

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Thursday, 1 April 2010

at 3.00 pm

in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors R W Cook, S Cook, Cranney, Gibbon, A E Lilley, London, McKenna, Rogan and Wright

Resident Representatives:

Ted Jackson, John Lynch and Iris Ryder

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 25 March 2010 (*to follow*)
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

No items.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's Business Incubation System

7.1 Draft Final Report – *Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum*

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

i) Date of Next Meeting:- To be confirmed

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

25 March 2010

The meeting commenced at 3.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Councillor Trevor Rogan (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob Cook, Kevin Cranney, Alison Lilley, Frances London and Edna Wright

Resident Representative:
Ted Jackson

Also Present: Councillor Peter Jackson, Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Alastair Smith, Assistant Director, Transportation and Engineering Services
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

71. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Steve Gibbon and Resident Representative John Lynch.

72. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

73. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2010

Confirmed subject to the addition of the date of 4 March 2010 on page 1 of the minutes.

74. Consideration of requests for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

None

75. Proposals for Inclusion in the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department Departmental Plan 2010/11 *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhood)*

The Departmental Plans and Corporate Plan covered 2008/09 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 proposals would be considered by each Scrutiny Forum early in March, reported back to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 16 April 2010 and used to formulate the formal Scrutiny response to Cabinet. A copy of the draft Departmental Plan was attached at Appendix A together with a detailed Action Plan which set out the proposals that underpinned each outcome to be included in the Departmental Plan including those that fell within the remit of this Forum.

The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services provided a presentation on the key issues and priorities that the department faced over the next year and proposals on how these would be addressed which provided Members with the opportunity to consider the proposed outcomes and actions for inclusion in the 2010/11 Departmental and Corporate Plans. A number of achievements were highlighted which included:-

- Crime Reduction and Anti-Social Behaviour
- Preventing Terrorism
- Attracting Business
- Housing Investment continuing

Members were advised of the challenges ahead which included balancing the budget/business transformation, funding opportunities, business development, alcohol abuse and re-offending.

In relation to future proposals, the Director reported that there were 24 outcomes which the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department played a lead role with contributions to a number of others.

Following the conclusion of the presentation a discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- Following a Member's concern regarding the limited improvements to Mill House Leisure Centre, it was suggested that this issue be pursued by the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum or raised at the next meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee.

- In response to a query regarding the arrangements in place to utilise the Jackson's landing site during the Tall Ships Event as well as the future use of this building, the Director reported that agreement had been sought from the owners that the facility could be utilised during the event. However, the long term proposals for this building remained uncertain.
- The Forum went on to discuss the future use of the unoccupied building at Jackson's landing during which a Member referred to the Forum's previous suggestion that alternative uses be explored including the provision of a musical entertainment arena and ice skating facility. The Director outlined the financial implications of these suggestions.
- Some concern was expressed with regard to the red flag received in a recent inspection relating to the reduction of alcohol abuse to which the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods reported on the Compulsory Area Assessment (CAA) inspection process and indicated that the limited funding available to address this issue contributed to this outcome. However, it was anticipated that some improvement in the reduction of alcohol abuse would be evident in the next inspection undertaken.
- Members recognised that many of the proposals by the Department were likely to need substantial investment for them to come to fruition and that the sale of Council assets and the development of strong evidence of income streams were vital to ensure political support for any subsequent prudential borrowing requirements.

Recommendation

- (i) That the proposed outcomes and actions for inclusion in the 2010/11 Corporate Plan as attached at Appendix A, be supported.
- (ii) That the comments of the Forum, as outlined above, be presented to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 16 April 2010.

76. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum – Portfolio Holder's Response to the Hartlepool Transport Interchange *(Report of the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods and Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods)*

The Assistant Director (Transportation and Engineering Services) presented

the report which provided feedback on the recommendations from the investigation into 'The Hartlepool Transport Interchange', which was reported to Cabinet on 8 February 2010. Cabinet had approved the recommendations of the investigation in their entirety. Details of each recommendation and proposed actions to be taken were provided as set out in Appendix A to the report.

Progress on the proposed actions to date were provided including details of the proposed artwork and design of the unused platform. A number of photographs were tabled at the meeting which set out progress made since commencement of the project.

A Member commented on the importance of maximising use of the interchange by transport operators. The Assistant Director advised on the benefits of encouraging use of public transport which would assist with usage of the interchange. However, it was highlighted that the interchange was a facility to assist with changes from different modes of transport and link in with the Christchurch Improvement Scheme.

Following a Member's suggestion that a transport booking facility should be available in the town to enable users to make travel arrangements with various operators, it was reported that the feasibility of introducing an automated ticket booking system would be further explored. Work was also ongoing with the Joint Strategy Unit in relation to the introduction of a universal multi-card system.

The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Neighbourhoods joined the meeting and commented on the advantages of an integrated transport system and the need to pursue an oyster type/multi-card system.

Recommendation

That the proposed actions, as detailed in the Action Plan, attached at Appendix A, be noted.

77. Issues Identified from Forward Plan

A Member requested clarification regarding the outcome of the single programme bids to which the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods advised that a decision was yet to be determined.

78. Date and Time of Next Meeting

It was reported that the next meeting would be held at 3.00 pm on 1 April 2010.

The meeting concluded at 4.15 pm.

CHAIRMAN

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

1 April 2010



**Report of: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny
Forum**

**Subject: DRAFT FINAL REPORT – HARTLEPOOL’S
BUSINESS INCUBATION SYSTEM**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into ‘Hartlepool’s Business Incubation System’.

2. SETTING THE SCENE

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 17 July 2009, Members determined their work programme for the 2009/10 Municipal Year. The topic of ‘Hartlepool’s Business Incubation System’ was selected as the second scrutiny topic for consideration during the current Municipal Year.
- 2.2 Responsibility for the monitoring and development of Hartlepool’s Business Incubation System lies with the Economic Development Section which is part of the Authority’s Regeneration and Neighbourhood’s Department.
- 2.3 Business Incubation has many different connotations and meanings, but UK Business Incubation the professional body for the business incubation industry defines business incubation as providing:-

“SMEs [Small and Medium Enterprises] and start-ups with the ideal location to develop and grow their businesses, offering everything from virtual support, rent-a-desk through to state of the art laboratories and everything in between. They provide direct access to hands on intensive business support, access to finance and experts and to other entrepreneurs and suppliers to really make businesses and entrepreneurs grow.”¹

¹ UK Business Incubation, 2009

3. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 3.1 The overall aim of the Scrutiny investigation was to gain an understanding of the Business Incubation System Strategy and how the businesses in Hartlepool are benefiting from this support, with the ultimate aim of making Hartlepool more globally competitive.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 4.1 The Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny investigation were as outlined below:-

- (a) To gain an understanding of the Business Incubation System Strategy;
- (b) To seek the views of local businesses of the value of the Business Incubation System in Hartlepool;
- (c) To explore the work of other support agencies involved in the role of business incubation;
- (d) To assess the effectiveness of the Business Incubation System in Hartlepool in comparison to national / local baselines; and
- (e) To examine future development plans for the Business Incubation System.

5. MEMBERSHIP OF THE REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

- 5.1 The membership of the Scrutiny Forum was as detailed below:-

Councillors R W Cook, S Cook, Cranney, Gibbon, A E Lilley, London, McKenna, Rogan and Wright.

Resident Representatives: Ted Jackson, John Lynch and Iris Ryder.

6. METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

- 6.1 Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum met formally from 5 November 2009 to 13 April 2010 to discuss and receive evidence relating to this investigation. A detailed record of the issues raised during these meetings is available from the Council's Democratic Services.

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

- (a) Detailed Officer presentations and reports supplemented by verbal evidence;
- (b) Holding Forum meetings at the Hartlepool Enterprise and Innovation Centres, two sites key to the Hartlepool Business Incubation System; and
- (c) Verbal evidence from local businesses and support agencies.

FINDINGS

7 THE HARTLEPOOL BUSINESS INCUBATION SYSTEM STRATEGY

7.1 Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum met at the Hartlepool Enterprise Centre on 18 February 2010, where they received detailed evidence from the Economic Development Manager and the Principal Economic Development Officer (Business Services) surrounding the historical development of the Business Incubation System Strategy in Hartlepool.

7.2 The Forum was reminded that the development of a Business Incubation System was based on the Community Strategy Aim of:-

“Develop[ing] a more enterprising, vigorous and diverse local economy that will attract new investment, enable local enterprises and entrepreneurs to be globally competitive and create more employment opportunities for local people”²

7.3 In reflecting on the Community Strategy Aim (see paragraph 7.2) Members were provide with the context of Hartlepool in 2000 having one of the lowest numbers of business start ups in the Tees Valley, the impact of the decline in traditional engineering and manufacturing companies and the challenges of a more globally competitive market.

7.4 In response to the challenges highlighted in paragraph 7.3, the Forum were informed that DTZ Piedad Consulting were commissioned, by Hartlepool Borough Council and Hartlepool New Deal for Communities, to produce an Incubation Strategy in 2002. The outcomes of this feasibility study resulted in the Hartlepool Business Incubation Strategy being formalised in 2003, with five main recommendations as detailed below³:-

- (i) That a ‘hot house’ development be created at the Town’s Queens Meadow site;

² Hartlepool Partnership, 2010

³ HBC, 2009

- (ii) That a major enhancement scheme take place at Brougham Enterprise Centre;
- (iii) That an overarching support mechanism be developed to incubate start-up and existing small businesses;
- (iv) That consideration be made towards community incubation, with any physical developments deferred until the main system is fully operational and integrated into the local economy; and
- (v) That the issue of move-on accommodation requirements be considered to ensure a flow through the system.

7.5 Members learnt that the production of the Business Incubation System Strategy by DTZ Pida, provided the necessary momentum for a partnership approach to realise the ambition of the Strategy. Through a combination of Council funding and finance available from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF), Single Programme and UK Steel Enterprises (UKSE) many of the main recommendations of the Hartlepool Business Incubation Strategy were delivered as follows:-

- (i) UKSE developed a 27,000 square foot Innovation Centre at Queens Meadow, which was opened in December 2005;
- (ii) The Brougham Enterprise Centre was enhanced and relaunched as the Hartlepool Enterprise Centre (see Picture1 below) in October 2006, providing a dedicated support for start-up and existing small business via 59 on site business units;



Picture1: Hartlepool Enterprise Centre

- (iii) The developments of the Enterprise and Innovation Centres created an environment that could incubate start-up and existing small

businesses, this was enhanced by the development of Enterprising Hartlepool, a small business network group fostering the sharing of good practice, alongside the suggestions by businesses of activities that may encourage even more entrepreneurial activity; and

- (iv) The enhancement of facilities at Newburn Bridge and the development of 40,000 sq ft business premises by Rivergreen Developments at Queens Meadow to supplement the move-on accommodation in Hartlepool.

8 VIEWS OF LOCAL BUSINESSES TOWARDS THE HARTLEPOOL BUSINESS INCUBATION SYSTEM

- 8.1 Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum were keen to hear the views of local businesses who had been involved with or through the Hartlepool Business Incubation System. When the Forum met on 4 March 2010, Members were delighted to hear evidence from the Managing Director at Hart Biologicals Limited.
- 8.2 The Managing Director from Hart Biologicals provided Members with an insight to the development of the organisation from its inception seven years ago, to its current siting at one of the premises developed by Rivergreen Developments at Queens Meadow.
- 8.3 Members were delighted that the Managing Director was extremely positive about the impact that the Hartlepool Business Incubation System had in developing the organisation and that the expansion of the business has resulted in over 50% of the company's turnover coming from export sales. This expansion had resulted in Hart Biologicals being one of the Hartlepool based company that contributed towards Hartlepool Borough Council's 'Access to Markets' programme. The Forum had already heard an explanation at their meeting of 18 February 2010, that the aim of 'Access to Markets', was to encourage the trading of local businesses beyond the boundaries of Hartlepool, therefore, drawing wealth into the Town.
- 8.4 In the development of Hart Biologicals, Members were informed that Hartlepool Borough Council had played a major part through initially sourcing premises at Usworth Road, before assisting with an expansion to Newburn Bridge for the fledgling company. The Council's Economic Development Team also supported the company at exhibitions, these being the most effective method of promoting Hart Biologicals' product. Members were responsive to the comments that it was disappointing that the larger move-on accommodation at Rivergreen was not operated by the Council, but the Forum recognised the important role of partnership working delivering the aims of the Business Incubation Strategy.

- 8.5 When the Forum met on 18 February 2010, Members received details of a case study of Big Studio Glass Design Limited. The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum were informed that it was through the Business Incubation System that Big Studio Glass Design had managed to increase its profitability and ultimately expand the business. The business improvements in Big Studio Glass Design had mainly been achieved via the mentoring of the business by a process engineer, who advised more efficient ways of minimising glass wastage. The identification of a process engineer highlighted to Members the ability of Hartlepool's Incubation System to provide direct access to experts, a service that wouldn't necessarily be afforded to the company if there wasn't an Incubation Business System in Hartlepool.

9 THE WORK OF SUPPORT AGENCIES INVOLVED IN THE HARTLEPOOL BUSINESS INCUBATION SYSTEM

- 9.1 Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum recognised that in order to achieve the aims of the Business Incubation System, there was a requirement for a number of support agencies to work together in order to provide the specific areas of expertise that may help a start-up or existing small business enterprise.
- 9.2 When Members met at Hartlepool Enterprise Centre on 18 February 2010, they recognised that business in Hartlepool had benefited from not only the support provided by the Council's Economic Development Team, but also the support of agencies such as One North East, Business Link, Job Centre Plus, North East Chamber of Commerce and Owton Fens Community Association (OFCA).
- 9.3 The Forum meeting held on 4 March 2010 at the Innovation Centre enabled Members to hear detailed evidence from the Regional Manager of UKSE in relation to the support that UKSE provide to the Hartlepool's Business Incubation System.
- 9.4 The Regional Manager of UKSE provided Members with the historical development of UKSE since 1975 as the regenerative arm of British Steel and more recently Corus. It was the aim of UKSE to help those local economies where steel industries were based to respond to the changing global demand for steel. This had resulted in the development of the Innovation Centre by UKSE in partnership with the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, One North East (ONE) and the Council (see Picture2 below).



Picture2: Hartlepool Innovation Centre

9.5 Members were particularly delighted to learn that the Managing Director of UKSE had highlighted Hartlepool as being one of the best Local Authorities to work with in terms of its proactive approach to the development and involvement with new and existing small businesses operating within the Business Incubator model. This was supported by the fact that the Innovation Centre in Hartlepool was the best performing Centre in UKSE's nationwide portfolio.

9.6 The Form was particularly interested to learn that UKSE operated easy in and out rental terms and were in the position of being able to offer financial support. His financial support supplemented the physical support provided through the Innovation Centre having meeting rooms, broadband internet connection and the use of a shared printing and gymnasium resource. Although it was recognised that UKSE did not operate the traditional incubator model, in that there was no maximum amount of time that a business could operate from the Innovation Centre. However, both Business Link and the Local Authority were instrumental in providing the interactive link that may enable a business to grow and move onto larger premises.

10 COMPARISON OF HARTLEPOOL'S BUSINESS ECONOMY TO NATIONAL AND LOCAL BUSINESS STATISTICS

10.1 In order to assess the impact of the Hartlepool Business Incubator System on the local economy and its comparison to North East and National figures, Members were provided detail statistical comparisons by the Economic Development Manager at their meeting of 4 March 2010.

10.2 Since the launch of the Business Incubation Strategy in 2002 Members were interested to examine the VAT/PAYE data, which demonstrated the strength of a local economy in creating and sustaining small businesses as highlighted in Table1 below:-

Table1: VAT/PAYE Births per 10,000 adult population (16 plus) 2002-2007

Area	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007 [#]
Hartlepool	25	29	31	36	39	48
Tees Valley	30	33	34	35	33	45
North East	33	36	37	37	34	43
Great Britain	52	56	59	57	52	62

[#] Changes to the recording of VAT/PAYE data lead to increases in this figure across all areas.

Source: BERR

10.3 Members were pleased to see that the data in Table1 indicated solid growth of businesses in Hartlepool and that the Town in recent years had out performed both Tees Valley and the North East. It was noted by Members that the 2007 figures were distorted slightly through the changes to the method of calculating VAT/PAYE; this had led to a positive impact on the figures. Members at their meeting of 4 March 2010 were advised that the 2008 figures had only recently been published and were currently being analysed, however, it was likely that these would reveal a fall in these figures as a result of the credit crunch and subsequent recession.

10.4 The Members of the Forum were particularly interested to see how sustainable newly born enterprises were in Hartlepool and Table2 below, demonstrated the ability of new enterprises to survive one or two years in operation:-

Table2: Percentage of newly born enterprises surviving 1 or 2 years

Area	2003		2004		2005		2006		2007	
	1 yr	2 yrs	1 yr	2 yrs	1 yr	2 yrs	1 yr	2 yrs	1 yr	2 yrs
Hartlepool	92.7	78.0	93.3	77.8	94.2	76.9	96.5	78.9	92.9	No figures available
Tees Valley	91.9	77.2	94.9	78.2	94.0	78.3	96.8	80.5	93.9	
North East	92.3	77.3	93.5	76.9	93.6	79.2	96.7	80.1	94.5	
Great Britain	92.6	78.0	94.2	78.7	94.3	79.8	96.5	80.7	95.5	

Source: National Statistics

Members noted that the survival rate of newly born enterprises in Hartlepool had followed a similar to trends to those demonstrated in the regional, sub-regional and national figures.

10.5 In assessing all the evidence for the impact of the Business Incubator System in Hartlepool, Members recognised it was the number of working aged self employed people (shown below in Table3) which demonstrated the greatest change. From a low starting figure in 2001/02 the percentage of self-employed people in Hartlepool had nearly doubled by June 2009, outperforming both the Tees Valley and the North East.

Table3: Trend in % population of Working Age Self-employed

Area	2001/2	2002/3	2003/4	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
Hartlepool	3.8	3.8	4.0	5.7	6.4	7.4	6.7	6.7	6.8
Tees Valley	4.7	4.9	4.6	5.4	6.0	5.8	5.5	5.7	5.7
North East	5.2	5.6	5.4	5.8	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.3
Great Britain	8.6	8.7	9.0	9.1	9.2	9.3	9.4	9.1	9.1

Source: National Statistics

11 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR BUSINESS INCUBATION IN HARTLEPOOL

11.1 The Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum were interested in finding out what the future challenges and plans were that the Business Incubation System faced in Hartlepool. Recognising that although statistical evidence in paragraphs 10.1 to 10.4 highlighted the positive impact that the Business Incubation System had made to Hartlepool's business economy, Members were keen to see that although the model for business incubation seemed right, it would need constant updating, particularly as a result of the recent poor economic climate.

11.2 When the Forum met on 18 February 2010, Members were presented by the Economic Development Manager of the future strategies that were planned for the Business Incubation System. The following details highlight some of the key developments / challenges:-

- (i) With the capacity of the Innovation Centre at 100% occupancy and with there being a waiting list of interested businesses, UKSE with the support of ONE's Single Programme funding are planning to deliver a 20,000 sq ft extension to the Innovation Centre from June 2010;
- (ii) Due to the scarcity of good quality 'move on' space for businesses that outgrow the Enterprise and Innovation Centres, Rivergreen Developments are planning to double the existing provision at Queens Meadow from 40,000 to 80,000 sq ft;
- (iii) The lack of sustainability of funding from sources such as the Working Neighbourhoods Fund and the Council's own budgetary pressures, means that business incubation will face funding as one of its more fundamental challenges in the future; and
- (iv) For sustained business incubation growth there is a challenge for the retention of graduates within Hartlepool by encouraging the entrepreneurial spirit of graduates or by the creation / attraction of businesses which meet graduate requirements.

12 CONCLUSIONS

12.1 The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum concluded:-

- (a) That Hartlepool's Business Incubation System has played a major role in the development of sustainable local businesses that can help make Hartlepool more globally competitive;
- (b) That businesses involved through the Business Incubation System in Hartlepool highly value the proactive approach of Hartlepool Borough Council's Economic Development Team in helping them start-up and / or grow through the incubation model;
- (c) That the support and active participation of Hartlepool Borough Council in the Business Incubator System in Hartlepool was and has been a major contribution factor for the Innovation Centre being one of UKSE's best performing Centres in its Portfolio;
- (d) That there was some logical notion that the Council should be involved at all stages of the Business Incubation System, but that a partnership approach involving organisations such as UKSE and Rivergreen was currently the most efficient method of delivery;
- (e) That due to both the Enterprise and Innovation Centres being at full capacity there was a:-
 - (i) demand for an increase in this provision, which maybe solved in the short term by the expansion at Queens Meadow led by UKSE; and
 - (ii) requirement to respond to the lack of move on accommodation for businesses who were likely to out grow the Enterprise and Innovation Centre, which maybe solved in the short term by an expansion to facilities available at the Rivergreen development at Queens Meadow.

13 RECOMMENDATIONS

13.1 The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum has taken evidence from a wide 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 due to long-term sustainability problems of NRF funding and the increasing pressure placed on the Council budget, that the Department seeks innovative ways of attracting sustainable income to support and develop the Business Incubation System in Hartlepool;

- (b) That where empty properties exist in the Town, investment is sought to convert them into areas appropriate for:-
 - (i) business incubation; and
 - (ii) move-on accommodation;
- (c) That local schools are encouraged to embrace incubator business opportunities through:-
 - (i) Invitation to businesses to link with local schools providing students with an insight into entrepreneurial activities; and
 - (ii) Investigating the role of local businesses representatives as e-mentors.
- (d) That a feasibility study be undertaken into promoting the support available through Hartlepool's Business Incubation System via exhibitions / stands in vacant shops.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee is grateful to all those who have presented evidence during the course of our investigation. We would like to place on record our appreciation, in particular of the willingness and co-operation we have received from the below named:-

Hartlepool Borough Council:

Stuart Green – Assistant Director, Planning and Economic Development

Antony Steinberg – Economic Development Manager

Mick Emerson – Principal Economic Development Officer (Business Services)

External Representatives:

Simon Hamilton – Regional Manager, UK Steel Enterprise

Alby Pattison – Managing Director, Hart Biologicals Limited

COUNCILLOR TREVOR ROGAN CHAIR OF THE REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

April 2010

Contact Officer: James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department – Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel:- 01429 523647
Email:- james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background papers were consulted or referred to in the preparation of this report:-

- (a) UK Business Incubation (2009) *What is Business Incubation?*, Available from: <http://www.ukbi.co.uk/index.asp?SID=222> [Accessed 20 October 2009]
- (b) Sanderson, D. (2009) *Business Incubation in Hartlepool: A Feasibility Study*, DTZ Piedad Consulting
- (c) Hartlepool Borough Council (2009) *Business Incubation System*
- (d) Hartlepool Partnership (2010) *Hartlepool Partnership – Priority Aims*, Available from: http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/partnership/site/scripts/documents_info.php?documentID=361&pageNumber=2 [Accessed 11 March 2010]
- (e) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's Business Incubation System – Scoping Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 5 November 2009.
- (f) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Hartlepool's Business Incubation System – Setting the Scene – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 18 February 2010.
- (g) Report of the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods entitled 'Draft Scrutiny Report – Business Incubation' delivered to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 18 February 2010.
- (h) Presentation by the Economic Development Manager entitled 'Business Incubation' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 18 February 2010.
- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Hartlepool's Business Incubation System – Business Evidence – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 4 March 2010.

- (j) Presentation by the Economic Development Manager entitled 'Scrutiny Enterprise Brief' delivered to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 4 March 2010.
- (k) Minutes of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 17 July 2009, 5 November 2009, 18 February 2010 and 4 March 2010