

REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO DECISION RECORD 20th January 2006

Present:

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond)
Councillor Bill Iseley

Officers: Stuart Green, Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development)
Chris Barlow, Principal Community Strategy Officer
Dave Stubbs, Head of Environmental Management
Sarah Scarr, Landscape, Planning and Conservation Manager
Pat Watson, Democratic Services Officer

42. Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) (*Head of Community Strategy*)

Type of decision

Key

Purpose of report

To provide feedback on the NRF Evaluation, seek agreement to the continuation of successful interventions for 2006-08, subject to full appraisal, and agree the allocation of £430,000 to the Lifelong Learning Partnership from the Jobs & Economy NRF allocation as agreed by the Hartlepool Partnership.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report outlined the findings from the NRF Programme Evaluation completed in December 2005. The report set out the case for an allocation to the Hartlepool Lifelong Learning Partnership from the Jobs & Economy allocation. On the basis of the Independent evaluation and Best Practice Workshops held during October and November 2005 recommendations were made on the future interventions to be funded through the NRF for 2006-08.

Decision

The Portfolio Holder endorsed the decision of the Hartlepool Partnership Board by

- noting the findings of the NRF evaluation
- agreeing to approve in principle to fund the 'employment sensitive posts' and other projects outlined in the report, subject to full appraisal and final approval; and
- agreeing to allocate the Lifelong Learning Partnership £430,000 from the Jobs & Economy allocation to target the skills agenda.

43. Remit and Membership of the Proposed Conservation Area Advisory Committee *(Director of Regeneration and Planning Services)*

Type of decision

Non key

Purpose of report

To provide confirmation of the membership of the proposed conservation area advisory committee and its proposed remit.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report outlined background information and indicated that, following the taking of soundings of potential member organisations, it was suggested that the membership of the committee should comprise the following representatives, all of whom had expressed interest in being involved,

Member representation

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability
Chair of Planning Committee

Professional representation

Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA)
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)

Amenity groups

Civic Society
Hartlepool Archaeological Society
Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB)
Victorian Society

Parish Councils

Greatham Parish Council
Headland Parish Council

Local residents / Business representatives

Headland Residents Association
Seaton Carew Renewal Advisory Group (SCRAG)

It was suggested that should new resident, business or amenity groups be established in the future they could be invited to join the CAAC with the agreement of the members of the committee at the time.

The proposed remit for the Borough-wide CAAC seen as having a strategic focus (rather than individual planning applications), including:

- Policy
- Conservation Area Appraisals
- Development Briefs
- Awareness raising on Conservation Areas
- Grant Schemes.

The Assistant Director gave a verbal update on the further outcome of consultation. The consultation with ward councillors had elicited a response from one of the Seaton members welcoming the proposed involvement of SCRAG whilst the three St Hilda members had raised various queries and concerns about consultation processes and whether the proposed involvement in the CAAC of the Portfolio Holder and the Planning Committee Chairman presented potential conflicts of interests. The latter concerns had also been raised by the Headland Residents Association (HRA). The Assistant Director advised that the inclusion of such Members on CAACs was not unusual in other Councils/areas and that legal advice was that there would be no conflict of interest, given the proposed CAAC focus on strategic matters, rather than individual planning applications.

The HRA had also requested that a CAAC for the Headland alone be set up as they felt they had a unique situation. They had suggested that the membership would include a majority of Conservation Area residents. The Assistant Director acknowledged that the Headland was the longest established and largest conservation area, with the greatest concentration of listed buildings. Should the Portfolio Holder wish to explore the feasibility of establishing a Headland CAAC, it would be useful to clarify its potential remit, composition and relationship with the Borough-wide CAAC. Establishment of a Headland CAAC as well as the Borough-wide CAAC might also raise capacity issues. Whilst the Assistant Director envisaged there being capacity within the Department to support both Borough-wide and Headland CAACs there may be a question mark over the capacity of other organisations to become involved in more than one CAAC, obviously

pressures would increase if proposals emerge for CAACs for other individual Conservation Areas. The Assistant Director also suggested that any CAAC should be reviewed after a year of operation, to establish any need or scope for revision.

The Chairman of Planning Committee stressed the importance of conservation and gave his support to the Portfolio Holder by approving the membership of the CAAC as indicated in the report. He was of the view that separate committees for areas of the town were not appropriate at the present time and care should be taken in any plans to set up such committees.

The Portfolio Holder was in agreement with the contents of the report relating to the Borough-wide CAAC and requested that further views be obtained from HRA and the Headland Parish Council on the potential establishment of a CAAC for the Headland, relating particularly to its remit, composition and relationship with the borough-wide CAAC.

Decisions

The Portfolio Holder;

- (a) agreed to the establishment of a Borough-wide Conservation Area Advisory Committee with a remit and composition as suggested in the report, to be reviewed after one year of operation;
- (b) authorised officers to arrange an initial meeting of the CAAC as soon as practicable;
- (c) agreed to consultation with the Headland Parish Council and Headland Residents Association on the remit, composition and relationship with the Borough-wide CAAC of a potential Headland CAAC, with a report back to a future Portfolio Holder meeting.

44. Pride in Hartlepool Proposals (*Head of Environment and Management*)

Type of decision

Non Key

Purpose of report

To request Portfolio Holder consideration of the recommendations of the Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group in respect of proposals for community projects.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report contained a list of Pride in Hartlepool proposals and

recommendations for funding of those proposals.

Decision

The Portfolio Holder agreed the recommendations of the Pride in Hartlepool Steering Group in respect of proposals for community projects.

45. Additional Powers for Community Wardens *(Head of Environmental Management)*

Type of decision

Non Key

Purpose of report

To seek the granting of additional powers to Community Wardens to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for a variety of offences.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report detailed the history of legislation and previous discussions concerning additional powers.

The report indicated that the findings of the consultation exercise had proved useful and, in general, members of the public were in favour of granting additional powers and the ability to issue FPNs for most available powers.

The report provided details of the accreditation scheme and health and safety training.

The Portfolio Holder agreed that accreditation was a welcome new addition to the powers available for the Council as it endeavoured to provide a safe and clean environment for the people of Hartlepool.

Decision

The Portfolio Holder agreed to the granting of additional powers to Community Wardens and requested that the implementation date be 1st April 2006 at the latest..

46. Single Programme Approvals *(Head of Regeneration)*

Type of decision

For Information

Purpose of report

To provide information highlighting recent Single Programme funding approvals relating to Brougham Enterprise Centre, new business units at Queen's Meadow and the Central Area Attractors project.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report detailed funding approvals by the Tees Valley Partnership and ONE North East in relation to the three projects identified above. The report also drew attention to the significant achievement of securing Single Programme resources totalling over £3.5m for the financial years 2005/06 to 2007/08.

Decision

The Portfolio Holder noted the Single Programme approvals for the three identified projects.

J A BROWN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 25th January 2006