

NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM AGENDA



Wednesday, 29 June 2011

at 10.00 am

**at West View Community Centre,
Miers Avenue, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM:

Councillors Barday, Cook, Fenwick, Fleet, Fleming, Griffin, Jackson, J Marshall, J W Marshall, McKenna, Robinson, Rogan, Shields, Thomas and Wright

Resident Representatives: Christine Blakey, John Cambridge, John Maxwell, Joan Noman, Bob Steel, Joan Steel and Ian Stewart

- 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**
- 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 3. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 4. MINUTES**
 - 4.1 To confirm the minutes of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum meeting held on 6th April 2011
 - 4.2 To confirm the minutes of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum meeting held on 18th May 2011
 - 4.3 Matters arising
- 5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (maximum of 30 minutes)**

6. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION

- 6.1 Dog Control Orders – *Waste and Environmental Services Manager*
- 6.2 Allotment Improvements – *Waste and Environmental Services Manager*
- 6.3 CCTV – Old Cemetery Road – *Community Safety Officer*
- 6.4 Housing Strategy – *Housing Strategy Officer*

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR INFORMATION

- 7.1 Parking Control / Enforcement – *Parking Services Manager*
- 7.2 20s Plenty – *Traffic Team Leader*

8. ITEMS FOR DECISION

- 8.1 Minor Works Schemes 2011/2012 – *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*

**9. WARD ISSUES FROM WARD MEMBERS AND RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVES
(maximum of 30 minutes)**

10. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the North Police and Community Safety Consultative Forum will take place on Wednesday 27th July at 2pm at West View Community Centre.

The next meeting of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum will take place on Wednesday 17th August at 6pm at Throston Grange Community Centre

WARDS

Brus
 Dyke House
 Hart
 St Hilda
 Throston

NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM

6 April 2011

MINUTES OF THE MEETING



The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. in West View Community Centre, Miers Avenue, Hartlepool

PRESENT:

Chair: Councillor Mary Fleet - Dyke House Ward

Vice Chair: Bob Steel (Resident Representative)

Councillor Sheila Griffin - Brus Ward

Councillor John Marshall - St Hilda Ward

Resident Representatives:

Christine Blakey, John Cambridge, John Maxwell, Joan Norman, Linda Shields, Joan Steel and Robert Steel

Public: Tim Hyde, David Nin, Cath Torley, Liz Torley and Alan Vale,

Officers:

- Johanna Powell, Families Information Service, Information Officer
- Penny Thompson, Childcare Market Officer
- Brian Neale, Community Safety Manager
- Karen Oliver, Neighbourhood Manager
- Garry Jones, Neighbourhood Services Officer
- Peter Frost, Traffic Team Leader
- Peter Nixon, Senior Traffic Technician
- Ann Callaghan, Neighbourhood Development Officer
- Joanne Burnley, Senior Environmental Health Officer
- Sally Forth, Social Behaviour and Housing Officer
- Craig Thelwell, Waste and Environmental Services Manager
- Sarah Harrison, Democratic Services Officer

Housing Hartlepool: Lynn McPartlin

Fire Brigade Representative: Peter Bradley

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Atkinson, Cook, Thomas and Wright.

59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

60. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 FEBRUARY 2011

These minutes were confirmed with the addition of Apologies being received from John Maxwell.

61. MATTERS ARISING

Steetley Site – The Forum was notified that a meeting had been arranged to focus solely on this issue and would take place on Wednesday, 18 May 2011 at 2.00 pm in West View Community Centre, Miers Avenue, Hartlepool

Lancaster Road Bus Stop – A resident representative after consulting with a local resident expressed concern that the solution of bricking up this bus shelter may not be the best option. The Neighbourhood Services Officer advised that there were issues with the land behind owned by Railtrack and that bricking up of the shelter was still the best solution.

62. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NORTH AREA POLICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY CONSULTATIVE FORUM HELD ON 17 MARCH 2011

These were received by the forum.

Cyber Bullying - A resident representative asked that her comments

be noted that she had not been given support by Police in relation to this traumatic incident.

63. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Old Cemetery Road – A resident reported that there were lighting problems in the area and one had been cut down. This would be addressed by Officers.

Local Authority Budget Cuts – A resident asked how the budget cuts would affect the north area of town. The Neighbourhood Manager said that it was difficult to quantify but the cleansing and horticulture teams had not lost any staff. Community Safety Staff had been affected as funding such as Working Neighbourhoods Funding being withdrawn. It was agreed that this item would be discussed in more detail in the new municipal year as the Authority had to make savings of £7.5m in the next financial year. A resident representative expressed disgust at the increases in executive pay and stated that local people were furious with the Chief Executive's pay rise.

Ward Boundaries – A resident asked for details of the proposed new ward boundaries. The Neighbourhood Manager had details of these to circulated to those present in order that they could participate in the consultation with the Boundary Commission if they wished.

Speed Sign on King Oswy Drive – A resident stated that this did not appear to be working. The Senior Traffic Technician said that he was aware of this problem but this could be looked at by the new supplier of these signs.

64. CCTV – OLD CEMETERY ROAD

The Community Safety Manager attended the meeting in order to present a number of options in relation to the provision of a

CCTV camera or alternative security arrangements in the Old Cemetery Road locality to replace former camera irrevocably damaged previously.

A Member expressed concern that the report appeared to trivialise the seriousness of problems that local residents were facing in that area including fly tipping and fires and stated that he wanted the camera replacing. A resident highlighted that insurance money had been claimed regarding the CCTV cameras and this should be used to replace what had been there originally.

A discussion ensued with the general opinion that the cameras should be replaced like for like. However the meeting was inquorate so a decision could not be made at this time. It was agreed therefore that a site visit and discussion by Ward Members and interested parties be arranged with recommendations from that being fed back to the next meeting of the forum.

65. CHILD POVERTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND REVISED STRATEGY
--

The Forum was reminded that the Local Authority had a duty to produce a Child Poverty Needs Assessment and Strategy. The Child Poverty Working Group had drafted a Child Poverty needs assessment and a refreshed strategy and were in the process of consulting with interested parties for views.

The Forum was told that the Government measured poverty by saying that any adult with one child living on less than £145 per week was classed as living in poverty. Locally, children and young people in Hartlepool made up almost 20% of the population and almost a third of these were living in poverty. Hartlepool has one of the highest percentages of children living in poverty in the North

East. An independent review had been carried out nationally which recommended the establishment of a set of 'life chances' indicators as well as establishing a foundation years education system covering 0 – 5 years. The Childcare Market Officer asked for views on how the Authority could support families currently in poverty as well as preventing poor children from becoming poor adults.

A resident representative expressed concern that those in poverty were measured at the £145 income level yet benefits could be from as little as £67 per week. A Member asked whether families had been questioned as to their actual problems and was informed that a number of case studies had taken place during a scrutiny investigation into financial advice and details of these had been shared to give an accurate picture. A Member suggested that alcohol and drug dependency also contributed to the level of poverty of children as those affected would spend income on their addictions rather than their families. An example of the voluntary sector's contribution in helping young people was cited. A resident representative commented that when issues like child poverty were highlighted it was wrong that senior executives were receiving salary increases and that the meeting should highlight negatives as well as positives including negative reaction to the Tall Ships events.

The meeting was reminded that the Families Information Services Hartlepool had recently moved from the Central Library to the Hindpool Close Surestart Centre and was a source of support and information for families in the area.

66. SCHOOL SAFETY SCHEMES

A report had been circulated with the agenda papers outlining the schools

where safety schemes had already been implemented. A further two schools were due to be implemented in this financial year and there were three schools still awaiting funding and investigation.

St Helen's Primary School – A resident commented that electronic signs appeared to have been located on the wrong side of the road. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to check this.

Milbank Road – A resident stated that part of this had been resurfaced but the speed bumps had not been reinstated. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to follow this up. He informed the meeting that the speed bumps were not to be replaced in Amberton Road following consultation with residents.

Evaluation of Schemes – A Member asked whether schemes were evaluated after they had been implemented and was informed that the traffic team was able to provide figures in terms of accidents.

Raby Road – It was suggested that this area be considered for implementation of the next school safety scheme. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to provide statistics so that the Forum could make an informed decision.

St Hild's School – A resident representative highlighted issues with parking outside the school and said that the restrictions were not enforced. The Traffic Team Leader said that the recently purchased camera enforcement vehicle should assist in enforcement action. A Member asked that a letter be sent to the Police asked for more rigorous enforcement of traffic infringements. The Neighbourhood Manager agreed to do so on behalf of the Forum.

Space to Learn Centre – A resident representative highlighted that there was no car parking provision and users were

parking on the pavement. He was informed that when planning permission was obtained for this centre, users were expected to park in the nearby St Hild's School.

Tall Ships Yellow Lines – A resident representative stated that visitors to the town should have been made to feel welcome but the abundance of yellow lines had the reverse effect and she felt that every parking ticket issued should be revoked.

67. MINOR WORKS BUDGET 2011/2012

The Forum was told that there was £58,000 allocated for the new financial year for Minor Works and £4050 from the previous financial year would be carried forward to this making a total of £62,050.

A scheme in relation to the demolition of the old electric sub station at the rear of Jacques Court was suggested by a Member.

68. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT
--

The Chairman ruled that the following item of business should be considered by the Committee as a matter of urgency in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(B) (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 in order that the matter could be dealt with without delay.

Selective Licensing of Landlords

The scheme was outlined to the Forum i.e. that in certain areas of the town private landlords were required to be licensed. This scheme already in place in some areas of Hartlepool was to be extended to other parts of the town and consultations were currently taking place with residents groups, landlords, consultative forums and partner agencies.

Everyone in the affected and surrounding areas would have received a consultation document. The results of the consultation would be considered by Cabinet in June and updates would be brought to future Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.

69. WARD ISSUES

Merlin Way/Falcon Road – A resident representative asked whether there was any update on the traffic calming which had been introduced and was informed that a survey had been carried out but there was no information available yet.

Retirement Village – A resident representative commented that the playpark near to Hartfields had not yet been established and hoped that something would be in place for families to enjoy.

Tall Ships Yellow Lines – A resident representative asked when it would be clearer where people could park and was informed that approximately 80% of these had been removed and once completed, this would be publicized.

Silverbirch Road/Merlin Way – A resident representative commented that there had been a number of vehicle near misses because it was unclear who had right of way where Silverbirch Road joined Merlin Way near to the Bellway showhomes. The Traffic Team Leader agreed to ensure that something was put in place to prevent this.

Disabled Ramp Durham Street – A Member complained that this had not been completed but was informed that this work was on order and he would be informed when the work was due to be complete.

Bond Street Garages – A Member complained that these were in a poor state of repair and was informed that the

Neighbourhood Manager was currently trying to find out who owned these in order that the owners could be asked to improve their condition.

Town Square – A Member highlighted problems with vandalism in this area and was informed that coping stones and lights were currently on order to repair damage as were bollards which had gone missing.

Paddling Pool – A Member expressed concern at the poor state of this and asked that this be brought up to standard by the summer.

King Oswy Shops – A resident representative highlighted problems with graffiti and was informed that this had recently been painted over.

Bus Layby on West View Road – A Member commented that she was pleased that this work had been carried out.

Accountability – A resident representative commented that some of the above issues appeared to have been ongoing for years and that issues should be addressed when raised. She commented that if staff were incompetent then they should not be paid as much. She was informed that all the issues raised by the Member were already in hand and also that Officers picked up other issues which needed addressing when doing work out and about in the area rather than wait for them to be reported by residents.

The meeting concluded at 12.16 pm

Chair

NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATIVE FORUM

WARDS

Brus
Dyke House
Hart
St Hilda
Throston

18 May 2011

MINUTES OF THE MEETING



The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm. in West View Community Centre, Miers Avenue, Hartlepool

PRESENT:

Chair:	Councillor Mary Fleet	- Dyke House Ward
	Councillor Mick Fenwick	- Brus Ward
	Councillor Tim Fleming	- St Hilda Ward
	Councillor Sheila Griffin	- Brus Ward
	Councillor John Marshall	- St Hilda Ward

Resident Representatives:

John Cambridge, John Maxwell and Joan Norman

Public: R Dunn, J and S Grabby, Ian Stewart, Cath and Liz Torley and Alan Vale

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Karen Oliver, Neighbourhood Manager
Sylvia Pinkney, Public Protection Manager
Chris Pipe, Planning Services Manager
Ann Callaghan, Neighbourhood Development Officer
Garry Jones, Neighbourhood Services Officer
Jo Stubbs, Democratic Services Officer

70. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Shields and Thomas and Resident Representatives Christine Blakey and John Lynch

71. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

72. THE FORMER STEETLEY SITE

The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods gave a brief presentation on the former Steetley site. He advised that an outline planning application for housing on the site was approved in March 2010 subject to a legal agreement. Included within this legal agreement was a timescale for clearance of the site which it was anticipated would commence in November 2011 and take

12 months to complete. The site itself had been inspected by two environmental health officers who had confirmed the presence of asbestos cement on the site but felt this did not constitute a public nuisance. This was for the following reasons:

- The asbestos cement is in the form of roofs of demolished sheds. It is in the open air (on private land) and has been so for a number of years and therefore further damage is thought to be unlikely.
- Asbestos cement has a low fibre content as the fibres are held together by cement. Even if the material were broken up any fibre release would be very low

Information was also given regarding future access to the site and on-site activity by the police, fire brigade and the environmental enforcement team

A councillor referred to the previous meeting at which a request had been made to hold this special meeting. At that time members had asked that a representative from the health and safety executive be asked to attend however there was nobody in attendance. It was suggested that another meeting be called on this issue if this request had not been actioned. The Neighbourhood Manager was unable to recall whether this request had been made and the minutes did not refer to it. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods advised that the Health and Safety Executive had no authority or influence over the site however the councillor felt this was besides the point as members had wished to have the benefit of expert advice to ensure that all legal requirements were being complied with. The Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods noted this request but

felt that a representative would have been unlikely to attend in any event.

The following issues were raised by members:

What is the nature of the dust which blows off the site and what are the health implications of long term exposure? The Director advised that it was council officers professional opinion that the dust currently blowing off the site was not a public statutory nuisance and posed no danger to residents. He highlighted that since work had stopped on the site the amount of dust being generated had decreased substantially.

Why had the asbestos not been removed according to Health and Safety Executive recommendations in the first instance? These stated that in the case of large scale work or mechanical demolition a risk assessment and plan of work should be prepared but this had not been done. Buildings had been smashed up leaving the equivalent of 40 tonnes of broken asbestos and fibres which were both visible and invisible. The Director indicated that at the time the Health and Safety Executive had been responsible for the clearance of the site. However neither the Health and Safety Executive or the Council were now responsible as it was a private site. He reassured those present that asbestos was present in the atmosphere from other sources at low levels and this did not pose a risk to health. The Council's professional officers had advised that the amount, type and positioning of the asbestos was not a public nuisance so legally no action could be taken. A Councillor acknowledged these comments but felt that someone from the Health and Safety Executive should have been asked to attend as was previously requested. He reported his intention to call for a public enquiry into the clearance

of the site and the possibility of public contamination.

The lorries that took the asbestos off the site had not been covered up. As these were on public roads was this the Council's responsibility? The Director reported that it was the police's responsibility to ensure that any vehicles which posed a hazard were covered. A Councillor commented that the Health and Safety Executive had advised that as it was no longer a working site this was the Council's responsibility. The Director confirmed that Waste Management was the Council's responsibility but the company which owned the site had a waste carriers licence. This would have required a full environmental plan to be approved by the Council and this approval would not have been given if it were not being completed in a safe manner. A resident advised that the plans had confirmed that the lorries would be covered but this had not happened. Neither had the Barnshaw Bending end of the site been cleared as was promised. The Director acknowledged this but said the company in question could not be forced to adhere to the plans.

What was being done to stem fly tipping in the area? The Director acknowledged this was a problem. Covert cameras had been installed and fines had increased but the site was too large. A Resident Representative queried whether the decision to charge for bulky waste collection had led to an increase in fly tipping but the Director felt it had always happened and there had been no particular increase following the introduction of charges. He also noted that the land in question was private and therefore the Council were not obliged to remove waste from the site anyway.

Would the chimney on the site ever be removed? The Director confirmed that part of the remediation works included the

demolition of the chimney but there was no plan in place at the moment. This was something which would be discussed prior to the site clearance in November.

Why had no risk assessments being carried out when the buildings had been broken down two years ago? The Council had been unable to provide a risk assessment for asbestos on the site despite requests by a Councillor. The Director reported that a risk assessment for safe demolition had been carried out at the time but there had been no requirement for a risk assessment after the fact. The Councillor disputed this, commenting that 40 tonnes of broken asbestos was extremely dangerous regardless of who was responsible and officers should not turn a blind eye. The Director reiterated Council officers professional opinion that the asbestos did not pose a health risk.

If the work were not due to start until November then it would be another 18 months before the site were cleared. The dust and problems on-site would continue. The Director acknowledged this and was sympathetic to those living nearby but the Council could only take action if the site was deemed to be a statutory nuisance which it was not. In terms of the danger to people venturing onto the site he advised that the public land around the site was perfectly safe to walk on however anyone entering the private site did so at their own risk.

Had the site ever been monitored to ascertain the content of the dust coming off the site? The Director confirmed that no monitoring had taken place as this was not standard practice. Allotments with asbestos sheeting were also not monitored. A Councillor felt this was a different situation given the amount of asbestos on the site. Other Councils would have engaged professionals to

dispose of asbestos so why had Hartlepool not done so.

The Chair thanked the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods for attending the meeting and answering questions.

73. ANY OTHER BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

The Neighbourhood Manager referred to a previous request that the CCTV camera be replaced on Old Cemetery Road. She advised that a report on this would be brought to the next North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum meeting. A Councillor asked that he be given details of the insurance amounts involved in writing. The Neighbourhood Manager to action this.

The meeting concluded at 2.55pm.

Chair

North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum

29th June 2011

**Issues Raised/Action Sheet
From NCF on 6th April 2011**

ISSUE DETAILS	ACTION TAKEN	OFFICER
1. Lights broken at Old Cemetery Road.	The broken lights have been repaired.	GJ
2. Speed sign not working – King Oswy Drive.	Work on order	PF
3. Arrange site visit regarding replacement CCTV options Old Cemetery Road.	Site visit has taken place – Report to be discussed at the NCT Meeting on 29 th June 2011.	Peter Gouldsbro
4. St Helens Primary School – Electronic Signs.	East bound sign working, west bound sign awaiting repair work to be carried out	PF
5. Milbank Road – traffic calming – speed humps have not been replaced.	Resident consultation revealed that there was no desire to replace the speed humps after resurfacing of Milbank Road.	PF
6. Letter to Police regarding Parking Enforcement Action at King Oswy Drive.	Police alerted. This area has been included on the Neighbourhood Policing Teams top 3 priorities list. A proactive approach has reduced the level of problems over the last month, including the relocation of the ice cream van.	KO
7. Traffic calming. Dyke House School, Raby Road entrance.	To be included in the School Safety Scheme programmes for the North. Scheme proposal to be presented to the forum in August 2011.	Peter Frost
8. Silverbirch Road/Merlin Way issues raised regarding ‘Right of Way’.	Give way signs and marking have been checked and Highways are not recommending any changes to the existing scheme.	Peter Frost

ISSUE DETAILS	ACTION TAKEN	OFFICER
9. Durham Street/Throston Street steps and ramp – Damage to store work.	Give way signs and marking have been checked and Highways are not recommending any changes to the existing scheme.	Peter Frost
10. Paddling Pool – concerns regarding state of repairs.	Paddling Pool is in use and will be monitored on a daily basis throughout the summer months.	GJ
11. Play provision Middle Warren.	Plans have been submitted by the developers with a view of starting work in this year.	KO
12. Bond Street Garages.	Proving difficult to identify owners, until we can Neighbourhood Team to complete a Mini Cleansweep in that location.	KO
13. Trees Town Square – replacement of dead trees.	This will be carried out this Autumn vandalised bollards will be replaced, currently on order.	GJ
14. Graffiti – King Oswy Shopping Parade.	Has now been removed.	GJ
15. Merlin Way/Falcon Road.	Report will be presented to Cabinet outcome will be reported back to the forum when a decision is announced.	PF

North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum

29th June 2011



Report of: Community Safety Officer

Subject: CCTV – OLD CEMETERY RD.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. To consider options for the replacement of a CCTV camera to monitor the Old Cemetery Road locality in replacement of the former camera irrevocably destroyed previously.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In 2002/2003 a CCTV camera was installed to the north west end of Old Cemetery Road to address issues of crime and anti-social behaviour within the cemetery site and general area bordering on the former Steetley site.
- 2.2 Camera images were transmitted to Hartlepool CCTV Monitoring Centre to facilitate live monitoring of the locality and report of any ongoing incidents to Police or other emergency services.
- 2.3 Operational capability of the camera was, over a period, affected by:
- interruption of power supplies to the camera through damage and vandalism to cabling
 - loss of street lighting capacity which, allied to an existing lack of general lighting in the area during hours of darkness, substantially reduced the quality of camera images
 - attacks, to differing levels of severity, on the camera and transmission equipment.
- 2.4 The attacks on the camera equipment came to a head with two attacks within a close timescale the first of which resulted in the destruction of the camera unit through a series of projectiles fired from a high velocity rifle or similar. The second resulted in the severing of the CCTV column, close to ground level, and the ignition of petrol poured over the camera head equipment. This resulted in a total write off of the camera equipment and column.

- 2.5. Following these attacks it was agreed that the feasibility of reinstatement in the same location had to be in doubt and would, in all probability, lead to further attacks and damage.
- 2.6 The effectiveness of the camera could not be fully measured as details of arrests and other action by Police, and other enforcement agencies, have not been fully reported. We do, nevertheless, understand that this area still remains a community concern.

The adjacent Steetley site has raised a considerable number of issues. The camera, whilst operational, was utilised to support initiatives to address issues of trespass and crime and again we understand that the overall position has improved. Again community concerns still prevail. Issues of damage to grass verges, by motor vehicles, and some fly tipping were also identified and referred to the respective authorities who undertook action where they considered appropriate.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1 A report to the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum of 6 April 2011 offered a number of proposals in respect of the potential replacement of the previous camera. These, in summary, were:
- Reinstatement of the camera at its previous location
 - Installation of a replacement camera in an adjacent location such as the south east end of Old Cemetery Road, in the proximity of the junction with Leas Grove
 - Alternative CCTV options given the use of fixed site CCTV cameras is now regularly superseded by utilisation of deployable cameras. Such afford flexibility in that they can be installed at a nominated site, as a monitoring and evidence gathering tool, then rapidly relocated should an alternative requirement arise or the original investigation concluded.
- 3.2 Following comprehensive discussion it was agreed that a site visit and meeting, to include technical expertise, be arranged to review the implications of the proposed options. This was subsequently held on 13 May 2011.
- 3.3. During the visit, and subsequent meeting, we were able to report on a further option emerging. The Council has been exploring the feasibility of establishing an Information Technology (I.T.) transmission hub for the northern area of Hartlepool. Such would initially facilitate transmission of live images for a number of Hartlepool Borough Council CCTV cameras to the CCTV Monitoring Centre by radio in replacement of existing fibre systems. That link should, in turn, enable other general Council I.T. streams to be similarly transmitted in a secure format.

The proposal is to utilise a 20 metre lighting or similar column already established within the P.D. Ports site. Should suitable agreement be reached then that could also afford the opportunity to mount a high specification camera to the column which would afford excellent views along the full length of Old Cemetery Road. Images would be transmitted to the CCTV Monitoring Centre to enable live monitoring.

3.4 The conclusion of the meeting of 13 May 2011 was that two preferred options be further explored inclusive of financial implications:

- Reinstatement of the camera at its previous location
- Installation of a camera within the proposed I.T. transmission hub.

3.5 We are pleased to subsequently report that agreement “in principle” has been reached with P.D. Ports for the proposed I.T. transmission hub. However progression will be subject to a full survey of radio transmission levels and bandwidths and the approval, by Hartlepool Borough Council, of the relevant business case.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS & FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS.

4.1 An insurance settlement of £13,137–10 has been received. This reflects the estimated cost to replace the camera at the same location to the same specification and recognising that infrastructure was unaffected by the camera destruction. Those monies are ring fenced.

4.2 Reinstatement of the camera at previous original location to the north west end of Old Cemetery Road.

The vulnerability of this location has been previously outlined. The location is remote, with no residential or business proximity to afford a degree of overview surveillance. Street lighting in this section of road repeatedly suffers from power supply and equipment damage. We understand that two recent replacement street lighting columns were both severed shortly after installation.

We would recommend installation of a column with a concrete core plus high security specification camera and transmission equipment to protect against previous high velocity rifle or similar attacks e.g. reinforced camera lens and high tensile casing. In addition a separate static camera is recommended to monitor the immediate area around the column base – this option has been previously used, successfully, in high risk locations within Hartlepool and countryside.

Former operational standards for camera pan, tilt and zoom capability and the transmission and monitoring of live images, by the CCTV Monitoring Centre, would be incorporated.

Estimated cost for this installation, inclusive of the above enhanced security recommendations, is £14,000–00.

4.3. New camera installation within proposed North I.T. transmission hub.

Subject to full agreement of the proposed transmission hub, we would recommend the installation of a high specification camera, incorporating 35 times zoom capability lens and suitable stabilisation, which would comfortably provide views of the full length of Old Cemetery Road. Camera would have full pan, tilt and zoom capability and images would be transmitted to the CCTV Monitoring Centre for live monitoring. The operational capability and resilience of cameras at this height, and associated transmission effectiveness, was fully and very successfully tested within temporary CCTV operations for last year's Tall Ships event.

As indicated this recommendation is subject to the finalisation of the I.T. transmission hub proposals. Until such time as the survey and associated tests are concluded, which we would anticipate be by the end of July 2011, we cannot determine the actual transmission link requirements.

Estimated cost for the camera and transmission installation is £10,000–00 subject to survey outcomes and recommended equipment specification costing.

- 4.4. Our recommendation would be to progress the option to install a camera within the proposed North I.T. transmission hub recognising:
- substantially enhanced security of equipment and operation
 - greater flexibility within camera operation which would substantially increase geographical viewing area capability and enhance image quality
 - projected cost benefits

In the event of the hub proposal not coming to fruition then the option would remain to fall back on reinstatement at the previous location or a review of other options.

There would not be any significant difference in revenue costs of operating a camera at either location.

5 BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

6 CONTACT OFFICER

Peter Gouldsbro, Community Safety Officer.

North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum

29th June 2011



Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: MINOR WORKS SCHEMES 2011/2012

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To consider improvement schemes as part of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum Minor Works Budget.

1.2 Snowdon Grove

Officers, Ward Members and the local neighbourhood policing team have been approached by residents to help tackle the issue of motorcycles speeding on the footpath along the narrow stretch of Snowdon Grove, running alongside Barnard Grove School field to the Horseshoe tunnel on Speeding Drive. The North Neighbourhood co-ordinator in collaboration with residents and Neighbourhood Police would like to install two chicane barriers at each end of this long stretch to prevent vehicles such as motorbikes from accessing the pedestrian footpath in order to eradicate the community safety issue in this location.

Cost £1,100

1.3 Scheme 2

Throston Street Small Area Regeneration Project

The above location has been blighted for a number of years as a result of a number of issues such as the long standing problems of Durham Street Methodist Church including the derelict land adjoining the church and the general decaying of the area surrounding the Headland Social Club.

Whilst there have been a number of physical improvements primarily under the North SRB (Single Regeneration Budget) funding several years ago – such as Throston Street steps and “Force Ten Statue”, improved street lighting and a new development which backs onto this location. There remains however, a significant large area which has had no investment. In addition to this the Headland Social Club has suffered much vandalism and there have been a number of issues related to fly tipping in and around the general area.

The Headland Social Club have endeavoured to find funding to prevent anti social behaviour and vandalism to the rear of the Club, however they have not been able to meet the full cost of completing the fencing work. The scheme put forward today does include improvements to land and property owned by the Headland Social Club, along with land owned by the Local Authority. However, the fundamental aim of the scheme is to create a much needed improvement to the physical environmental which is hoped will prevent the ongoing anti social behaviour, but more importantly improve the location for those residents who live in close proximity.

The scheme is broken down into smaller schemes to allow members to consider the full scheme or if desired a possible phased approach.

Provision of fencing to rear of the Headland Social Club to prevent youths gathering in the small dark corner and prevent access to the roof of the building this would be a palisade fence to match the newly installed fencing the club has already provided themselves.

Cost £1,700.

Provision of six trees with protective cages, which would be sited in the large disused car park to add an attractive feature for those residents overlooking this area. Trees at the bottom of Throston Street, to compliment the Durham Street/Throston Street environmental improvements as mentioned in this report.

Cost £2,450

Resurface the alley/access road to the rear of the Headland Social Club which is currently in a very poor state and is used by several residents on Durham Street, to access their individual garages. This would again improve the general appearance, as well as improve it for car owners.

Cost: £7,560

2. Recommendations

That members consider the schemes presented in this report.