

# **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA**



**Tuesday 26 January 2010**

**at 5.00 pm**

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

**MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

Councillors S Akers-Belcher, Barker, R W Cook, Coward, Fleming, J Marshall, Rogan, Worthy and Wright

Resident Representatives: John Cambridge 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 23 November 2009
- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

No items.
- 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**

- 6.1 Neighbourhood Services: Budget and Policy Framework Consultation  
Proposals 2010/11 – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

7. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

- 7.1 Suggested Proposals to Amend the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's  
Work Programme for the 2009 / 10 Municipal Year – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

8. **ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM THE FORWARD PLAN**

9. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

**Date of next meeting –**

Monday, 1 February 2010, commencing at 4.00 p.m in Committee Room B, Civic  
Centre, Hartlepool

# **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

## **MINUTES**

23 November 2009

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

### **Present:**

Councillor: Stephen Akers-Belcher (In the Chair)

Councillors: Caroline Barker, John Coward, Trevor Rogan and Edna Wright.

Resident Representatives: John Cambridge and Brenda Loynes.

Also Present: Sgt. Carter, Cleveland Police

Residents; R Hay, M Murphy, J Story, M Thomas, and P Wolfe.

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods  
Mike Blair, Transportation and Traffic Manager  
Phil Hepburn, Parking Services Manager  
Julia Pinchen, Business Liaison Manager NDC Commercial Areas  
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer  
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

### **45. Apologies for Absence**

Councillors R W Cook and Worthy.

### **46. Declarations of interest by Members**

None.

### **47. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2009**

Confirmed.

### **48. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum**

No items.

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

No items.

**50. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents**

No items.

**51. Car Parking On Estates** (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Parking Services Manager outlined the contents of his report to the Forum detailing the background to the parking issues faced by residents in different parts of the town, if and how these were managed by council parking officers and traffic regulations and the difference between Police and local authority responsibilities and enforcement. One of the main issues faced was the obstruction of pathways and more recently dropped kerbs by parked vehicles. Both the Police and the local authority were working to raise public awareness of these issues and joint enforcement had been undertaken with notices being issued to those who had parked inconsiderately. With recent changes to the Traffic Management Act there were several new contraventions which would assist with the management of traffic and the control of parking.

Members considered that some of the problems in the 'newer' developments in the town were due to developers maximising the land for housing and thereby the profit that could be made. Little planning of the traffic in these areas seemed to have taken place and there should be greater provision made when building to avoid the situation being experienced in Clavering for example, where lay-bys were having to be constructed to allow traffic to move freely on estate feeder roads. Officers commented that this was not the case. There were set standards for roads in new developments and these were applied through a design standards document that applied to all developments in the Tees Valley area that itself was based on national standards.

Members also raised concerns that during the design process for schools under BSF (Building Schools for the Future) not enough was being done to address parking issues in advance of the developments being undertaken. The new Jesmond Road school development was highlighted. Officers indicated that parking and road access had been considered during the planning of the site, but the lack of rear access and the location did limit what could be done. The best available option had been implemented. Members agreed that school parking for parents and visitors was a major problem and needed to be considered in detail at the planning stage to ensure that all school developments had adequate drop – off and parking areas. There was the issue that the authority should be seen to encourage parents not to be bringing their children to school by car and that providing easy access drop off

points undermined that work.

The Chair noted that a number of residents were in attendance and asked if they had any specific points they wished to make. Residents highlighted that there were issues with some parking regulations that the council had put in place that actually caused a greater problem than they were trying to alleviate. The Cliff in Seaton Carew was highlighted as an example where the traffic regulations to protect resident parking ended at 6.00 p.m. on an evening and didn't apply on Sunday. This caused significant problems for residents who found accessing their own homes extremely difficult on an evening and were completely disadvantaged on Sunday when there were many visitors to Seaton Carew. Therefore, extending the operational hours would alleviate these problems. Although these regulations and many others in Seaton Carew and other areas of the town away from the town centre were 'self-enforcing', the costs of enforcement would likely lead to an increase in the cost of parking permits. Officers indicated that they would look into these issues. ..

Residents also highlighted problems in Rift House Road, Kingsley Avenue and Browning Avenue. The parking problems around the Sixth Form College during its redevelopment were also highlighted as a major concern for local residents. Officers commented that the college redevelopment did include a car park for 140 vehicles, an increase of 40 over the current position, but that it was to be located in the middle of what was now a building site. Arrangements had been made in advance of the redevelopment to alleviate some of the anticipated issues and all residents had been consulted and informed of them in advance.

In other areas the problems related to narrow roads and people parking on both sides of the road. It becomes quite difficult at times to manoeuvre in these roads when vehicles park on either side as traffic flow is restricted to single file. Residents were, however, expected to be reasonable in where they parked so as not to cause an obstruction. Consideration was being given to the suggestion made by one of the residents that one-way operation would allow the levels of parking on either side of the road to continue.

There was concern raised by a member that the increased number of lay-bys and off-road parking provision was exacerbating the flooding in certain areas. Officers stated that there was no evidence of this. It was highlighted by officers that where parking restrictions or regulations existed, then action could be taken by either the local authority or the Police. However, if there were no regulations in place, then it was up to the Police to determine whether a parked vehicle did or did not constitute an obstruction. Sgt. Carter commented that in many cases that would depend on the officer attending when a complaint had been made and the attitude of the owner of the vehicle, if they were available. If a vehicle was not obstructing the carriageway or a dropped kerb and was taxed and had a valid MOT certificate, then little could be done. The Forum expressed concerns that it was unclear to members of the public who to contact with a parking problem as there was uncertainty of what actually equated to a parking offence and the enforcement roles of the

Council and the Police.

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods commented that there were many parking issues around the town and that most could be solved through the simple use of common sense. Parking in areas with narrow streets with vehicles half on the road and half on the pavement could be seen as acceptable but in other areas, keeping the footpath clear had to be the priority. The PCSO's in the town had been given the authority to issue fixed penalty notices for littering offences and the Director indicated that it would be beneficial if this was extended to parking offences as well.

The Chair commented that other ways of funding additional parking provision needed to be examined further. There were many Housing Hartlepool properties in the town that had no off-road parking. Consideration needed to be given to seeking funding for such facilities from Housing Hartlepool. The Forum highlighted that the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums had a small amount of funding to address parking issues and highlighted that a process needed to be put in place to monitor and review the Minor Works funding allocation to each of the Consultative Forums on a ward by ward basis.

Members asked if the use of unused school land for drop-off facilities or additional parking could be examined. The Director commented that any land that was not utilised for buildings at schools was deemed as school playing field and the use of such land for any other use required Ministerial approval. There were green travel plans in place for all the schools in the town and as had been mentioned earlier, parents needed to be encouraged to bus, walk or cycle with their children to school rather than dropping them off in cars. The Chair commented that Councillors had a responsibility when considering the planning applications for the BSF proposals to look at the issues of parking and travel arrangements in detail.

Residents raised the issue of parking in and around Hartlepool Railway Station. The Director indicated that there were issues at the moment as a considerable amount of work was being undertaken around the station to provide additional parking and to develop the Transport Interchange which would include 100 new spaces.

Following the debate on the parking issues in the town, the Chair thanked all those present for their contributions to the debate. The Scrutiny Support Officer sought the forum's approval to the Chair finalising the comments of the meeting for the report to be then considered by Scrutiny Coordinating Committee. The Chair stated that it would not be possible to resolve all the issues and all the proposals put forward may not be implemented, but that did not mean they should not go forward.

### **Decision**

That from the evidence gathered during this review of Car Parking on Estates the Chair finalises the report / recommendations to be submitted to a future meeting of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee

## **52. Issues Identified From The Forward Plan**

No items.

The meeting concluded at 5.05 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

## **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

26<sup>th</sup> January, 2010



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: BUDGET AND  
POLICY FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION  
PROPOSALS 2010/2011

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide the opportunity, as part of the Budget and Policy Framework consultation proposals for 2010/2011, for the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum to consider the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department's pressures and priorities relating to the provision of neighbourhood services.

### **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 At a meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2009, consideration was given to the Executive's Initial Budget and Policy Framework consultation proposals for 2010/2011 to 2012/2013. At this meeting it was agreed that the initial consultation proposals would be considered on a departmental basis by the appropriate Scrutiny Forum. This occurred throughout November, 2009.
- 2.2 The comments/observations of each Forum were fed back to the additional meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 and were used to formulate the formal Scrutiny response to Cabinet. The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's formal response was received by Cabinet on the 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and taken into consideration during the finalisation of its Budget and Policy Framework Proposals for 2010/2011 on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2009. The Executive's finalised proposals were considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2010 and repeating the process previously implemented have again been referred to the appropriate Scrutiny Forum for consideration on a departmental basis.
- 2.3 As such, appended to this report, for consideration as part of the Budget and Policy Framework consultation proposals for 2010/2011, are details of the pressures and priorities relating to the neighbourhood services areas of



service provision within the Regeneration and Neighbourhood Services Department:-

**Appendix A** - Schedule of Budget Pressures 2010/2011;

**Appendix B** - Schedule of Budget Priorities 2010/2011.

- 2.4 Cabinet is proposing that the pressures identified are funded. In relation to the priorities Cabinet is not proposing that these items are funded.
- 2.5 In addition, as part of the overall budget strategy a cross departmental increased income target of £0.3m was established. Of this target £0.224m has been identified, of which £0.017m relates to Neighbourhood Services. Proposals to achieve this target are set out at **Appendix C**.
- 2.6 To assist Members of this Scrutiny Forum in the consideration of the proposals arrangements have been made for the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhood Services to be in attendance and an invitation to this meeting has also been extended to the relevant Portfolio Holder(s) (attendance subject to availability).

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Scrutiny Forum:-
- a) as part of the Budget and Policy Framework consultation proposals for 2010/2011, consider the pressures, priorities and income generation proposals relating to the neighbourhood services areas of service provision within the Regeneration and Neighbourhood Services Department; and
  - b) formulates any comments and observations to be presented by the Chair of this Scrutiny Forum to the meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee to be held on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2010 to enable a formal response to be presented to the Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> February, 2010.

**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](mailto:laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk)

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

**INITIAL PRESSURES 2010/11****6.1 Appendix A****NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**

	£'000	Description
Support Bus Service and Concessionary Fares	154	This pressure arises due to the reinstatement of the hospital service H1 to North Tees and an anticipated above inflationary increase in concessionary fare payments.
<b>Total</b>	<b>154</b>	

**INITIAL PRIORITIES 2010/11****6.1 Appendix B****NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**

	£'000	Description
Extension of out of hours service	183	Depending on Members' decision on options for extending the service the costs could be funded from existing budgets or incur additional costs of <b>up to</b> £183,000.
Neighbourhood Management/Community Safety	50	With the demise of NDC the contribution towards the Neighbourhood Management/Policing and Community Safety programme at 173 York Road will cease. Cleveland police are committed to funding half of the costs and are pursuing the increase through their own budget pressure rounds. The costs cover premises/ half a FTE anti social behaviour officer and administrative support.
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	

## Schedule of Proposed Income Increases 2010/2011

### Neighbourhood Services

#### Potential Sources of Additional Income - 2010/11.

		Section	Officers / Budget Holder	Item / Task Discussed	Estimated Additional Income £'000
Property Services		Environmental Protection	Adrian Hurst/Heather Deane	Sponsorship of Pest Control Vans - Local companies may be willing to pay for advertising on Council vehicles which are on the road around the town all day.	5
Property Services		Environmental Sustainability	Helen Beaman/SEAI officer	Schools Environmental Action Initiative (SEAI)- This programme is currently funded through the Working Neighbourhood Fund - other authorities have started to charge for Environmental support (e.g. Sunderland charges £1000 per school and has matched that with local funding). Each school to be charged £500 per annum per service - Anticipate that 4 schools will sign up this year.	2
Property Services		Environmental Sustainability	Helen Beaman/Kate Ainger	Pride in Hartlepool sponsorship	1
Property Services		Environmental Sustainability	Rocco Graziano/Helen Beaman	Resource use reduction - Offer service to schools to examine and reduce resource usage- programme currently funded through Working Neighbourhood Funding the charge could be a percentage of the savings achieved (as business such as KPMG ). £1,000 per school (based on achieving a 20% saving)- anticipated that 2 schools will sign up this year.	2
		Horticultural Services	Albert Cope		5
		Environmental Services	Craig Thelwel		2
		<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>17</b>

Risk impact	Risk probability	Risk score	Risk status	Other Comments
2. Medium	1. Unlikely	2	Green	
2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	
1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	
2. Medium	2. Possible	4	Amber	
1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	
1. Low	1. Unlikely	1	Green	

## **NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

26 January 2010



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SUGGESTED PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY  
FORUM'S WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE 2009 / 10  
MUNICIPAL YEAR

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum of the suggested proposals to amend the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum's work programme for this Municipal Year in order to carry out an investigation into the possible environmental impacts of dust deposits on the Headland.

### **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Health Scrutiny Forum recently conducted an investigation into 'Dust Deposits on the Headland' following serious concerns from residents regarding the possible health implications of dust deposits on the Headland and surrounding areas. The Chair of the Health Scrutiny Forum presented the Forum's findings and recommendations to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 11 December 2009. The Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee accepted the Health Scrutiny Forum's recommendations and subsequently agreed that a further scrutiny investigation be carried out into the possible environmental impacts of dust deposits on the Headland by the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.
- 2.2 As Members are aware, the current work programme for this Forum is very challenging with the capacity of the Forum currently at its maximum. The delivery of the current work programme is extremely tight but achievable. However, the delivery of the remaining work programme along with an investigation into dust deposits on the Headland would not be achievable.

- 2.3 Therefore, in order for the Forum to carry out an investigation into dust deposits on the Headland it is suggested, for Members consideration, that the two outstanding work programme items, 'Traffic Lights' and 'Speed Humps' are considered as part of the Forum's work programme for the next Municipal Year, 2010 / 11.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum:-

- (a) investigates the possible environmental impacts of dust deposits on the Headland; and
- (b) considers the two outstanding work programme items, 'Traffic Lights' and 'Speed Humps', as part of the Forum's work programme for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

**Contact Officer:-** Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: - 01429 523087  
Email:- [laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk)

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Health Scrutiny Forum entitled 'Final Report – Dust Deposits on the Headland' presented to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 11 December 2009