

COMMUNITY SAFETY AND HOUSING PORTFOLIO DECISION SCHEDULE



Tuesday, 7 September 2010

at 10.00 am

in Committee Room C, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond responsible for Community Safety and Housing will consider the following items.

1. KEY DECISIONS

No items

2. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 2.1 Locally Important Buildings – *Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)*
- 2.2 Heritage Regeneration Manager Project – *Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)*
- 2.3 Government Review of Anti-Social Behaviour – *Assistant Director (Community Safety and Protection)*
- 2.4 Safer Hartlepool Partnership Community Cohesion Fund Proposals – *Assistant Director (Community Safety and Protection)*

3. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

No Items

4. REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS

No items

COMMUNITY SAFETY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

REPORT TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER

7 September 2010



Report of: Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)

Subject: LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide information to the Portfolio Holder on the proposal to establish a list of locally important buildings.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report outlines the background to locally important buildings and the proposed criteria and selection process which will be used to establish a list. An outline is also provided of the proposed consultation method that will be used to enable the public to nominate buildings.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Conservation policy falls within the Portfolio.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non - key decision.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio holder only

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

That the Portfolio Holder agrees to the processes outlined in the report to establish a list of Locally Important Buildings in Hartlepool.

Report of: Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)

Subject: LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 Some local authorities have lists of locally important buildings. These are properties which are important to an area but do not merit inclusion on the statutory listed of listed buildings. This list, compiled by English Heritage, uses national criteria which usually do not take into account the local significance or impact of a building. This report outlines Hartlepool Borough Council's proposals for a list of locally important buildings.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Hartlepool has some 200 listed buildings. These are properties which have been designated by the Government as structures which are of 'special architectural or historic interest'. Nominations for potential listed buildings are considered by English Heritage who make a recommendation to the Government on the potential to list a property. The Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) considers this recommendation and will, if it deems appropriate, list the building.
- 2.2 English Heritage and DCMS have encouraged the development of Local Lists. While no formal guidance exists for the development and production of a Local List planning guidance does encourage the development of such lists. By 2004 approximately 44% of Local Authorities in England had produced a Local List and saw it as a way to identify and encourage protection of locally important heritage assets as well as raise the profile of local history and heritage and conserve local distinctiveness.
- 2.3 Locally important buildings are not of national significance however they may merit protection because, for example, they are the work of a local architect or have a link to a locally significant historical figure which, although not nationally noteworthy, nevertheless make a contribution to the local sense of place. These buildings are sometimes omitted from the list by the Secretary of State or English Heritage because the view is that there are better examples elsewhere within the Country. Some characteristics of buildings may, however, be rare within Hartlepool or may have important group value or may display important local distinctiveness which makes up the town's heritage.

- 2.3 The recently introduced Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment defines a heritage asset as 'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions.' These can include 'assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process (including local listing).'
- 2.4 Within the Local Plan the Authority has made a commitment, to prepare a non-statutory list identifying Buildings of Local Interest which would be desirable to preserve as a means of emphasising local character and a sense of place.
- 2.5 Identifying a building as being of local importance would not provide any additional statutory protection above and beyond the existing planning controls that currently cover the property. It would however, be a means of highlighting the significance of a building, to the Borough.
- 2.6 A policy in the Local Plan (HE12) indicates that the Council will seek to prevent the demolition of locally important buildings or the removal of their important features. Their removal or alteration would only be supported 'if it can be demonstrated that it would help preserve or enhance the character of the site and the setting of other buildings nearby.'

3. CRITERIA

- 3.1 A series of criteria have been compiled for assessing potential locally important buildings. The full list can be found in Appendix 1.
- 3.2 In essence the criteria is similar to those considered for national listing, the architectural merit of the property, the historic interest in the building and the survival of the original structure and features.
- 3.3 The buildings would be known as Locally Important Buildings and unlike those nationally listed there would be no grades distinguishing different levels of completeness or importance.
- 3.4 It is proposed that although referred to as buildings nominations would not be limited to what is thought of as a building and therefore could include other structures for example pill boxes or traditional telephone boxes, along with parks or landscapes.

4 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Alongside officers compiling a list of potential nominations it is proposed that the process is opened up to public consultation to allow

residents and local groups an opportunity to nominate buildings which they feel are significant.

- 4.2 A standard form would be developed and made available at Council offices and on the website. Alongside this would be a guidance note including the criteria for listing the property and asking, where possible, that people include a photograph of the property or location plan so there can be no doubt of the building which is nominated. In addition they would be asked to provide any research or information they have on the property which they feel demonstrates why the building is locally important.
- 4.3 Local groups and committees would be invited to submit any nominations that they have. It is suggested that these groups would include the Hartlepool Conservation Area Advisory Committee, Headland Conservation Area Advisory Group, Parish Councils and residents groups across the town.

5 SELECTION PROCESS

- 5.1 Once nominations are closed officers would compile a full list of the buildings including any relevant information which would assist in the selection process. This list would then be published with a further period of consultation to enable residents and groups to nominate any buildings they feel have been missed off the initial draft list.
- 5.2 All of the properties will be contacted directly to make owners and occupiers aware that their building has been nominated and inviting them to make any comments. Their comments will be presented alongside any material considered for selecting the buildings to be placed on a final list.
- 5.3 It is proposed that the selection of buildings would be carried out by an independent panel. The panel would comprise individuals with specialist knowledge in the field of conservation, architecture or history.
- 5.4 Once the panel have compiled the final list owners and occupiers will be notified that their properties are on this list and given an opportunity to comment.
- 5.5 The final list will be presented to Planning Committee for their comments prior to being brought to this Portfolio Holder for agreement.

6 RECOMENDATION

- 6.1 That the Portfolio Holder agrees to the processes outlined in the report to establish a list of Locally Important Buildings in Hartlepool.

7 CONTACT OFFICER

Sarah Scarr
Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager
Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department
Bryan Hanson House
Hanson Square
Hartlepool
TS24 7BT

Direct Line: (01429) 523275
Email: sarah.scarr@hartlepool.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1**Defining a locally important building**

The statutorily listed buildings can be all sorts of structures including telephone boxes, walls and gates as well as what we all recognise as buildings. In addition there is also a statutory process which recognises parks and gardens. It is proposed that when considering locally important buildings these definitions are combined and therefore the list will not be limited to buildings but will include other streetscape structures along with parks and landscapes.

Assessment Criteria

The proposed assessment criteria that will be used;

- **Design merit:** is it the work of a particular architect or designer of regional or local note? Does it have qualities of age, style or distinctive characteristics relative to the area? Does it have landmark quality? Is it characterful and time-honoured or locally-valued
- **Historic interest:** does it relate to an important aspect of local, social, economic, cultural, religious or political history; does it have an historic association with an important local feature?
- **Historic association:** does it have close associations with famous local people (must be well documented); does it relate closely to any statutorily protected structure or site?
- **Survival:** does it survive in a substantial and recognisable form; are historic features and layout still present; does it represent a significant element in the development of the area?
- **Layout:** is it part of a planned layout that has remained substantially intact e.g. a terrace or a square?
- **General:** does it provide an important visual amenity?

Proposed selection of locally important buildings:

It is proposed that when a conservation area appraisal is carried out an assessment of properties for potential locally listed buildings is included.

Amenity societies and Parish Councils within the town will be approached and asked to nominate potential buildings.

In addition a standard form will be produced that will allow individuals to nominate properties.

Selection of properties for a local list

The selection of properties for a local list would be carried out by an independent panel of local experts specifically formed to consider locally important buildings.

COMMUNITY SAFETY AND HOUSING REPORT TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER

7 September 2010



Report of: Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)

Subject: HERITAGE REGENERATION MANAGER PROJECT

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform and seek support of the Portfolio Holder in principle to an initiative to source funding of up to £500,000 for vacant heritage buildings (both listed and unlisted). Part of the report will seek consent to give support to the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust (CBPT) by way of political representation on the Board of Management of the Trust and to use Compulsory Purchase powers available to the Council to purchase properties as part of “back to back deals” with CBPT or Groundwork.

The project has still to be developed further particularly the relationship between CBPT and Groundwork, but is brought to the Portfolio Holder for information and to allow the Portfolio Holder to indicate commitment to future actions to support the project.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The project is a joint partnership between the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust (CPBT), Groundwork (North East), the Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF), English Heritage (the latter two as sources of funding) and the other local authorities within the Tees Valley consisting of Stockton, Redcar and Cleveland, Middlesbrough and Darlington besides Hartlepool. The project will consist of the employment of a Heritage Regeneration Manager by Groundwork. The role of the Manager will be to investigate viable new uses for unused heritage buildings and then to source funding by way of a loans of up to £500,000 per building from the Architectural Heritage Fund via either the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust or Groundwork.

The role of the partnering local authorities in the Tees Valley which includes Hartlepool will be to use those legal powers available to them to compulsorily acquire properties and undertake “back to back “deals with willing development partners. They will also provide direction to the project by way of political representatives on the Board of Management of the CBPT (which its constitution allows) and to become involved in the CBPT’s activities generally. Partnering authorities may also provide financial support to feasibility studies and works **if** the costs of either feasibility studies or works exceed the maximum grant or loans available from the AHF. Each project will be considered on its individual merits on the basis of a completed feasibility study identifying a viable use, costs and end value.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The report concerns information on a funding initiative for heritage buildings with possible budget implications for the Council.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key decision

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio holder for Community Safety and Housing.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

That the Portfolio Holders indicates support in principle for the project and awaits a further report as the project development is finalised.

That on finalisation of the project the Council will give a commitment in principle to use of appropriate Compulsory Purchase powers to acquire heritage buildings as part of “back to back “deals with CBPT or Groundwork.

That the Portfolio Holder agrees that a Member representative is nominated to become a member of the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust Board of Management.

Report of: Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)

Subject: HERITAGE REGENERATION MANAGER PROJECT.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform and seek support of the Portfolio Holder of an initiative to source funding of up to £500,000 per building for vacant heritage buildings (both listed and unlisted). Part of the report will seek consent to give support to the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust (CBPT) by way of political representation on the Board of Management of the Trust and to use Compulsory Purchase powers available to the Council to purchase properties as part of “back to back” deals with CBPT or Groundwork.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The project is a joint partnership between the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust (CBPT), Groundwork (North East), the Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF), English Heritage (both as sources of funding) and the other local authorities within the Tees Valley consisting of Stockton, Redcar and Cleveland, Middlesbrough and Darlington as well as Hartlepool. The project will consist of the employment of a Heritage Regeneration Manager by Groundwork. The role of the Manager will be to investigate viable new uses for unused heritage buildings and then to source funding by way of a loan of up to £500, 000 from the Architectural Heritage Fund via either the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust or Groundwork. Initially the post may be on a part time basis to reduce employment cost risks.

3. ROLES OF PROJECT PARTNERING ORGANISATIONS

- 3.1 **Cleveland Building Preservation Trust (CBPT)** – The Cleveland Building Preservation Trust was established in 1982 with the objective of preserving of architectural, historic or constructional interest within the Tees Valley. Membership is open to any local authority in the Tees Valley. The aim of CBPT at set up was to help local authorities’ access funding for unused historic buildings from the AHF. Besides local authorities, membership of the CBPT consists largely of various voluntary groups such as civic societies, but with conservation officers from the Tees Valley authorities closely involved. CBPT operates by identifying unused historic buildings for restoration and obtaining grants for feasibility studies from the Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF) to establish a range of viable uses, likely building costs of repair and the likely end value of the building if sold. CBPT is not in the position to consider a loss on a restoration project but must cover all of its project costs. To date CBPT has sold the buildings it has restored rather than

retain them. Building restoration costs are funded by way of a loan from the AHF.

- 3.2 The difficulty found by the CBPT since it was formed has been its inability, due to its size and the voluntary nature of the Trust, to take on full time staff to dedicate to developing heritage building projects. Local authority conservation officers have indicated that they do not have sufficient time to devote to working up potentially difficult heritage projects that the Trust could possibly then take on. Another issue is that since the abolition of Cleveland County Council and the establishment of replacement unitary authorities political representation on the Trust has declined.
- 3.3 **Architectural Heritage Fund** – The Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF) was established in 1976 as a registered charity to promote the conservation of historic buildings by providing advice, information and finance in the form of grants and loans for projects undertaken by BPT's and other charities. At the end of 2009, 167 BPT's were registered with the AHF (including CBPT) allowing the BPT's to access its funding and advice. The AHF obtains its income from private endowments, accumulated surpluses, interest on loans and interest from bank deposits, with grants via English Heritage, Historic Scotland and other government agencies. At the end of 2009 the AHF had £7.8m out on loan to BPT's from a total resource of £12.5m.
- 3.4 The AHF is concerned that the Tees region is not active in taking advantage of the funding available from the AHF and is something of a "black hole " in terms of activity compared to other areas. The AHF is therefore interested in seeing increased heritage restoration activity in the Tees area and is specifically interested in the partnering project between Groundwork and CBPT as a way of achieving this and providing a model for BPT's elsewhere.
- 3.5 The following grants and loans are available from the AHF. The Project Development Grant is only available to BPT's with the other loans and grants being available to any registered charity with an environmental remit which would include the CBPT and organisations like Groundwork.
 - Options Appraisal Grant – A grant of up to 75% of the cost of an initial options appraisal (or feasibility study) of a project likely to qualify for an AHF loan. The maximum grant is normally £7,500 but in exceptional circumstances this can be raised to £12,000.
 - Low-interest loans - The loan is intended to help trusts purchase the property and finance the cost of capital works. The loans are subject to ceiling of £500,000 per building with interest charged at 6% simple, payable at the end of two years or when the building is sold whichever comes first. Security is required for every loan to

protect AHF's resources usually from a local authority or as a first charge on the property.

- **Project Development Grant** – This grant is only available to BPT's and only after a viable project had been identified. It is intended to help BPT's with the costs of developing projects to the point where works start on site. Eligible costs include reasonable administration costs, costs of a suitably qualified project organiser, with the grant not normally exceeding 75% of the organiser's total cost up to a maximum of £15,000. This element can fund the residual post costs after grant from English Heritage and any other income.

- 3.6 **Groundwork (North East)** – Groundwork as a Trust was established in response to the environmental, social and economic problems arising from the recession of the early 1980's. The first Groundwork Trust was established at St Helens and on the basis of the success the same model was applied through out the country. Groundwork was established in the region in 1986 in the East Durham coalfield area and has since expanded to cover areas to south of the Tees, Tyneside and west Durham. A close working relationship has already been established with the Tees Valley local authorities and Groundwork with four of the five local authorities already Groundwork company members. Stockton Council is considering becoming a member.
- 3.7 The benefits that Groundwork can bring to the Heritage Regeneration Manager project and the partnership with the CBPT is the range of projects that Groundwork is involved in, from environmental improvement projects to employment, health and training. Groundwork has undertaken heritage building projects previously with the restoration of its own offices in Easington and Bishop Auckland. Groundwork has existing relationships with the local authorities in the area with partnering agreements to deliver specific projects. Groundwork locally employs some 160 staff and therefore has the ability to host a post specifically aimed at heritage buildings.
- 3.8 A partnership between Groundwork and CBPT can solve the problem that the CBPT has had in employing staff dedicated to heritage building projects and combine this with CPBT's access to funding from the AHF. Groundwork can add other aspects to potential heritage building projects in the form of environmental improvements (treating the setting of a building not just the building itself) and access to employment and training initiatives for potential end users of the building.
- 3.9 **English Heritage** – English Heritage is a national body which advises central government on conservation and heritage issues and has a regional office based in Newcastle. Besides giving advice and information the regional office has a grant budget to directly assist with building restoration but also to build the capacity and capability of organisation in the region to deal with heritage building issues. English

Heritage is aware of the comparatively high proportion of heritage buildings at risk in the region. English Heritage is willing to offer grant from its Capacity Building grant to support the Heritage Regeneration Manager post based at Groundwork with a grant of 75% of the post costs in the first year, 50% in the second year and 25% in year three. On the post costs so far determined Groundwork estimate that the likely grant support from English Heritage could be in the region of £50-£60,000 over the 3 years of the project. After 3 years English Heritage would expect the post to be self supporting generating income from project fees. If project is successful English Heritage can build regional capacity to solve heritage issues and remove some of the Building at Risk from the register.

- 3.10 **Partnering Local Authorities** – Partnering local authorities would include Hartlepool, Stockton, Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland and Darlington. Besides any funding that the authorities can provide (which is likely to be very limited) the authorities have powers available to them to deal with unused and neglected listed building or unlisted buildings in conservation areas. Part of the difficulty with unused listed buildings is that private owners have unrealistic expectations of the value of their neglected buildings, but with often no firm plans to reuse them. These unrealistic values make it impossible for organisations like CBPT or any other to acquire a building at a realistic cost to allow development to occur. Powers are available to local authorities to compulsorily purchase heritage buildings and undertake “back to back” deals with BPT’s and remove any potential liabilities to the authority from acquiring the building.
- 3.11 Partnering local authorities have a role to play in breaking the log jam between unwilling owners and a willing developer. The advantages to local authorities are that they can access potential funding of up to £500,000 per building to find new uses. This would be via the CBPT or Groundwork with local authorities not directly forming part of the loan arrangement. Financial restrictions on local authorities in the foreseeable future are not likely to provide any other sources of funding. Frequently heritage buildings are substantial, located in settled communities with their derelict condition often blights the local economy and sense of well being. Local authority financial commitment could extend to providing security for any loan provided by the AHF to CBPT or Groundwork and a shared contribution to residual employment costs or their underwriting if grants do not cover the full employment costs.

4. **PROJECT BENEFITS AND IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 The project benefits to the Council can be identified as follows :

- Indirect access to funding to undertake feasibility studies on problematic heritage buildings of at least £7,500 per property and £12,000 in some cases. The Council may have to contribute to the

cost of feasibility studies if they exceed these amounts but each can be considered on a case by case basis.

- Indirect access to funding for building works of up to £500,000 per building. The authority may have to contribute to building costs (by maximum loan, but again considered on a case by case basis on information provided by a feasibility study. Identifying an end user will reduce the risk of the building not being sold on completion.
- Grant support from English Heritage of between £50–£60,000

- 4.2 Any applications for grant and loans will be by CBPT or Groundwork to the AHF. The authorities' commitment could be to possibly guarantee loans provided by the AHF to CBPT or Groundwork. The Council could also possibly have to part fund or underwrite, with the other partnering authorities, residual employment costs of the Heritage Regeneration Manager post based at Groundwork, after possible grant from English Heritage or the AHF. The post may be on a part time basis initially to reduce the level of employment cost risk.
- 4.3 As part of the project, partnering local authorities would provide a commitment to the project to use appropriate legal powers available to them to compulsorily acquire problematic heritage buildings as part of "back to back" deals with Groundwork or CBPT.
- 4.4 As part of the project the partnering authorities would increase their involvement with the CBPT by providing a political representative to sit on the Board of Management of the Trust.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK

- 5.1 There may be budgetary implications for the Council in the project. This could be in two ways. The first could be contributions to the cost of feasibility studies **if** these exceed the maximum grant available from the Architectural Heritage Fund (at 75% of the cost of a feasibility study up to a maximum of £7,500 with £12,000 available in exceptional circumstances) or loans to the cost of works **if** these exceed the maximum £500,000 per building available from the Architectural Heritage Fund. A feasibility study for each building would establish a viable use with an estimate of building costs and end value. On completion of the works the building would be sold on the open market. This risk could be reduced if an end user was identified during the process of examining the building. The Cleveland Building Preservation Trust cannot proceed with a restoration project if a potential loss is identified by the feasibility study. Each project would be considered on a case by case basis. The second form of budgetary implication could be a contribution to residual employment costs **if** the grant available to support the Heritage Regeneration Manager from English Heritage and the Architectural Heritage Fund do not cover the full costs of employment. Groundwork must recover all employment costs. In this

case funding could be divided between the five partnering local authorities either by the allocation of resources to the post or the underwriting of residual post costs if grants were not obtained. The English Heritage grant funding is available for 3 years starting at 75% of post costs and reducing to 25% at a possible level of £50-£60,000. The grant for staff costs from the AHF is only available when a viable project has been identified and only available to the CBPT. The intention is that the project and post becomes self sustaining.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Further development work is required for the project in particular to agree the working relationship between CPBT and Groundwork. The costs of employment also need to be more fully investigated and the role of grants from the AHF and English Heritage. The report is made to seek support in principle to the project at this stage of its development. English Heritage has asked that the profile of the project be raised within the potential partnering authorities, with this report being part of that process. The same needs to occur with the other partnering authorities. English Heritage have also asked that a business plan for the project be produced to identify the levels of demand i.e. the number of problematic heritage buildings. When the project is finalised a further report will be made.
- 6.2 An equally viable approach would be for the Council to propose projects to the CBPT directly to source grants and loans using its own staff to develop projects.

7. RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 That the Portfolio Holders indicates support in principle for the project to date and awaits a further report as the project development is finalised.
- 7.2 That on finalisation of the project the Council will in principle give a commitment to use appropriate Compulsory Purchase powers to acquire heritage buildings as part of “back to back” deals with CBPT or Groundwork.
- 7.3 That the Portfolio Holders agrees that a Member representative become a member on the Cleveland Building Preservation Trust Board of Management.

8. CONTACT OFFICER

Peter Graves
Town Heritage Initiative Manager
Landscape, Planning and Conservation
Bryan Hanson House
Hanson Square

COMMUNITY SAFETY AND HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report to Portfolio Holder
7 September 2010



Report of: Assistant Director (Community Safety and Protection)

Subject: Government Review of Anti-social Behaviour

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the portfolio holder on recent developments nationally in the field of anti-social behaviour

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report gives an overview of the speech made on 28th July 2010 by the Home secretary and outlines potential implications for dealing with anti-social behaviour in Hartlepool.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Community Safety Issue

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Community Safety & Housing Portfolio 7th September 2010

6. DECISION REQUIRED

- 6.1 The Portfolio Holder is also recommended to confirm that Hartlepool Borough Council remains committed to dealing with Anti-social behaviour using the full range of tools at our disposal.
- 6.2 The Portfolio Holder is recommended to agree that the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit publicise local evidence to demonstrate that Anti-Social Behaviour orders are believed to be effective.
- 6.3 The Portfolio Holder is asked to note:
 - (i) that all anti-social Behaviour Orders current in Hartlepool remain in force
 - (ii) that Hartlepool Borough Council, in consultation with Cleveland Police, will continue to use this legislation so long as it remains on the statute book.

Report of: Assistant Director, Community Safety and Protection

Subject: Government Review of Anti-social Behaviour

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the portfolio holder on recent developments nationally in the field of anti-social behaviour

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The new Coalition Government announced relatively early in its period of office that there would be a review of legislation in respect of anti-social behaviour; that there would be a new definition and a new means of measuring it.
- 2.2 The Home Secretary subsequently made a speech on 28th July 2010 indicating that Anti-social Behaviour Orders, or ASBOs were to be ended. This has led to some confusion expressed by residents, as to whether current ASBOs were to remain in place.
- 2.3 The primary legislation, namely the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, under which ASBOs are granted remains in force, and Hartlepool Anti-social Behaviour Unit will continue to use the powers granted in this and subsequent Acts so long as they remain in force.
- 2.4 Whilst there is much that remains unclear, there are several themes coming through strongly, chief of which is that tackling anti-social behaviour is a high priority for the Coalition.
- 2.5 Within the Home Office there is working party, which includes senior practitioners, reviewing the raft of powers used to deal with anti-social behaviour. There is a widespread view that the legal landscape has grown too crowded and some powers are under used or have been superseded by later legislation, so the review of powers will clarify and simplify the range of tools available. Indications are that the ASBO will be replaced by a tool which retains the prohibitions element of the ASBO but also includes positive actions which the recipient must adhere to. This links with the concept of dealing not only with the anti-social behaviour but its root causes. The twin-track approach of linking support with enforcement, as epitomised by the Family Intervention Projects is to remain a key element of dealing

with anti-social behaviour. There is to be a continued emphasis on the needs of victims.

- 2.6 The definition of anti-social behaviour is to be changed as the existing definition of “causing harassment, alarm or distress” is considered too subjective. Whilst there has been no announcement on the new definition, which is expected to be included in the review of legislation, the Home Office website currently states “anti-social behaviour is any aggressive, intimidating or destructive activity that damages or destroys another person's quality of life.”
- 2.7 The role of the Home Office is to change to one of facilitation, primarily by collecting and disseminating best practice. In particular, continued roll-out of the national single non-emergency number (101), effective case work and ICT projects which enable easy and efficient data-sharing between agencies are to be encouraged.
- 2.8 The Place Survey, which used to be carried out biennially, and which would have taken place in September of this year, has been put on hold and is unlikely to take place. This links to the Home Secretary's view that it is the reduction in actual anti-social behaviour rather than the perception of it which takes precedence.
- 2.9 The Labour Government had set out a list of minimum standards which Community Safety Partnership were expected to adhere to in dealing with anti-social behaviour. The coalition is ending top -down targets, but, in the spirit of efficiency, transparency, and local accountability, which it sees as the hall marks of the Big Society, Community Safety Partnerships are encouraged to agree service standards with their local communities. There is an intention to link this to the Big Society agenda through encouraging residents and community leaders to take responsibility for tackling anti-social behaviour where it is safe to do so, and for training to be offered to facilitate this.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The Portfolio Holder is also recommended to confirm that Hartlepool Borough Council remains committed to dealing with Anti-social behaviour using the full range of tools at our disposal.
- 3.2 The Portfolio Holder is recommended to agree that the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit publicise local evidence to demonstrate that Anti-Social Behaviour orders are believed to be effective.
- 3.3 The Portfolio Holder is asked to note:

- (i) that all anti-social Behaviour Orders current in Hartlepool remain in force

- (ii) that Hartlepool Borough Council, in consultation with Cleveland Police, will continue to use this legislation so long as it remains on the statute book.

CONTACT OFFICER

Sally Forth, Social Behaviour & Housing Manager

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Speech of the Home Secretary, Teresa May, 28th July 2010
[://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/media-centre/speeches/beyond-the-asbo](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/media-centre/speeches/beyond-the-asbo)

COMMUNITY SAFETY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder

7 September 2010



Report of: Assistant Director (Community Safety & Protection)

Subject: SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP
COMMUNITY COHESION FUND PROPOSALS

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider the recommendations of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership (SHP) Community Cohesion Grants Panel in respect of applications for community cohesion funding.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Proposed awards for community cohesion grants are as follows:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
St. Joseph's Church	£ 500
Hartlepool Special Needs Support Group	£2100
Total	<u>£2,600</u>

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Portfolio holder has responsibility for community safety, which includes community cohesion grants.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Community Safety & Housing Portfolio on 7th September 2010.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is recommended to agree the recommendation of the SHP Community Cohesion Grants Panel in respect of the application for funding to support community cohesion related projects totalling: £2,600.

Report of: Assistant Director (Community Safety & Protection)

Subject: SAFER HARTLEPOOL PARTNERSHIP
COMMUNITY COHESION FUND PROPOSALS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider the recommendations of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership (SHP) Community Cohesion Grants Panel in respect of applications for community cohesion funding.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Community cohesion, as defined by the Department for Communities and Local Government is: "What must happen in all communities to enable different groups of people to get on well together. A key contributor to community cohesion is integration, which is what must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another."
- 2.2 One of the annual priorities for the Safer Hartlepool Partnership under its strategic assessment process is that of public reassurance and community engagement. The lead for delivery of activity under this priority rests with the SHP Reassurance & Community Engagement themed group. This group has the remit to oversee initiatives, which fulfils the criteria for community cohesion funding, a key element of which is positive engagement and integration within communities across Hartlepool. A Community Cohesion grants panel has been formed, which comprises of members from that themed group, with fund administration undertaken by Hartlepool Voluntary Development Agency.
- 2.3 The SHP allocated £15,000 from 2008/09 and £15,000 from 2009/10 to be spent on projects which contributed to community cohesion. In 2010/11 £15,000 has also been allocated. The maximum grant for organisations in one year has been agreed to be £5,000.
- 2.4 The Safer Hartlepool Partnership Community Cohesion Grants Panel has met, considered applications submitted and recommended the applications outlined at Paragraph 3 for approval.

3. PROPOSALS

3.1 St Joseph's Church

The group wishes to hold a Summer Festival in September.

St Joseph's is a Catholic church in Central Hartlepool and has a strong mission of working with 13 different nationalities and disadvantaged sections of the community. They host a breakfast club every Monday for asylum seekers and homeless people.

Funding is sought to hold a Summer festival in September to bring together BME and the wider community to promote physical exercise and eating. Two similar events were held in 2009. It is anticipated that this event will target more members of the community than previous events and they are aiming for 150 people to attend (compared to 85 last year). The Filipino and Polish communities will be encouraged to attend and it is felt that using this venue will facilitate this. Publicity to the wider community will be via Community Network, St Joseph's congregation and building on contacts made by Ohanaeze.

Total cost of project	£1860
Grant Panel recommendation	£500

3.2 Hartlepool Special Needs Support Group

The group requires funding for a volunteer to undertake a BSL Level 3 Language Skills course

The group exist to alleviate the needs and advance the education of children/young people with various profound physical/learning disabilities with varying complex needs, including life limiting conditions and to support their families/carers and raise public awareness about disability. The group is involved with 100 families and two thirds of these have communication needs and would use elements of sign language. Service users and helpers would be taught signs which would be used in children's groups and also the drama group.

Funding is sought for a volunteer to undertake a British Sign Language Level 3 skills course. The volunteer has previously attended and passed all relevant qualifications to achieve acceptance of a place on this course. In the longer term the group would like to provide sign language awareness/training to a wider audience and create employment opportunities.

Total cost of project	£2100
Grant Panel recommendation	£2100

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Community Cohesion grant budget totals £15000 in 2010/2011. The Portfolio Holder has previously approved applications for £5085. Applications within this report amount to a total of £2600. If applications are approved this would leave £7315 to allocate

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 The Portfolio Holder is asked to agree the SHP Community Cohesion Grants Panel recommendation in respect of applications for funding for community cohesion related projects totalling £2,600.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Brian Neale
Crime & Disorder Co-ordinator
Tel: 01429 405584.
E.mail : brian.neale@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Individual grant applications.