waste Data Flow.

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The EC Landfill Directive requires that all member states reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste it sends to landfill. Each Waste Disposal

Authority (WDA) in England must make an individual contribution to achieve European and interim targets. LATS was introduced by Defra in order to meet these requirements. The scheme runs from 2005 to 2020 with a number of target dates set to ensure European targets are met. The Environment Agency monitor the performance of each WDA, relying heavily on data submitted through WasteDataFlow (WDF), a web-based data collection system for municipal waste used throughout the UK. To ensure the quality and consistency of this data the Environment Agency had visited 121 Local Authorities in England since 2007.

Hartlepool Borough Council had been visited in February 2009 with the outcome of the assessment determining Hartlepool as “reasonable”. Thirteen recommendations for improvement had been made within the inspection report and a six month action plan had subsequently been developed to act upon these recommendations. The Head of Neighbourhood Management advised that the “reasonable” determination had been challenged as the inspector had been felt to be particularly strict in this instance. The Portfolio Holder commented that he was disappointed that the inspector had found 13 areas needing improvement, all fairly minor.

### **Decision**

That the LATS Data Quality Report be noted and the associated action plan approved.

## **6. Neighbourhood Services Departmental Plan 2009/10** (*Director of Neighbourhood Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To report to the Portfolio Holder the Neighbourhood Services Departmental Plan containing the key objectives and actions for 2009/10.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Neighbourhood Services Departmental Plan 2009/10 set out the key outcomes and actions to be achieved by the Department in the coming year, describing how these contribute to the outcomes identified in the 2009/10 Corporate Plan. The Departmental Plan included proposals from all divisions within the Neighbourhood Services Department and would be used as a basis for the quarterly monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. A copy of the Plan was appended to the report.

## **Decision**

That the plan be approved for distribution.

## **7. Minor Works Proposals, Neighbourhood Consultative Forums** (*Head of Neighbourhood Management*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To consider recommendations of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums in respect of Minor Works funding.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The report set out the Minor Works proposals considered by the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums. The following schemes were proposed:

#### **North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum**

Throston Ward – Padstow Close – horticultural scheme - £450

St Hilds Ward – Bakers Mead – security fencing - £500

Hart Ward – Westwood Way – tarmac grass verge - £400

#### **Central Neighbourhood Consultative Forum**

Rift House Ward – Spenser Grove – car parking scheme - £3,345

Park Ward – Egerton Road – lighting - £8,500

Grange Ward – Eltringham Road – garden area - £3,500

Rift House Ward – Waverly Terrace – allotment community garden - £4,364

Various Wards – dropped crossings - £3,500

Various Wards – Pride in Hartlepool – various schemes - £5,000

#### **South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum**

Seaton Ward – Kildale Road/Elizabeth Way – flowerbed - £2,680

Fens Ward – Caistor Drive – new drain - £4,118

### **Decision**

That the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums be approved.

## **8. Neighbourhood Agreements** (*Director of Neighbourhood Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To formally report to the Portfolio Holder on the Neighbourhood Agreements recently entered into by the Local Authority, Cleveland Police and Fire Brigade, Housing Hartlepool and other RSLs in Central Estate and Burbank.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The report provided information regarding the Neighbourhood Agreements for Central Estate and Burbank. These are an arrangement between agencies and communities regarding the management of services operating in their neighbourhoods. Designed to complement Neighbourhood Action Agreements rather than replace them they enable residents to be involved in the design and development of front line services in their neighbourhood. Copies of both agreements were appended to the report.

### **Decision**

That the report be noted and the adoption of the Neighbourhood Agreements supported

## **9. Revised Local Transport Plan (LTP) Budget Allocations for 2009/10** (*Head of Technical Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To provide information on the local transport capital outturn expenditure in 2008/09 and seek approval for the revised LTP budget allocations and programme for integrated transport and structural maintenance in 2009/10.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The report provided details of the 2008/09 local transport capital allocations, the revised budget allocations and the actual allocations as from May 2009. The Head of Technical Services highlighted that work had recently begun on the Hartlepool Transport Interchange. The Portfolio Holder noted that despite costs increasing funding had actually decreased and felt this should be highlighted to the public. There was a constant battle to achieve savings while keeping roads to a certain standard.

### **Decision**

That the revised distribution of local transport capital funding for 2009/10 be approved.

## **10. Wharton Terrace/Parton Street – Proposed One Way Street** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the proposals to introduce a one way system on Wharton Terrace/Parton Street following an objection to the proposals

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

It was proposed to introduce a one way system on Wharton Terrace and Parton Street. Traffic would enter Parton Street and exit via Wharton Terrace. This proposal had come about following concerns raised by residents regarding the safety of the existing highway layout and the potential for serious vehicle incidents. Residents had asked if a one-way system for Wharton Terrace (west) could be considered to address these issues.

Consultation had been carried out with the residents of Wharton Terrace and Parton Street. 22 replies were received – 16 for, 6 against. The Emergency Services had raised no objection. Following official approval by the Head of Technical Services and the advertising of legal orders an objection was received from a Parton Street resident. A copy of the objection letter was appended to the report. The Head of Technical Services confirmed that all the issues raised by the objector had been considered.

The Portfolio Holder indicated his support for the proposals in line with the consultation feedback and the wishes of the majority of respondents.



## **Decision**

That the implementation of the scheme be approved.

## **11. Adoption of Highways, Hartlepool Marina** (*Head of Technical Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To request approval for the adoption of the highways on Hartlepool Marina known as Harbour Walk and Navigation Point and the large car park on Navigation Point.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

When work commenced on the development of Hartlepool Marina the developer, the Mandale Group, had reached agreement with the Local Authority that the internal roads would remain privately owned and maintained. However it had become clear that the maintenance and cleaning of the area was not of a standard deemed acceptable by the public or businesses situated on the Marina. There had been many complaints to the Authority, all of which had been passed onto the developer. In 2002 initial approaches were made by the developer with a view to the roads becoming adopted highway and thus maintained by the Council. Since that time there had been several meetings between the Council, developer and stakeholders resulting in an agreed way forward enabling the adoption of the roads, footways and car park at Navigation Point. The sewers however would remain the responsibility of the developer.

This agreement would take effect from 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009. It was then intended to introduce traffic management measures to regulate the amount of traffic using Harbour Walk by preventing through traffic, thereby reducing the amount of wear and tear. A recent visual inspection had shown immediate maintenance requirements of £50,000 to bring the area to an acceptable standard with a further £500,000 possibly required for future reconstruction.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services also highlighted that recent practices introduced by the developer whereby vehicle owners were being fined for not parking within parking bay white lines would stop. The developer's plans to introduce parking charges at Navigation Point would also not go ahead.

The Portfolio Holder was disappointed that there had to be immediate spending on the highways however he acknowledged that it was necessary given the forthcoming Tall Ships Races in 2010.

### **Decision**

That the adoption of the roads and footways known as Harbour Walk and Navigation Point and the large car park at Navigation Point on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009 be approved.

## **12. Avenue Road – Changes of Parking Restrictions** (*Head of Technical Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To consider requests from businesses on Avenue Road, to amend the current parking restrictions in place on Avenue Road.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

In April 2008 the Portfolio Holder had approved the creation of several new resident parking spaces on Avenue Road. These were accommodated by reducing some of the limited waiting spaces used by businesses. While this benefited the residents a number of businesses had found that the short stay customer parking had been reduced and convenient available parking directly outside the premises was often no longer available. The proposed amendments would not reduce the number of dedicated resident or business bays but would provide an extended area of 30 minute restricted customer parking, located predominantly outside the businesses themselves. Five responses to the subsequent consultation had been received, all in support of the amendments. The Traffic Liason Group had raised no objections.

The Portfolio Holder indicated his support for the proposals in line with the consultation feedback and the wishes of the majority of respondents.

### **Decision**

That the proposed amended parking restrictions be approved

## **13. Draft Neighbourhood Management Strategy for Hartlepool** (*Head of Neighbourhood Management*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval to consult on the draft Neighbourhood Management Strategy for Hartlepool that is capable of meeting the challenges of the Local Government Modernisation Programme in relation to how services are delivered,

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The report set out a Neighbourhood Management Strategy for Hartlepool based on current local working practices and strategies, along with national drivers, a sound knowledge of what works and most importantly the needs of the neighbourhoods. Hartlepool needed a Neighbourhood Management Strategy to strengthen community influence, to improve local outcomes for local people and to meet the challenges of the Government's modernisation programme. Details were given of the proposed strategy and main strategic objectives. This would complement the existing Community and Neighbourhoods Renewal Strategies and contribute toward locally adopted outcomes and targets.

It was proposed that consultation on the draft strategy take place with stakeholders following any comments from the Portfolio Holder. He expressed his support for the strategy, commenting that it showed the authority's ability to work in partnership with residents, neighbourhoods and stakeholders. He requested however that the ability to change and be flexible be included within the strategy. He also asked that the results of the consultation be brought back for his attention prior to their referral to Cabinet.

### **Decision**

That consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Management Strategy be approved and the subsequent results be brought back to the Portfolio Holder prior to referral to Cabinet.

## **14. Multi-Operator Bus Ticketing Scheme** (*Head of Technical Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To advise on proposals to investigate the introduction of multi-operator tickets for bus users in the town.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

As a result of the recent tendering process for supported bus services some

daytime and evening routes are now operated by different bus companies. This had the potential implication that a day ticket purchased on a daytime service might not be able to be used on an evening service as it was run by a different company. Stagecoach and Arriva had recently indicated they would be willing to participate in a multi-operator bus ticketing scheme, thereby alleviating such problems

The Portfolio Holder expressed his support for this proposal which should be implemented as soon as possible. He further requested that this scheme be included in the tender process next time if that was legally possible.

### **Decision**

That the introduction of a multi-operator ticketing scheme be endorsed in principle.

## **15. Residents Only Parking Controls – Grange Road** (*Head of Technical Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To consider a consultation carried out with residents of Grange Road to be re-instated into the resident only permit parking controlled zone.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

Grange Road had previously been included within zone C of the Hartlepool resident controlled parking zone. However when Cabinet approved a decision to increase the cost of a resident permit over a three year period the residents of Grange Road voted overwhelmingly for the controls to be removed. Therefore since 2008 there have been no controlled parking restrictions on Grange Road. Since then residents have experienced significant difficulty in parking within close proximity to their homes. As a result a consultation had been carried out regarding the reintroduction of permit controls. The results showed a clear split with the majority of Grange Road (east) residents in favour with those living in the west less supportive

The Portfolio Holder indicated his support for the proposals in line with the consultation feedback and the wishes of the majority of respondents.

### **Decision**

That those properties on Grange Road between Grosvenor Street and Thornville Street (14-70 even and 1-67 odd) be reinstated into the resident permit controlled parking zone while those properties between Thomville

Street and Linden Grove remain unrestricted.

## **16. Residents Only Parking Restrictions – Vicarage Gardens** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To consider a consultation carried out with residents of Vicarage Gardens for the extension of limited stay parking controls and the introduction of resident only parking restrictions.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

Vicarage Gardens is on the fringe of an existing resident only permit parking controlled zone. The area is predominately unrestricted and as such has suffered from regular instances of long stay commuter parking. To protect businesses operating in the area a limited waiting parking restriction was introduced restricting parking to one hour. However this had caused many of the businesses with residential occupancy difficulty in that the limited stay restrictions reduced parking options close to their properties and the popularity of the unrestricted parking areas greatly reduced available parking spaces. This had led to requests from businesses and residents for the provision of formal parking controls.

Under the proposals the current limited waiting restriction would remain and a new controlled parking restriction would be created along Stranton Garth to restrict parking to one hour with the exception of resident permit holders. As the location was within the subsidised town centre parking area permits would be offered at a cost of £5 per permit. Approval of these restrictions would however leave very few unrestricted parking areas in Stranton. This could lead to a displacement of traffic, leaving unrestricted areas particularly vulnerable. All businesses in the area had been consulted regarding the possibility of further parking controls being introduced, as had Stranton Church who were asked if they wished the controlled parking to include the church frontage. While supporting the new controlled restrictions they preferred to see the area outside the church remain unrestricted with the proviso that this be reconsidered if the restrictions had an unmanageable detrimental effect on the parking situation.

The Portfolio Holder requested that ways to restrict parking outside the church be explored. The Director of Neighbourhood Services advised that Heavy Goods Vehicles tended to park there overnight and it was therefore difficult to enforce parking restrictions at that time. The Portfolio Holder indicated his support for the proposals in line with the consultation feedback and the wishes

of the majority of respondents.

### **Decision**

That the limited stay parking controls be extended and that resident only permit restrictions be established at Vicarage Gardens.

## **17. Stagecoach – Cancellation of Services 20 and 456 as Commercial Services** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To advise on proposals by Stagecoach to remove three of their commercial services and seek approval to replace two of these by in-house provision.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

On 18<sup>th</sup> June 2009 notification was received from Stagecoach stating that as from 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2009 they would be cancelling three of their commercial services:

- Service 20 – Monday to Thursday 16:33 Tofts Farm to Middlegate
- Service 456 – Monday to Friday 07:53 Seaton Carew to Raby Gardens (Dyke House School)
- Service 456 – Monday to Friday 15:10 Raby Gardens (Dyke House School) to Seaton Carew (two buses)

As 56 days notice is required for the registration of these services by another operator other than Stagecoach this would have had to be done by 26<sup>th</sup> June, six working days. Given this the only options were that Stagecoach could be asked to maintain the route at a cost to the Council or the services could be designated as purely school services meaning they would not need to be registered and could be tendered ad-hoc or brought in-house.

Details were given within the report of the yellow bus scheme as supported by the Yellow School Bus Commission. 6,600 UK pupils currently use yellow buses as part of 20 pilot schemes across the country. The proposal was that the routes used by the Yellow School Buses would replace the existing school bus service previously operated by Stagecoach. Yellow buses generally had extra safety features such as CCTV, a regular driver provided with additional training and allocated seats for students. An ad hoc tender had been undertaken with 3 local operators for the provision of the 456 services. This showed potential savings of over £23,000 should the yellow bus option be taken up as opposed to current costs.

The Portfolio Holder expressed his support for the introduction of the yellow bus scheme which would be safer and more efficient than the current service. He was disappointed by the actions of Stagecoach particularly the timing which had left officers with limited options. He asked that his thanks be passed on to the relevant officers for their hard work in this instance.

The Portfolio Holder further advised that he was pleased yellow buses were being introduced as it would be an opportunity for the Council to take charge of public transport, particularly given the loss of a number of commercial services in recent years. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that he was hopeful that Government grant monies could be secured to help fund the yellow bus scheme. The Portfolio Holder asked that the use of the yellow buses be publicised effectively and that the result of these changes be monitored with a view to future actions of this type.

### **Decision**

That the operation of an in-house school service to compensate for the loss of Stagecoach's commercial services 456 to provide transport for pupils travelling to and from Dyke House School/Seaton Carew be approved.

## **18. York Road – Creation of One Hour Limited Waiting Parking Bay** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To consider a letter of objection received in relation to the advertised one hour limited parking bay in York Road

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

In October 2008 the Portfolio Holder approved the extension of the current 30 minute limited stay parking area in York Road (223-255) to one hour. These changes followed a request from businesses in the area experiencing problems following the introduction of a resident permit controlled zone into Houghton Street and Whitburn Street. A letter of support from 8 businesses had been received together with one letter of objection. Following approval the necessary legal orders had been advertised, leading to a further letter of objection. This was appended to the report.

The Portfolio Holder indicated his support for the proposals in line with the consultation feedback and the wishes of the majority of respondents.

**Decision**

That the objection letter be noted and the scheme approved as advertised.

**PETER DEVLIN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009**