REGENERATION AND LIVEABILITY PORTFOLIO

DECISION RECORD

21st April 2006

Present:

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond)

Officers: Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Stuart Green, Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety and Prevention Joanne Smithson, Head of Community Strategy Dave Stubbs, Head of Environmental Management David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

59. Assisted Area Consultation (Director of Regeneration and Planning Services)

Type of decision

Non-Key

Purpose of report

To endorse the response to the Assisted Area Consultation for Hartlepool Borough Council

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) reported that the Assisted Area map defined areas where Regional State Aid could be awarded to large firms. Under the existing map, due to expire at the end of 2006, all wards in Hartlepool were designated as Assisted Areas. However under proposals for the new map the extent of Assisted Areas coverage in the UK would need to drop from 30.9% of the population to 23.9%.

As part of the consultation Local Authorities were being asked for their general opinion on the proposed Assisted Area criteria and the geographical units that should be used. Previously wards had been

assessed largely by reference to indicators of need but under the new map Tees Valley local authority officers and the Joint Strategy Unit felt that account should also be taken of wards with business investment opportunities. Under this approach all Hartlepool wards would warrant Assisted Area status. In order to meet the deadline the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services had responded to the consultation, making those points, after informal consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

Decision

The response to the Assisted Area consultation by the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services was endorsed as outlined.

60. Conservation Grant Scheme (Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Type of decision

Non-Key

Purpose of report

To consider the criteria that could be used for a recently approved conservation grant scheme of £50,000

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) reported that £50,000 had been approved within the Council's 2006-07 budget for a conservation grant scheme. The suggested criteria, including eligible properties and the maximum amount of grant per person, were outlined and details given of proposed publicity methods.

It was noted that the proposals reflected comments from the Conservation Areas Advisory Committee. Whilst wider consultation on the proposals was considered, the Portfolio Holder acknowledged that the proposals reflected past experience and were consistent with other property grant regimes; given the pent-up demand it was felt that the availability of the grants should be launched without further delay.

Decision

The terms of the new conservation grant scheme were approved and appropriate publicity across the Borough was authorised.

61. Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2006/07-2008/09 (Director of Regeneration and Planning)

Type of decision

Non-Key

Purpose of report

To agree the Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan for 2006/07 to 2008/09

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The draft plan, appended to the report, set out the department's aims and objectives for 2006/07-2008/09, including the main activities to be undertaken by the department and a detailed action plan for 2006/07. The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) indicated that some minor amendments to the document still needed to be made. The Portfolio Holder would be consulted further if any more significant changes were required.

Decision

The Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan for 2006/07-2008/09 was approved subject to any amendments required as a result of further changes made to the Council's Corporate Plan and further refinement to complete the document

62. Planning Delivery Grant (Director of Regeneration and Planning Services)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To seek approval for use of the remaining amount of 2005/06 Planning Delivery Grant and part of the recently announced 2006/07 allocation.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report set out specific proposals for allocating the remainder of the 2005/6 Planning Delivery Grant and part of the 2006/07 grant. The total uncommitted amount available for allocation was £193,000 and the six

proposals detailed would cost approximately £97,000. This would leave up to £96,000 remaining, to be allocated later in the year. The proposals recommended for approval now were as follows:

Open Space Audit -	£30,000
Local Housing Assessment	£29,000
Contribution to Tees Valley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	£20,000
Funding Contribution to Hartlepool Access Group	£10,000
Staff Training	£8,000
Headland Conservation Area Appraisal - possible additional amount, to be	
confirmed	

Decision

The proposals regarding the use of unallocated Planning Delivery Grant, as reported, be approved.

63. Proposed Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee (Director of Regeneration and Planning Services)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To provide information on investigations into a proposed Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

In January the Headland Residents Association had asked that a Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) be set up specifically for the Headland. Further information had been requested from the Residents Association and the Headland Parish Council specifically relating to who would potentially be involved in the CAAC, their proposed remit and how they would relate to the Borough wide CAAC. Their responses were attached as appendices to the report along with the suggestions of the Princess Residents Association.

Following this consultation, details of the proposed composition, representation and strategic remit of a Headland CAAC were detailed within the report.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) queried the need for Hartlepool Borough Council to have formal representation on the Committee as was the case in the town-wide CAAC. The Portfolio Holder was of the opinion that this should be the decision of the Headland CAAC.

Decision

The response to the request for further information was noted and officers were instructed to commence with the formation of the Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

64. 2006 Community Security Contract (Head of Community Safety and Prevention

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To seek approval for the service provision for the 2006 community security contract.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report contained background information and detailed proposals for future service provision levels to be included in the new community security contract. Proposals included the amendment to the service provision at a number of specific sites due to changes in the way security needed to be provided at these locations following the development of CCTV and reassessment of security needs. A detailed timetable for contract tenders was set out in the report.

Decision

The new service provision levels and the contract timetable were approved.

65. Consultation Paper by English Heritage, 'Conservation Principles' (Director of Regeneration and Planning Services)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To provide information on the consultation paper by English Heritage, 'Conservation Principles', and details of the response proposed.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report detailed the background to the English Heritage draft paper

'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance'. A brief explanation of the Principles was provided as an appendix to the report along with officer comments on each of them. It was proposed that the Council support the general position of the paper but that further detailed consideration was needed on some of the supporting explanations.

Decision

The paper and responses were noted

66. Community Strategy Review 2006 (Head of Community Strategy

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To outline the process by which the current Community Strategy will be reviewed and a revised strategy document produced by the end of March 2007.

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The report gave background information on the review of the current Community Strategy. Details of the proposed consultation were given and a timetable was appended to the report.

The Portfolio Holder suggested the involvement of Scrutiny at an earlier stage in the review process than suggested in the timetable. This could be through Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee or an ad hoc Scrutiny Forum set up specifically for this purpose. The Portfolio Holder also acknowledged the recent referral to Scrutiny of the Community and voluntary sector and highlighted the importance of cooperation between the two pieces of work.

Decision

The proposals for the Community Strategy review were noted

67. Review of England's Waste Strategy (Head of

Environmental Management)

Type of decision

Non-key.

Purpose of report

To inform the Portfolio Holder of the DEFRA consultation document on the Review of England's Waste Strategy

Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder

The Head of Environmental Management reported that the consultation document invited local authorities to comment on the various waste management services. Detailed information was given on the background to the review and the various proposals contained within the document.

Decision

The report and information were noted.

J A BROWN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

Publication Date: 27th April 2006