REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

DECISION RECORD

17th September 2010

The meeting commenced at 3.30pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor	Pamela Hargreaves (Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and
	Economic Development)

Officers: Damien Wilson, Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning) Antony Steinberg, Economic Development Manager Jeff Mason, Head of Support Services Patrick Wilson, Employment Development Officer Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

20. Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2009/10 – Year End Indicator Performance (Assistant

Director (Regeneration and Planning)

Type of decision

Non-key

Purpose of report

To inform the Portfolio Holder of the progress made against Performance Indicators identified in the Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2009/10 for the year to the end of March 2010.

Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder

A detailed report was provided on the progress against the Performance Indicators contained in the Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Plan 2009/10 for the year to the end of March 2010. A report had previously been submitted to the Portfolio Holder giving details of the progress of the actions identified in the Departmental Plan. Of the 10 Performance Indicators for which the Portfolio Holder has responsibility 7 had been achieved while 3 had not. These related to unemployment rates, business start ups and the number of sites developed or improved. Further details were provided within the report. Also highlighted were key areas of achievement which included the creation of 300 jobs, training initiatives and above target processing of planning applications

The Portfolio Holder queried when she would receive the first quarter outturns report. The Head of Support Services advised that a corporate decision had been taken not to report the first quarter figures to any of the Portfolio Holders. The first Departmental Plan 2010/11 report would come at the halfway point. Should the Portfolio Holder require these details a report could be compiled or the information sent to her outside of the meeting. The Portfolio Holder expressed her disappointment that this decision had been made without consultation with herself. She asked that the person who had made the decision provide a report giving the rationale behind the decision. She would then consider whether or not she wished to see the quarter one figures.

Decision

That the progress of key performance indicators be noted

21. Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF) – Quarter 4 (2009/10) and Quarter 1 (2010/11) Update (Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)

Type of decision

Non key

Purpose of report

To update the Portfolio Holder on the position of the Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF) programme at the end of the 4th quarter of 2009/10 and 1st quarter of 2010/11 financial year.

Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder

In February 2009 Council approved the 2009/10 budget and 2010/11 indicative budget for the WNF programme. At that time there was $\pounds 5,167,838$ available to deliver the programme in 2009/10 with an indicative allocation of $\pounds 5,387,049$ for 2010/11.

In total £5,343,168 was available to spend in 2009/10, including a carry-over of £175,330. Details of the final budgets were appended to the report taking account of over and underspends from 2008/09. Also appended was information on the final budgets for 2010/11 taking account of over and underspends from 2009/10

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that the report appeared to be outdated. The Employment Development Officer acknowledged this saying that he had written the report some time ago but there had been a delay in receipt of the Quarter 4 figures from finance. The Portfolio Holder further highlighted the reduction of Working Neighbourhood Fund schemes by 10%, querying why her involvement along every stage of that process was not mentioned

In terms of the substantial variances from 2008/09 the Portfolio Holder queried whether any overspends had been automatically reallocated to 2009/10. The Economic Development Manager confirmed this. The Portfolio Holder noted that overspends tended to come from statutory sector budgets while voluntary sector budgets were under spent. The Economic Development Manager felt this was due to the voluntary sector being paid in quarterly amounts. Internal organisations were expected to be able to manage their own budgets effectively. There were also a number of controls in place such as regular inspections. It was hoped that there would be no underspends by March 2010 given pending Government cuts.

The Portfolio Holder queried what work was being done with organisations on the forthcoming 10% cuts. The Economic Development Manager advised that officers were attending meetings in September, attempting to bring similar providers together to talk about efficiency savings. They were also being advised on other funding opportunities and improved partnership working. The Portfolio Holder supported this approach saying that officers should be looking to rationalise management structures. In terms of the actual cuts as no details had yet been issued by the coalition government officers felt there was no point engaging in detailed discussions at the present time. The Portfolio Holder acknowledged this commenting that the time for such discussions would be following the release of the Comprehensive Spending Review in October. Where programmes had been confirmed consideration was being given to how these could be managed.

The Employment Development Officer also advised that the Council's expression of interest for the reduction for young People not in employment, education or training had recently been submitted. The results were expected by 4th October, a report would be brought to the next Portfolio meeting.

Decision

That the spend position of the WNF programme at the end of quarter 4 (2009/10) and the end of quarter 1 (2010/11) be noted

The meeting concluded at 3:45 pm

P J DEVLIN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 22nd September 2010