

# REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO DECISION RECORD

17<sup>th</sup> February 2006

**Present:**

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond)

Officers: Peter Scott, Director Regeneration and Planning Services  
Dave Stubbs, Head of Environmental Management  
Genevieve Parker, Principal Regeneration Officer  
Chris Barlow, Principal Community Strategy Officer  
Joan Wilkins, Principal Democratic Services Officer

## **47. Minor Works Proposals** (*Head of Environmental Management*)

**Type of decision**

Non key.

**Purpose of report**

To consider recommendations of Neighbourhood Consultative Forums in respect of minor grant works.

**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**

- i) Throston Grange Community Centre and Library Lighting – Continuation of the works to reduce anti-social behaviour in the above area through the provision of new columns and lanterns at the above location – Cost £3,200.

- ii) Clavering School – Proposed Traffic Calming – The provision of a traffic calming scheme outside the above school, consisting of speed cushions and a 20 mph speed limit - Cost £9,500.

### **Central Neighbourhood Consultative Forum**

- i) Colwyn Road Shrub Beds – The removal of the cobbled beds on the side streets, which adjoin Colwyn Road and the removal of the Rydal Street bed - Cost £3,100.
- ii) West Park/Park Drive Grassed Open Space – The Forum took the decision to defer consideration of a scheme to place boulders around the perimeter of the above grassed area, at a cost of £3,000, until next year as funding for this year was spent.

### **South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum**

- i) Fens Crescent – Crown thinning and raising twenty trees in the above location – Cost £2,312.
- ii) Fens Area – Street lighting improvements – Renewal of street lanterns at Watton Close, Wisbech Close, Brandon Close and Mildenhall Close – Cost £4,787.
- iii) Seaton Carew Gateway – Refurbishment of the shrub beds in the above location - Cost £2,779.
- iv) The Grove, Greatham – Removal of shrubs and holly bushes to make the footpath more accessible – Cost of £326.
- v) Sappers Corner to Claxton Junction Footpath – Reduction of the hedge and associated works in the above area – Cost £1,350.
- vi) Dundee Road – Car Parking Provision – A contribution of £4,500 towards a scheme to provide extra parking in Dundee Road.
- vii) Usworth Road – Stagecoach Bus Depot – Removal of shrub beds in the above location, with the creation of two circular flowerbeds and other associated works - Cost £1,353.
- viii) Kinross Grove – Car Parking Provision – A contribution of £2,300 towards a scheme in Kinross Grove to provide extra car parking.

### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder agreed the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums in respect of Minor Works proposals as outlined above.

## **48. Government Consultation on Local Strategic Partnerships** *(Head of Community Strategy)*

### **Type of decision**

Non key.

### **Purpose of report**

To seek endorsement of a response to the Government's consultation paper (December 2005) on the future of Local Strategic Partnerships - Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their Future.

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

The Principal Community Strategy Officer presented a report outlining the background to the Government's consultation paper and provided details of the following key chapters of the consultation:-

Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their Future

- Chapter 1 The role of LSPs and Sustainable Community Strategies
- Chapter 2 Governance
- Chapter 3 Accountability
- Chapter 4 Capacity Issues

Particular attention was drawn to the key questions asked at the end of each chapter and a copy of the proposed responses to each of them circulated at Appendix B of the report. The Portfolio Holder was advised that the consultation response was to be considered by the Hartlepool Partnership on the 24<sup>th</sup> February and following consideration of the information provided indicated that he was pleased to see the level of importance placed upon co-terminus working.

### **Decision**

The consultation response was approved and the Head of Community Strategy authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to agree any further amendments required as a result of the Hartlepool Partnership meeting.

**49. Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) (Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development))**

**Type of decision**

Non key.

**Purpose of report**

To detail the outcome of the Council's bid for funding within the first round of the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI).

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

The Assistant Director's report outlined the background and outcome of the first round LEGI bid submitted by the Council on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2006.

The Portfolio Holder was advised that although the Regional Assessment Panel had recognised the Councils robust partnership arrangements and track record of delivery it felt that the bid needed to be further developed to demonstrate cohesion and innovation. On this basis the bid was not recommended for short-listing.

The Portfolio Holder expressed his disappointment that the bid had been unsuccessful but recognised that the first round bid had been excellent. He encouraged the Economic Development Team to pull together and even better second round bid learning for the experience of the first round.

**Decision**

The report was noted.

**50. Draft North Hartlepool Neighbourhood Action Plan (Head of Regeneration)**

**Type of decision**

Non key.

**Purpose of report**

To seek comments on the draft North Hartlepool (Brus and St Hilda Wards) Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP).

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

The Head of Regeneration highlighted that the North Hartlepool was the sixth neighbourhood within the Neighbourhood Renewal Area to have a NAP developed and submitted a report detailing:

- The background to the production of the Plan,
- The geographical area covered,
- The consultation process undertaken,
- The contents of the draft NAP, and
- Feedback received upon it.

It was noted that some residents and Ward Councillors had expressed concern regarding the size of the area to be covered by the NAP and that efforts were being made to address these concerns. Whilst it was highlighted that the suggested ideal size for a NAP area was 10,000 people, equivalent to the size of the North area, it was acknowledged that with the availability of adequate resources three or four neighbourhoods could be created in that area. Although this was not financially viable at this time, work was ongoing to ensure the equitable split of resources on the basis of key factors such as levels of deprivation and population.

Following consideration of the information provided the Mayor indicated that he was happy with the content of the report and suggested that in the future sufficient resources were to become available it would be preferable for multiple NAP's in the North Hartlepool area.

### **Decision**

The report and the comments made by the Mayor, as outlined above, were noted.

**J A BROWN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2006**