

# **CULTURE, HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION PORTFOLIO**

## **DECISION RECORD**

3<sup>rd</sup> May 2006

### **Present:**

Councillor Robbie Payne (Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder)

Officers: John Mennear, Assistant Director (Community Services)  
Alastair Smith, Head of Technical Services  
Mike Blair, Acting Transportation and Traffic Manager  
Pat Watson, Democratic Services Officer

### **97. Multi-Use Games Area Strategy** *(Director of Adult and Community Services and Director of Children's Services)*

#### **Type of decision**

Key Decision (Test ii)

#### **Purpose of report**

For the Portfolio Holder to consider the outcome and findings of the Multi-Use Games Area Strategy developed for Hartlepool.

#### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report to the Portfolio Holder provided detailed background information and history in relation to the new Playing Pitch Strategy formally adopted on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2004 and the work undertaken in relation to the provision of Multi-Use Games Areas (MUGAs) in the Borough. Sport England had targeted Hartlepool for a grant to undertake the work and a grant of £4,500 was made to meet all the consultancy costs. In return for the grant aid, Sport England had asked to work closely with the consultants and some conditions had been imposed. An appendix to the report detailed the research and consultation process adopted to undertake the Strategy.

The MUGA Strategy had been prepared by a consultant and had involved extensive consultation with local sports clubs, schools and national

governing bodies. A full copy of the MUGA Strategy had been placed within the Members Library.

The key issues were described in detail in the report and a hierarchy of provision of MUGA's was provided as Appendix 2 to the report. A range of measures were proposed, some of which were subject to resources and would require success with grant applications or additional resources to achieve.

### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder approved the proposed strategy but asked that in appendix 2 the table relating to priority rankings be separated into two; one relating to Wards where Neighbourhood Renewal Funding or other funding is available and one indicating the remainder which could possibly be the Council priority for funding.

## **98. Highway Maintenance Programme 2006-2007** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Key Decision (Tests i and ii)

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the highway maintenance programme for 2006-2007.

### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report gave detailed background information, indicated a number of issues that had been considered and listed in Appendix 1 the proposals for schemes to be included in this year's programme, based on condition survey results. One of the issues brought to the Portfolio Holder's attention was a recent report from the Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance (ALARM) Survey 2006 which had highlighted a shortfall of £1.6bn in local authority road structural maintenance budgets across the country. The report also indicated that, given the current budget allocations, and presuming that these would not increase significantly over the coming years, it would not be possible to achieve the Government targets by 2011. It was important, therefore, that maximum benefit is achieved from available budgets to maintain the highway network in as safe a condition as possible. This would be achieved by the implementation of a Highway Asset Management Plan that was being developed in conjunction with the other Tees Valley Authorities.

The report advised that the highway maintenance budget for 2006-2007 was made up of the following elements:

- LTP structural maintenance £880,000
- Programmed maintenance revenue £690,000  
(approximately)

Of the above £330,000 is annually allocated for general works as follows:

Neighbourhood Services North Forum	£10,000
Neighbourhood Services South Forum	£10,000
Neighbourhood Services Central Forum	£10,000
Paving Various	£50,000
Patching Various	£80,000
Drainage Works	£10,000
Tree Maintenance	£15,000
Grass Verge Maintenance	£45,000*
Bridge Maintenance	£100,000

\*Note: this includes £15,000 to each Forum for the replacement of grass verges with tarmac in areas identified through consultation

### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder approved the highway maintenance programme for 2006-2007.

## **99. Tees Valley Sport Partnership** *(Director of Adult and Community Services and Director of Children's Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To update the Portfolio Holder on changes to the Tees Valley Sport Partnership.

To seek approval to a revised Memorandum of Understanding for Tees Valley Sport, including a broadening of its terms of reference and a change in its organisational structure.

### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The Portfolio Holder was advised that Teesside Sport had originally been established in 1999 as a partnership comprising four Teesside Local Authorities, Sport England, SportsCoach UK, Teesside University and Sports Governing Bodies to co-ordinate sports development in the Tees Valley.

In 2003, in preparation for Darlington Borough Council also joining the

Partnership, the Memorandum of Understanding had been revised, the group's terms of reference widened and a Strategy Group developed to guide future direction and priorities. The Partnership had also been renamed Tees Valley Sport.

With the Government's new agenda for the delivery of sport and physical activity and the requirement for a Single System for Sport to be co-ordinated on a sub-regional basis via County Sports Partnerships, the existing Memorandum of Understanding had again been in need of revision. Details of the new Memorandum were provided, which prepared the Partnership for the challenges that lie ahead with the need for the co-ordinated delivery of sport and physical activity in the Tees Valley. A copy of the draft Memorandum was attached at Appendix 1.

### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder:

- (a) approved the principle of a revised Memorandum of Understanding for Tees Valley Sport;
- (b) authorised the Director of Adult and Community Services and the Director of Children's Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to negotiate any alterations that are required arising from responses by other Tees Valley Sport Partners;
- (c) requested the Memorandum of Understanding, para 9.8, be amended to read "A partnership meeting is quorate when 7 members are present which shall include representation from each local authority".

## **100. Adult and Community Services Departmental Plan 2006/7-2008/9** *(Director of Adult and Community Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To submit the Departmental Plan for Adult and Community Services Department for Portfolio Holder consideration.

### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report outlined the Adult and Community Services Departmental Plan, detailing the vision for the department, key objectives and performance indicators. In the overview of the Plan the Director indicated that the following service plans were being developed under the strategic umbrella of the overall Departmental Plan:

- Older People
- Disabilities
- Mental Health
- Support Services
- Adult Education
- Libraries
- Sports and Recreation
- Culture Heritage and Grants
- Parks and Countryside

The report also outlined the Strategic Direction for Adult Services and the monitoring and reviewing arrangements. Quarterly reports would be presented to the Portfolio Holder to update on progress and highlight any key areas of achievement and/or concern.

### **Decision**

Portfolio Holder endorsed the proposed Departmental Plan.

## **101. Pilot Self-Management Project of Woodcroft Allotments** *(Director of Adult and Community Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To provide the Portfolio Holder with the outcome of the self management trial of the Woodcroft allotments site. To request that the self-management of this site now be considered as fully established.

### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report contained a brief overview of the site prior to the trial and a summary of the improvements made by the self-management group. A copy of the Woodcroft Allotments Association 'Interim Report' was attached at Appendix 1. The Portfolio Holder agreed with the Assistant Director's view that the Report was extremely encouraging and as a model could be inspirational to others and raised the issue of Burn Valley Allotment Holders' wishes to enter into such an arrangement. The Portfolio Holder raised concerns at the lack of progress in that matter. The Assistant Director explained the problems that were involved, the attempts made to resolve them and the need for 'one voice' from the three groups involved.

### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder:

- (a) approved the self-management arrangements of the Woodcroft allotments site by the Woodcroft Allotments Association (W.A.A.), and
- (b) noted the Assistant Director's assurance that he would endeavour to take a personal involvement in reconciling the issue relating to Burn Valley Allotments.

## **102. Objection to the Erection of Alleygates to the Rear of Marske Street/Stockton Road** *(Head of Technical Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key

### **Purpose of report**

To seek a decision as to whether alleygates should be erected to the back street of Marske Street/Stockton Road, taking into consideration objection received from residents during the consultation process.

### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report detailed the history of the issue and summarised and quantified responses to the consultation exercise undertaken with residents directly affected by the erection of the gates. A plan of the areas was provided.

The Portfolio Holder commented that as the majority of residents were in favour, and he had received a petition to that effect, he felt the scheme should proceed and that further liaison on the arrangements/timings etc should take place with those businesses affected.

The Portfolio Holder expressed concern that the Ward Councillors had not been consulted or kept informed on this issue. Officer agreed to take appropriate action to ensure that this did not happen in future.

### **Decision**

That the Portfolio Holder agreed to alleygates being erected on the back street between Marske Street and Stockton Road, bearing in mind the above arrangement in relation to the businesses affected.

### **103. Request to Extend Parking Restrictions – Back of Park Road (South)** *(Head of Technical Services)*

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key

#### **Purpose of report**

To consider a request from residents and businesses located between numbers 89 and 127 Park Road to amend the current parking orders.

#### **Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report provided detailed background information and Appendix A showed the location of restrictions and properties directly affected. The report also examined the results of a formal consultation carried out with residents and suggested an alternative traffic management control. A plan of the area was provided.

In relation to financial implications, the report advised that the cost of amending the Traffic Regulation Orders to extend the limited waiting time would have a minimal impact on the Parking Services budget commitments.

#### **Decision**

The Portfolio Holder agreed:

- (a) that the current limited parking restriction on Park Road (South) be extended from 30 minutes to 1 hour and be monitored;
- (b) that, where possible, further consideration be given to accommodate a limited number of permit spaces for residents/businesses directly affected by the parking restrictions, and;
- (c) a further report to be submitted in relation to the development of unregulated land to the rear of the properties if residents and businesses wish to pursue a business permit parking scheme.

### **104. Request to include Blakelock Gardens within the Approved Consultation Process** *(Head of Technical Services)*

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key

**Purpose of report**

To consider a request from residents to include Blakelock Gardens as part of the residents consultation programme.

**Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report examined the parking problems experienced by residents of Blakelock Gardens and sought permission to include the area within the formal consultation process.

**Decision**

The Portfolio Holder approved the inclusion residents of Blakelock Gardens, and the Ward Councillors, within the approved consultation process.

**105. Hartlepool Transport Interchange Progress Report**  
*(Head of Technical Services)*

**Type of decision**

For information

**Purpose of report**

To inform the Portfolio Holder of delays experienced, and progress made, in delivering the proposed Hartlepool Transport Interchange project.

**Issue(s) considered by the Portfolio Holder**

The report provided information on planning approval, legal agreements, Network Rail Approvals, Rail Regulator Approvals, land transfer arrangements, car parking arrangements, rail station improvements and detailed design. An updated programme for legal agreements, appointing a contractor and completing the works was also provided.

**Decision**

The Portfolio Holder noted the position regarding the delivery of the Hartlepool Transport Interchange Project.

**J A BROWN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 9<sup>th</sup> May 2006**