

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY AND HOUSING PORTFOLIO

DECISION SCHEDULE



Friday 23rd June, 2006

at 9.00 am

in Committee Room “A”

The Mayor Stuart Drummond responsible for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing will consider the following items.

1. KEY DECISIONS

- 1.1 Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) - 2005/06 Final Outturn Report – *Head of Community Strategy*
- 1.2 Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) - 2006/08 Programme – *Head of Community Strategy*
- 1.3 Headland Environmental Improvements 2006/07 – *Head of Neighbourhood Management*

2. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 2.1 Department of Work and Pensions City Strategy – *Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development)*
- 2.2 Local Enterprise Growth Initiative Round 2 – *Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development)*
- 2.3 Tees Valley Single Programme – Progress Report – *Head of Regeneration*
- 2.4 National Strategic Reference Framework Consultation – *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*
- 2.5 Neighbourhood Services Departmental Plan Update March 2006 – *Head of Neighbourhood Management*
- 2.6 Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) – Fee Structure and Delegation of Powers – *Head of Public Protection and Housing*
- 2.7 Compulsory Purchase of an Empty Property – 45 Lancaster Road – *Head of Public Protection and Housing*

3. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- 3.1 Regeneration and Planning Departmental Plan 2005/06 – Outturn Report – *Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*
- 3.2 Current Position on Untidy/Derelict Land and Buildings – *Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development)*

4. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

No items

5. **REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS**

No items

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23rd June 2006



Report of: The Head of Community Strategy

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND (NRF)
2005/06 FINAL OUTTURN REPORT

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to notify the Portfolio Holder of the final NRF Financial Outturn for 2005/06 and seek endorsement for the Hartlepool Partnership decision on the use of the carry over from 2005/06 into 2006/07.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report outlines the final financial outturn for the 2005/06 NRF Programme, and outlines recommendations as to how the budget for the 2006/07 NRF programme be modified to take into account the carry over from 2005/06 into 2006/07.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Neighbourhood Renewal and NRF is within the remit of the Regeneration & Economy Portfolio.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Key, test 2 applies.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder decision.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the 2005/06 final financial outturn position and agree the recommended use of carry over funding in 2006/07.

Report of: The Head of Community Strategy

Subject NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND (NRF)
2005/06 FINAL OUTTURN REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to notify the Portfolio Holder of the final NRF Financial Outturn for 2005/06 and seek endorsement for the Hartlepool Partnership decision on the use of the carry over from 2005/06 into 2006/07.

2. BACKGROUND

1. The NRF allocation for 2005/06 (including the 2004/05 carry over of £80,290) was £5,447,985. The final carry forward for 2005/06 has now been finalised at £18,284. This amounts to less than 1% of the total allocation and is well within the 5% carry over limit set by Government.

3. USE OF CARRY OVER IN 2006/07

1. Due to several projects underspending and managed overspending it is necessary to modify the agreed 2006/07 programme in response to the final 2005/06 outturn. The majority of project budgets are to remain as previously agreed but exceptions set out below.
2. The Education Theme overspent slightly by £719 in 2005/06. However it is recommended that the allocation for 2006/07 remains as previously agreed at £495,000.
3. The Community Safety Programme overspent by £26,619 during 2005/06. The Dordrecht Prolific Offender Project and the Target Hardening project both contributed to this and it is recommended that these project budgets for 2006/07 be reduced by £20,000 and £6,000 respectively. It is recommended that the current overprogramming of approximately £9,000 in the Community safety Theme for 2006/07 is retained.
4. The Jobs & Economy Programme overspent by £7,284 during 2005/06 and this will be deducted from the 2006/07 programme. In September 2005 the Board agreed to overprogramme during 2005/06 due to demands for additional resources to deliver physical improvements to Brougham Enterprise Centre. Due to a tight timescale associated with the Single Programme approval all of the works were not completed

during the 2005/06 financial year and it is recommended that underspends across the 2005/06 NRF Programme, with the exception of NAP Residents Priorities Budgets, are utilised during 2006/07 to fund the development at Brougham Enterprise Centre.

5. The Health theme underspent by £50,899 during 2005/06 and it is recommended that this is redirected to Brougham Enterprise Centre in 2006/07. This is in line with the basic principle of overprogramming during 2005/06 to allow the Brougham Enterprise Centre Development to proceed.
6. Expenditure on the Housing and Environment Themes was broadly in line with the overall allocations. As a whole expenditure on NAP Priorities was again broadly in line and it is recommended that those neighbourhoods who underspent in 2005/06 have this carried over in 2006/07 and those NAP neighbourhoods that slightly overspent last year that the same amount deducted from their budget this year.
7. The North Hartlepool NAP Priorities Budget of £89,000 was originally programmed for 2005/06 but for a long time now it has been clear that this would not be spent during 2005/06 due to the timing of NAP development. It is recommended that this is carried over into 2006/07. At the Hartlepool Partnership meeting on 24th February 2006 the Board agreed to delegate authority to the Head Of Community Strategy to bring forward agreed interventions for 2006/07 into 2005/06. The NRF Community Chest budget of £95,000 was paid to HVDA during 2005/06 for the period March 2006 to April 2007 to balance this.
8. The Management & Consultation budget overspent by £21,636 during 2005/06. This is a managed overspend involving a first payment to MORI of £20,000 for survey work to be undertaken during 2006/07 in conjunction with NDC. The 2006/07 Management & Consultation Budget will be reduced by the same amount to balance the managed overspend.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

1. The Council and the Hartlepool Partnership will benefit from significant NRF resources to 2008. The funding has enabled successful elements of the current NRF programme to continue although the mainstreaming of interventions into partners core budgets is increasingly becoming more important and will be critical in 2008.

5. RECOMMENDATION

1. The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the 2005/06 final financial outturn position and agree the recommended use of 2005/06 carry over funding into 2006/07.

APPENDIX 1

NRF 2006/07 RECOMMENDED BUDGET

Project	Final Outturn 2005/06	Recommended Budget 06/07
Education		
Primary/ Secondary Schools	795,176	396,000
General Projects	170,543	99,000
	£965,719	£495,000
Community Safety		
Community Safety Small Grants Fund	8,095	10,000
ASB Officer (06/07 budget includes ASB Analyst)	24,637	66,100
Community Safety Wardens	308,561	-
Environmental Enforcement Wardens	-	150,000
Diversions Activities	35,329	-
Safer Streets & Homes	179,332	224,000
Dordrecht Prolific Offenders Scheme	139,141	105,000
NRF Project Assistant	21,457	22,500
COOL Project	40,440	61,600
Families Changing Communities	154,917	187,668
Advance Project	15,373	22,947
ASB Analyst	35,489	-
Burglary Prevention (Full 06/07 allocation subject to further approval)	27,880	58,104
Community Coordination	42,116	-
Landlord Accreditation Scheme	43,976	10,000
Young Firefighters (06/07 LIFE Project)	170,876	33,000
Streetlighting	38,437	-
Headland Community Capacity Building	15,000	-
Neighbourhood Policing	-	273,000
PINS	-	23,040
	£1,301,056	£1,247,409 (an over programming of £8,992)
Jobs & Economy		
Basic Skills Training (HCFE)	100,000	-
Targeted Training	36,581	51,956
Womens Opportunities	39,342	38,454
Jobs build	80,647	80,792
Workroute ILM	102,392	143,000
Tourism/Business Marketing	5,000	-
Marketing Assistant	23,733	24,456
Employment Co-ordinator	17,178	28,000
Hartlepool Action Team for Jobs Marketing	13,999	-
Improving the Employment Offer (Worksmart)	42,175	45,000
Employment Skills Officer	18,516	-
Self Employment Training	20,000	-
Learning Mentors	50,000	-
Study Support Tutors	42,000	-

Assisting Local People into Work	129,459	100,000
Incubator Systems (06/07 includes Business Skills Training)	229,699	175,000
Volunteering Into Employment	66,563	76,334
Brougham Capital	489,118	120,000
OFC A Social Enterprise Support		150,000
Homelessness Project		70,000
Carers into Training & Employment		10,000
Owton Manor West Employment Project		35,000
West View Employment Project		30,000
RESPECT		6,892
Grange Road Methodist Church		30,000
	£1,506,402	1,214,884
Health		
Occupational Care for Kids (PCT)	37,659	40,000
Owton Rossmere Health Development Worker	38,586	40,000
Benefits Advice	29,700	-
Addlink Project	31,400	-
Mental Health Development Project	83,462	62,906
Mobile Maintenance Worker (Full 06/07 allocation subject to further full approval)	15,336	20,022
Smoking Issues	40,561	72,500
Fitness from Football	44,111	-
Health Inequalities Community Chest	40,000	-
Belle Vue Sports Project	45,266	39,000
Health Inclusion Project	18,306	-
Hartlepool Special Olympics	24,440	-
Headland Borough Hall Sports Project	387,500	-
Adaptations	61,164	-
Waverly Terrace Allotments	45,000	-
Male Life Expectancy Research	6,000	-
Integrated Health & Social Care Teams	78,533	25,000
Cardiac Rehab Through Exercise	-	25,000
Connected Care Health Trainers	-	117,250
Anchor Trust community Development	-	31,154
Alzheimers Day Service	-	61,290
Hartlepool Carers	-	20,600
Reducing Childhood Obesity	-	109,700
MIND Manager & NDC Support Network	-	47,000
Mental Health Carers Support	-	20,782
TNEY/MIND Common Mental Health Needs	-	41,000
Discharge Planning Post	-	30,000
VCS Core Costs	-	121,166
	£1,027,024	£925,000
Environment & Housing		
Dyke House/Jackson Environment Team	£76,060	£100,000
Housing Market Renewal Support for Scheme Delivery	£82,089	£128,000
	£158,149	£228,000

NAP Priorities		
Dyke House NAP - Housing Renewal Support for Residents Priorities	£101,999	£65,339
Burbark NAP	-	£23,000
Rift House/Burn Valley NAP	£38,017	£50,883
Owton NAP	£71,324	£51,176
Rossmere NAP	£42,451	£20,549
North Hartlepool NAP	-	£153,000
	£253,791	£363,947
Lifelong Learning Theme	-	£215,000
Community Chest	£95,000	-
Management & Consultancy	£122,302	£145,231

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23rd June 2006



Report of: The Head of Community Strategy

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND (NRF)
2006/08 PROGRAMME

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to seek Portfolio Holder endorsement to the Hartlepool Partnership approval of a range of interventions to be funded through NRF for 2006-2008.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report sets out a range of interventions recommended to be funded through NRF for 2006/07 and 2007/08. These have previously been developed through relevant Theme Partnerships and the Hartlepool Partnership.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Neighbourhood Renewal and NRF is within the remit of the Regeneration & Economy Portfolio.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Key, test 2 applies.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder decision.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is recommended to endorse the decision of the Hartlepool Partnership Board by agreeing to fund the projects outlined in the report.

Report of: The Head of Community Strategy

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND (NRF)
2006/08 PROGRAMME

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Portfolio Holder endorsement to the Hartlepool Partnership approval of a range of interventions to be funded through NRF for 2006-2008.

2. BACKGROUND

1. In July 2005 Government Office announced that Hartlepool would continue to receive NRF for a further two years. Hartlepool will receive £4,830,926 in 2006-07 and a further £4,375,218 in 2007-08. The Hartlepool Partnership and the Portfolio Holder have previously agreed the majority of the programme.

3. COMMUNITY SAFETY THEME

1. The basis of the Community Safety NRF programme was agreed in principle by the Safer Hartlepool Partnership in 2005.
2. The NRF Evaluation of the Community Safety Programme found drugs and related issues as a priority area that required greater resources devoted to it. In response the Safer Hartlepool Partnership has recommended two additional projects for approval

Parents In Need of Support (PINS) (£23,040 for 2006/7) to provide support to parents and carers whose children are involved or at risk of drug abuse, crime and anti-social behaviour. This service is available outside of normal office hours.

ADDvance (£22,947 for 2006/7) to employ a full-time outreach worker to support drug users on an emotional and practical level and assist in their re-integration into the community. This service is available outside of normal office hours.

3. It is also recommended that following discussion at the Hartlepool Partnership Board meeting on 24th February that £10,000 is set aside each year to contribute towards the **Landlord Accreditation Project**. This provides support towards the voluntary scheme to accredit private sector landlords whose properties meet the required standards.
4. At the Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2006 a number of projects within the Community Safety Theme were agreed for continuation. The actual allocations for these projects have been agreed by the Safer Hartlepool Partnership and the Hartlepool Partnership and are included below for your approval:

Neighbourhood Policing (£273,000 for 2006/7 and £273,000 for 2007/8) to support the development of the neighbourhood policing model in Hartlepool.

Anti-Social Behaviour Analysis & Intervention (£66,100 for 2006/7 and £67,500 for 2007/8) to investigate cases of ASB and provide analysis of a range of ASB data to identify hot-spots and individuals causing problems, in conjunction with police.

Safer Streets & Homes (£224,000 for 2006/7 and £200,000 for 2007/8) targeting crime hotspots with improved physical security of properties, streets and streetlighting.

Dordrecht Programme (£105,000 for 2006/7 and £125,000 for 2007/8) to work with prolific offenders.

Target Hardening (£14,526 for 2006/7) to prevent walk-in burglaries and secure properties. This project has been approved for the first 3 months of 2006/7 with the remainder of the 2 years funding ring-fenced and subject to approval after the project is reviewed further.

Community Safety Project Monitoring Assistant (£22,500 for 2006/7 and £23,500 for 2007/8) provides support to partnership activities such as development of the quarterly newspaper, updating the website, administering to community safety grants pool for resident and community groups, and assisting with monitoring of NRF community safety projects.

At present the Community Safety Programme is over-programmed by approximately £9,000.

4. HEALTH & CARE THEME

1. The Health & Care Strategy Group agreed at their meeting in November to focus the Health & Care NRF on the five Local Area Agreement (LAA) outcomes of improving health, older people, children's health, mental well-being and access to services. The Health & Care Strategy Group met in March to consider the proposals put forward for these outcomes and the following were recommended for approval:

Smoking Issues (£72,500 for 2006/7 and £72,500 for 2007/8) to provide community based smoking cessation services at accessible times and venues and to contribute towards regional tobacco control work. (Improving Health)

Cardiac Rehabilitation through Exercise Referral (£25,000 for 2006/7 and £30,000 for 2007/8) to enhance and expand the current exercise referral scheme for cardiac patients and deliver from a further three, community based venues. (Improving Health)

Early Implementation of Integrated Care Teams (£25,000 for 2006/7 and £40,000 for 2007/8) employment of a project manager to oversee the development of integrated care teams and their relocation to shared accommodation in the North, Centre and South of the town. (Improving Health & Access to Services)

Connected Care/Health Trainers (£117,250 for 2006/7 and £135,000 for 2007/8) local people will be employed to act as a link between communities and individuals in greatest need and professionals, translating health messages into actions that take account of individual circumstances and overcoming barriers to accessing appropriate services. (Improving Health and Access to Services)

Anchor Trust Community Development Team (£31,154 for 2006/7 and £31,154 for 2007/8) to provide support and training opportunities for older people so that they can become more involved in their community and other groups such as the 50+ Forum and statutory service planning groups. (Older People)

Alzheimers Day Service (£61,920 for 2006/7 and £61,920 for 2007/8) to provide activities and support to older people with dementia and supporting carers in their role. (Older People)

Hartlepool Carers (£20,600 for 2006/7 and £20,600 for 2007/8) to support older carers in their role through low-level support, respite, advocacy and counselling. (Older People)

Reducing Childhood Obesity, Promoting Emotional Well-being (£109,700 for 2006/7 and £95,300 for 2007/8) provision of a dedicated school nurse working with families and children to respond to the rise in childhood obesity through healthy eating and access physical activities. (Children's Health)

MIND Manager & NDC Mental Health Support Network (£47,000 for 2006/7 and £49,110 for 2007/8) to provide support and assistance to those with mental health problems. (Mental Well-being)

Mental Health Carers Support (£20,782 for 2006/7 and £21,404 for 2007/8) to provide support to carers with responsibility for those with mental health needs. (Mental Well-being)

TNEY/MIND Common Mental Health Needs (£41,000 for 2006/7 and £46,000 for 2007/8) development of a Joint Project to deliver interventions that will increase the availability, equity and access to support. It will address common mental health needs and support a stepped care approach to interventions. (Mental Well-being)

Discharge Planning Post (£30,000 for 2006/7 and £20,000 for 2007/8) expansion of the Discharge Liaison Service to ensure the enhancement of patient choice in their preferred place of care whilst working collaboratively with pre-existing health and social care services and voluntary sector organisations. (Access to Services)

Voluntary & Community Sector (VCS) Core Costs (£121,166 for 2006/7) to provide core costs support to VCS organisations who contribute towards the 5 LAA outcome areas for Health & Care. (Cross-cuts all Health & Care outcomes)

2. At the Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2006 a number of projects within the Health & Care Theme were agreed for continuation. The allocations for these projects have been agreed by the Health & Care Strategy Group and the Hartlepool Partnership and are included below for your approval:

Belle Vue Health & Fitness Club (£39,000 for 2006/7 and £41,400 for 2007/8) targeting prevention of ill health through exercise, diet and lifestyle advice and assistance.

Owton Rossmere Health Development Worker (£40,000 for 2006/7 and £40,900 for 2007/8) working within the community to help local people become more aware of health issues and support them in effecting change.

Dyke House Jackson Health Development Worker (£40,000 for 2006/7 and £40,900 for 2007/8) to target young people and assist them in developing good health habits as well as supporting parents and families to go through this behavioural change.

Mobile Maintenance Worker (£9,000 for 2006/7) to assist older and more vulnerable residents to retain their independence and remain in their own homes. This project has been agreed for the first 6 months of 2006/7 with the remainder of the 2 years funding ring-fenced and subject to approval after a review of low-level support work.

MIND Mental Health Development and NRF Mental Health Support Network (£62,906 for 2006/7 and £64,645 for 2007/8) to provide support and assistance to those with mental health problems.

5. JOBS & ECONOMY THEME

1. At the Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2006 it was agreed that a range of interventions continue to receive NRF for 2006-08. The approved projects did not take up the full allocation for the theme and the Economic Forum have prioritised projects for the remainder of the allocation. It was agreed by Hartlepool Partnership that this funding should be used to maximise the amount of European Social Funding (Objective 2 Priority 4) brought into Hartlepool as match funding for projects.
2. The Economic Forum assessed the range of projects put forward and has recommended the following additional projects for the 2006-08 Jobs & Economy NRF programme (full appraisal forms are available on request) with allocations for 2007/8 subject to further agreement:

Homelessness Project (£70,000 for 2006/7 and £44,906 for 2007/8) to provide an increased level of integrated support mechanisms that assist in the rehabilitation of offender behaviour, enable tenancies to be secured and assist in the transition to independent living with clear pathways to training, education and employment.

Carers into Training and Employment (£10,000 for 2006/7 and £10,000 for 2007/8) to provide the support necessary to enable jobless carers and those people whose caring responsibility has now ended to enter training, education or

employment. The project will also provide help for carers who are in employment to continue with their caring role through receiving appropriate support and promoting carer friendly employment practices.

Owton Manor West Neighbourhood Watch & Residents Association (£35,000 for 2006/7 and £23,000 for 2007/8) the provision of job search, information, advice and guidance services and direct training interventions for local residents in the Owton Manor area which experiences the highest level of worklessness in the town. The project will be delivered from premises at Brierton Shops and will also offer direct employment opportunities through a printing social enterprise.

West View Project 18-24 year old (£30,000 for 2006/7 and £20,000 for 2007/8) the provision of a 12 to 30+ week programme operating one day per week with an expedition component towards the end with the aim of developing self-esteem, confidence and motivation. The programme also offers accredited outcomes through the Youth Achievement Award process and accredits the acquisition of skills with national governing body awards.

Grange Road Methodist Church Resource Centre (£30,000 for 2006/7 and £20,000 for 2007/8) to provide a wide range of learning and social opportunities for all sections of the community at the Community Resource Centre in Tankerville Street with a focus on helping to prepare people for employment. Training courses will be provided in computing, first aid, food hygiene, languages, numeracy and literacy. The project will also deliver a employment/social skills initiative for adults with learning disabilities to prepare them for independent living and participation in the jobs market.

RESPECT (£6,892 for 2006/7) to provide flexible monitoring support to young people aged 16-19 that are at risk of being excluded from education, training and employment. Support will be provided 7 days per week, 365 days per year and 5 evenings a week. The flexible approach to service delivery enables users to address emotional, personal and social problems before they impact on their education, employment or training record.

3. There is an additional project - HVDA Business Support Project – that was initially not funded due to the level of funding available in the budget. This is currently being reviewed and a verbal update will be provided at the meeting.

4. At the Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2006 a number of projects within the Jobs & Economy Theme were agreed for continuation. The allocations for these projects have been agreed by the Economic Forum and the Hartlepool Partnership and are included below for your approval:

Targeted Training (£51,956 for 2006/7) to offer programmes of training to potential employees to meet the skills needs of new or existing businesses who are looking to recruit local people.

Women's Opportunities (£38,454 for 2006/7) to offer employment-focused training for women in Hartlepool particularly lone parents, those returning to work having been on benefits and those who have never worked or who are returning to the workforce after some time.

Jobs Build (£80,792 for 2006/7) to help local companies with their recruitment process.

Workroute ILM (£143,000 for 2006/7) to help unemployed people to achieve their career aspirations through training and work-placements, with the prospect of regular employment. This project covers the environmental, construction, administration, childcare, plumbing and health and fitness sectors.

Hartlepool Worksmart (£45,000 for 2006/7) to provide small and medium enterprise's in Hartlepool with human resource advice and training with the overall aim of improving the employment offer.

Enhancing Employability (£28,000 for 2006/7) providing a package of activities to improve basic skills and assistance for residents into employment by involving employers in pre-16 education.

Progression to Work (£100,000 for 2006/7) providing local people with disabilities or health problems employment for a period of up to 9 months, with associated work experience, training and personal development.

Volunteering into Employment (£76,334 for 2006/7) targeting residents to stimulate and encourage interest in volunteering and community activity, using volunteering as a springboard into paid work and/or training to NVQ level 2 and above.

Incubation Systems and Business Skills Training (£175,000) offering a multi-package approach to business creation and growth, bringing together existing mainstream provision with additional support to stimulate VAT registrations.

Business & Tourism Marketing (£24,456 for 2006/7) aims to promote a positive image of the town through various marketing activities, using the strengths of both the business and tourism offers.

Community Employment Outreach (£150,000 for 2006/7) providing community based employment and training information, advice and guidance services to people living in the NRF areas, particularly focusing on the NAP priorities.

Brougham Enterprise Centre (£120,000 for 2006/07) contributing towards the capital costs of the redevelopment of the facility. This project is discussed further in the NRF 2005-06 Final Outturn Report that is also being considered at this meeting.

6. LIFELONG LEARNING THEME

1. At the Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2006 it was agreed that a proportion of the Jobs & Economy NRF, £215,000 for 2006/7 and £215,000 for 2007/8, would be directed towards upskilling to provide Hartlepool with a good workforce for the future. Responsibility for developing this programme was given to the Lifelong Learning Partnership. The finalised budget is set out below with allocations for 2007/8 subject to satisfactory evaluation of the first year of the project:

Active Skills –West View Project (£25,000 for 2006/7 and £25,000 for 2007/8) to offer young people and adults aged 16+ the opportunity to engage in activity that results in recognised awards and develops skills that they are able to transfer into the world of work and employment.

Hartlepool Deaf Centre (£30,000 for 2006/7 and £30,000 for 2007/8) to facilitate training of British Sign Language up to level 3 and above in order to 'upskill' adults and enable them to gain employment in the sign language field.

Career Coaching – HVDA (£32,000 for 2006/7 and £32,000 for 2007/8) to provide career coaching to those involved in the Volunteering Service co-ordinated by HVDA. Career coaching will assist individuals to expand their learning opportunities, overcome barriers to their personal advancement, gain confidence and self-esteem and improve training course completion rates.

Level 3 Progression (£79,000 for 2006/7 and £79,000 for 2007/8) providing intensive support to re-engage young people who have achieved NVQ level 2 and have dropped out and support those currently on a level 2 course to progress to NVQ level 3. Support will be individualised and based around a

number of elements including transition workshops, one to one support and study skills support.

Hartlepool “On Track” Project (£45,000 for 2006/7 and £45,000 for 2007/8) to re-engage young people aged 16-19, living within the NRF area, particularly those from vulnerable groups, who are NEET or at risk of becoming NEET, in education, employment and training opportunities. The vulnerable groups will include looked after children, care leavers, Black and Minority Ethnic Groups, young parents, young carers, those dependent upon drugs/alcohol and young offenders.

Lifelong Learning Partnership Administration (£4,000 for 2006/7 and £4,000 for 2007/8) to provide support to partnership activities such as assisting with the monitoring of NRF lifelong learning projects and the administration of the partnership meetings and webpages.

7. ENVIRONMENT THEME

1. At the Portfolio Holder meeting in January 2006 the continuation of the Environmental Action Team and the development of an Environmental Education initiative were agreed. The Environment Partnership and Hartlepool Partnership have approved the allocations for these projects and they are put forward for your endorsement:

Environmental Action Team (£100,000 for 2006/7 and £90,000 for 2007/8) to continue the work of the team in the Dyke House/Jackson neighbourhood and to investigate the opportunity to roll out the service across the neighbourhoods.

School Environmental Action Officer (£23,731 for 2006/7 and £16,270 for 2007/8) to work with schools and the wider school community to increase knowledge, skills and accessibility to environmental opportunities therefore equipping pupils and residents to make informed decisions regarding environmental issues and to take positive action to improve their environment.

8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

1. The Council and the Hartlepool Partnership will benefit from significant additional financial resources to 2008. The funding will potentially enable successful elements of the current NRF programme to continue although the mainstreaming of interventions into partners core budgets is increasingly becoming more important and will be critical in 2008.

9. RECOMMENDATION

1. The Portfolio Holder is recommended to endorse the decision of the Hartlepool Partnership Board by agreeing to fund the projects outlined in the report.

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23 June 2006



Report of: Head of Neighbourhood Management

Subject: HEADLAND ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPROVEMENTS 2006/07

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek approval to proceed with the implementation of Environmental Improvement schemes forming part of the North Hartlepool Partnerships Headland Environmental Improvement Programme.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report provides background on the HEIPAP and HEIKRA programme, the funding available, details of the schemes produced and consultations undertaken.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The proposed schemes form part of the continuing regeneration of the Headland within the North Hartlepool Partnerships programme and therefore of interest to the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key decision (test (i) applies.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder, with separate approval from North Hartlepool Partnership Board.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is requested to approve the implementation and adoption of the proposed works, as already approved by the NHP Board.

Report of: Head of Neighbourhood Management

Subject: HEADLAND ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPROVEMENTS 2006 / 07

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek approval to proceed with the implementation of Environmental Improvement schemes forming part of the North Hartlepool Partnership's Headland Environmental Improvement Programme.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The NHP has entered into its final year and the NHP Board, at their meeting on 16 December 2005, received a list of potential environmental improvements to be implemented in 2006/07.
- 2.2 The five projects endorsed by NHP Board at its meeting on 16 December 2005 are:
- Croft Gardens: replace paving at existing entrances and provide new entrance adjacent to the Harbour of Refuge Public House.
 - Fish Sands: provide new lighting and Paving to Sandwell Gate and provide down-lighting onto Fish sands promenade area.
 - Fairy Cove Terrace: an environmental improvement scheme to include a Gun to reflect the link to the Heugh Gun Battery.
 - Plaque next to Heugh Gun Battery: refurbish Plaque honouring the fall of the first soldier on British Soil during WW1.
 - St Mary's Church Railings: replace existing railings and copings to Church boundary.
- 2.4 One more project endorsed by the NHP Board at its meeting on 26 May 2006 is the provision of a car parking area to the rear of the CO-OP (Graham Street).
- 2.5 Headland residents were invited to attend a public consultation event of the proposals in the Borough Hall on Monday 15 May 2006 between 4pm and 7pm. A total of 39 members of the public attended the event. All those attending were asked to complete a feedback sheet expressing a preference and providing additional comments. The great majority of the respondents supported the proposals. The original feedback sheets will be available for scrutiny at the Portfolio Holder meeting.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Funding of £134,200 has been allocated with remaining HEIPAP/ HEIKRA budgets for the works at each of the above sites, as follows:

• Croft Gardens	£18,500
• Fish Sands	£19,500
• Fairy Cove Terrace	£37,000
• Plaque	£1,000
• St Mary's Railings	£8,200
• Car Park to Rear of Co-op (Graham Street)	£50,000

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Portfolio Holder is requested to:

- 4.1 Note the contents of the report and consider the decisions taken by the NHP Board on 16 December 2005 and 26 May 2006 in deciding whether to approve the implementation of the above schemes.
- 4.2 Authorise officers to progress with the development of the individual schemes, including obtain the necessary Planning Consent/Approvals.

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23 June 2006



Report of: The Assistant Director, (Planning & Economic Development)

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF WORK & PENSIONS CITY STRATEGY

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide the Portfolio Holder with details of the Department of Work & Pensions City Strategy programme and highlight the opportunities this presents for Hartlepool.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report provides an overview of the City Strategy programme, key milestones and the implications for Hartlepool.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Worklessness is a key element of the Portfolio Holder's area of responsibility

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Approval granted to submit Expression of Interest

Report of: The Assistant Director (Planning & Economic Development)

Subject: DEPARTMENT OF WORK & PENSIONS CITY STRATEGY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To provide the Portfolio Holder with details of the Department of Work & Pensions City Strategy programme and highlight the opportunities this represents for Hartlepool.

2. BACKGROUND

1. In the Government Green Paper 'A new deal for welfare: Empowering people into work, the government set out its long-term aim to achieve an employment rate of 80% for the working age population. To deliver this aim the Government has developed a new strategy that will address local areas that suffer from high levels of worklessness, poverty, low skills and poor health. The City Strategy has been devised with this aim in mind and recognises that local stakeholders can deliver better results where interventions are aligned and integrated within a series of shared priorities and actions. This new approach also offers an opportunity for local freedoms and flexibilities to be introduced that help deliver mainstream provision in a way that achieves better and more focussed results.
2. The City Strategy programme will be targeted at 10-15 towns and cities with the worst labour market position in the first instance and pathfinder areas will be created that will assist in the development of innovative ways to achieve high levels of employment activity in deprived areas.
3. The key aims of the City Strategy will be the development of a consortium of local stakeholders from the public, private and voluntary sectors that will delivery an integrated and co-ordinated programme of employment support that will improve the prospects of jobless residents. The main features of this approach will be:
 - A multi-agency consortium coming together to increase employment rates, with clear employer involvement;
 - The development of agreed local priorities and the creation of an evidence based delivery plan, which includes the integration of funding and other resources.

- The agreement of stretching outcomes and targets with Government that provides a clear focus on raising employment rates. Targets should be reflected within the Local Area Agreement and the additionality that the City Strategy offers will need to be explicitly identified.
 - Local consortia will be the lead partnership for tackling worklessness and should be embedded within the existing Local Strategic Partnership structure.
4. The development of the City Strategy must be a bottom up approach that focuses on neighbourhoods and areas that are furthest away from the Government's aspirational target of an 80% Employment Rate. It is expected that the number of successful pathfinder bids will be small, however this will be determined by the quality of proposals submitted. Underpinning the programme will be an opportunity for areas to think innovatively about the way in which worklessness is tackled and to design approaches that are relevant to local need. However there are some basic principles that are prescribed by Government:
- Outcomes will need to be measurable and make a considerable improvement in the level of employment in pathfinder areas;
 - Improve engagement with the labour market, provide training that equips people with the skills necessary to secure and retain employment, develop demand led approaches that bring local people and vacancies together in a matched approach to local recruitment and develop good recruitment practices within the local labour market;
 - Proposals should ensure priorities and resources are aligned across organisations and complement local strategies and action plans;
 - Membership of the Consortium will be determined locally, however it is expected that it will include Job Centre Plus, Learning & Skills Council, Local Authorities, Key employers and the Voluntary / community sector.
5. Hartlepool has been invited to submit an expression of interest to become one of these pathfinders and outline proposals will need to be submitted by 3 July 2006.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

1. There are no financial implications for Hartlepool Borough Council. The City Strategy is not a major source of new money, although £5 million is available as 'seed-corn' funding to help develop local consortiums. The expectation is that proposals will seek to use existing resources in a way that improves performance and local results. There will also be access to the new Department of Work and Pensions Deprived Area Fund (DAF) and allocations for each area will be made on the basis of need relating to the scale of worklessness in each area.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR HARTLEPOOL

1. The invitation to Hartlepool to submit an expression of interest reflects the still significant gap between Hartlepool's employment rate and the national figure, despite the range of measures which have been used locally to seek to address this issue over recent years. As such there is a strong presumption that Hartlepool should respond positively to the invitation. It should be to our advantage that the local authority already works closely at an operational level with many of the likely key members within a consortium approach, including agencies and key employers.
2. Discussions have already been initiated with likely partners with a view to expressing an interest. The information requirements for this first stage is relatively brief (**See attached proforma at Appendix 1**). The main emphasis of the expression of interest will be about using existing resources more effectively, cutting across organisational boundaries so that interventions can be targeted geographically at areas of greatest need with increased results.
3. Whilst, as indicated, this initiative appears to offer more in the way of improved partnership working, freedoms and flexibilities than in the form of financial resources, it clearly would be advantageous to pursue this opportunity.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the Portfolio holder authorise the submission of an Expression of Interest for Hartlepool to become a pathfinder for the City Strategy programme, with details of the submissions content to be referred to the Portfolio Holder prior to submission.

Appendix 1

Proforma for Expressions of Interest for DWP City Strategy

In completing this proforma, you will wish to refer to the accompanying guidance note. Completed forms must be returned by 12.00pm on Monday 3rd July 2006. They should be emailed to city-strategy@dwp.gsi.gov.uk, or sent in hard copy to:

City Strategy 'Expression of Interest'
City Strategy Project Team
Department for Work and Pensions
Area 5, 2nd floor, The Adelphi
1-11 John Adam Street
London, WC2N 6HT

Late submissions will not be accepted. If you are sending hard copies, we recommend that you retain some form of proof of delivery.

Expression of interest for DWP city strategy	
Please state the city or town to which this expression of interest relates:	
Main contact for this expression of interest:	
Position held:	
Address:	
Telephone:	
E-mail:	

What geographical focus do you propose for your consortium? Why is this the most appropriate focus? Please attach a list of wards covered.

--

Briefly outline the labour market and skills demand context in which your consortium will operate, including significant future trends.

--

What are the key supply-side issues in your area? Which disadvantaged groups will your consortium therefore focus on?

--

What organisations – including public sector bodies, employers and, where appropriate, private and voluntary sector organisations – will come together to form your consortium?

How will your consortium integrate the efforts of all partners behind chosen priorities? What will change as a result?

Do national policies or practices throw up any barriers to partnership working or efficient delivery at local level? For each barrier please state:

- the precise nature of the problem
- how you would like to see this overcome

how, and how much, performance would improve as a result

Barrier 1

Barrier 2

Barrier 3

What will your consortium achieve for its target groups, over and above existing targets? Please briefly explain how you have arrived at these targets. Who will be accountable for their achievement?

Please outline a robust system for tracking performance against your consortium's targets.

What will be the impact of your proposal on the wider LAA (or LAAs) - or equivalent - and other existing employment and skills strategies or initiatives?

How will governance arrangements need to change to accommodate and support new ways of working under your consortium? How will this fit with and relate to existing regional or local structures?

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23 June 2006



Report of: The Assistant Director, (Planning & Economic Development)

Subject: LOCAL ENTERPRISE GROWTH INITIATIVE
ROUND 2

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the Portfolio Holder on the progression of Hartlepool's Round 2 Local Enterprise Growth Initiative.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report outlines the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative, the national objectives and local arrangements for developing a Round 2 proposal for Hartlepool.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Enterprise is a key element of the Portfolio Holder's area of responsibility

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non Key

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

That the Portfolio holder authorise the submission of a Round 2 Local Enterprise Growth Initiative proposal with details of the content to be referred to the Portfolio Holder prior to submission.

Report of: The Assistant Director (Planning & Economic Development)

Subject: LOCAL ENTERPRISE GROWTH INITIATIVE
ROUND 2

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To provide the Portfolio Holder with details of the next round of bidding for Local Enterprise Growth Initiative and arrangements for the development of Hartlepool's proposal.

2. BACKGROUND

1. The Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) was announced by the Chancellor in his 2005 Budget and aims to release the economic and productivity potential of the most deprived local areas across the country through enterprise and investment thereby boosting local incomes and employment opportunities, and building sustainable communities. The aim is supported by three national-level pillars:

- To increase total entrepreneurial activity among the population in deprived local areas;
- To support the sustainable growth and reduce the failure rate of locally-owned business in deprived areas;
- To attract appropriate investment and franchising into deprived areas, making use of local labour resources.

Eligible areas are Local Authorities in receipt of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding, and successful proposals must meet the assessment criteria outlined in the seven bullet points below:

- the need for the proposal (providing robust evidence of market failure) and its potential to succeed;
- effective targeting and effective solutions (ensuring that people living in deprived areas benefit and address the fundamental barriers to growth - what will be done and why it will work where other things have not?);

- integration with local partnerships and consistency with Regional Economic Strategies;
 - compatibility with the outcomes and targets in the Local Area Agreement and the ability to secure leverage from broader regeneration efforts;
 - the value added and value for money of proposed activities and interventions;
 - significant commitment and sustainability (of resources over the long term, including after LEGI support has ended); and
 - evaluation and evidence building (to inform continuous improvement and the development of future policy);
2. Hartlepool submitted a proposal in Round 1 which was unsuccessful, the detail of which has been reported previously.
 3. Round 2 presents an opportunity for Hartlepool to build upon the strengths of the Round 1 bid, reflect on the weaknesses highlighted during the appraisal process and develop a competitive proposal for consideration by both the Regional and National appraisal panel. The development of the proposal will be co-ordinated by Hartlepool Borough Council, with a Working Group of the Economic Forum providing strategic direction. This is a similar approach to the Round 1 development, but further representation has been added from Business Link, Learning & Skills Council, Job Centre Plus and Hartlepool College of Further Education. This will enable the proposal to demonstrate a high degree of cohesion and integration with mainstream public sector enterprise and employment interventions.
 4. The Economic Forum Working Group met on 1 June 2006 with a view to agreeing the way forward for the Round 2 proposal. The Working Group agreed that the framework of the proposal would build on the three national pillars outlined in paragraph 1, but with a clear localised focus. In addition the Working Group also agreed the timetable for developing the Round 2 proposal, key milestone include:
 - National Event – 22 May 2006
 - Agree Outline Framework – 1 June 2006
 - Submit proposal for Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor – 14 June 2006
 - Meeting to discuss additional evidence requirements – 14 June 2006
 - Regional Event – 19 June 2006
 - Assessment of Round 1 winners – 4 July 2006
 - Review Interventions from Round 1 – 4 July 2006

- Invite new interventions – 4 July 2006
 - Presentation to LSP – 14 July 2006
 - Draft 1 of the evidence base – 17 July 2006
 - Finalise proposal interventions – 2 August 2006
 - Finalise interventions and allocation of resources – 3 August 2006
 - 1st Draft completed – 10 August 2006
 - Independent review of 1st draft – 17 August 2006
 - Final version – 8 September 2006
5. Additional support is also available to help develop the bid through Government Office for the North East in the form of five days assistance from a Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor, the Working Group agreed that the support required includes:
- Facilitating 4 Working Group meetings
 - 2 Days evaluating plausibility of interventions
 - 2 Days analysing draft and undertaking review workshop

A brief will be submitted to Government Office requesting this support at the earliest opportunity.

6. The Working Group also agreed that a consultant would be appointed to assist in presenting the proposal to maximum effect utilising the LEGL development funding awarded by Government Office for the North East. Furthermore the Working Group also proposed that an additional business representative with a marketing background be co-opted to the Working Group to assist in the presentation of the proposal.

3. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

1. Costs associated with the development of this proposal will be borne by the pump prime funding allocated by Government Office for the North East prior to the submission of the first proposal.
2. Feedback from the Round 1 process highlighted that Hartlepool's proposal requested a high level of resource, compared with the potential impact the interventions would have on the local economy. With this in mind an analysis of the ten winning proposals was undertaken in relation to the amount of resource allocated to each, compared to level of population. This indicates that the level of resource the Round 2 bid should amount to is between £5.4 million and £7.9 million over the first three years of the programme, rather than the £18 million that was proposed in the first bid.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR HARTLEPOOL

1. The Local Enterprise Growth Initiative represents an opportunity for Hartlepool to build on the improving economic performance of the last ten years, develop proposals that will continue this work and help to increase levels of entrepreneurial activity, business growth and employment rates of local residents.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the Portfolio holder authorise the submission of a Round 2 Local Enterprise Growth Initiative proposal with details of the submissions content to be referred to the Portfolio Holder prior to submission.

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23rd June 2006



Report of: The Head of Regeneration

Subject: TEES VALLEY SINGLE PROGRAMME –
PROGRESS REPORT

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek the Portfolio Holder's agreement for the Borough Council to continue its role as the Accountable Body for the Hartlepool Single Programme Package, and to provide a progress update on the Hartlepool Package for 2005/06 and 2006/07.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

1. The report provides a brief background to the Council adopting the role as the Accountable Body for the Hartlepool Single Programme Package, and advises of the need to renew this commitment in relation to the current three-year programme. The report also provides information on progress and expenditure on the Hartlepool Package in 2005/06 and proposals for 2006/07.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

1. Management of the Single Programme Fund falls within the remit of the Portfolio Holder.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

1. Non-Key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

1. Portfolio Holder meeting 23rd June 2006.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

1. The Portfolio Holder is requested to:-
 - i) Approve the Council's continued role as Accountable Body for the Hartlepool Single Programme Package
 - ii) Note progress on schemes included in the 20005/06 programme
 - iii) Endorse the proposals included in the 2006/07 programme.

Report of: The Head of Regeneration

Subject: TEES VALLEY SINGLE PROGRAMME –
PROGRESS REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek the Portfolio Holder's agreement for the Borough Council to continue its role as the Accountable Body for the Hartlepool Single Programme Package, and to provide an update of progress on the Hartlepool Package for 2005/06 and 2006/07.

2. BACKGROUND

1. The Single Programme is one of the Governments main strategic economic development and regeneration programmes. Regional responsibility for the Programme lies with One NorthEast but under devolved arrangements most of its programme is managed by the Tees Valley Partnership which is comprised of representatives of the five local authorities and key economic development/support and regeneration agencies such as Business Link, the Learning and Skills Council, Tees Valley Regeneration and the University of Teesside.
2. Local Package Management Groups have been established in the five Tees Valley local authority areas to appraise manage and monitor local projects with the local authorities taking on the role of Accountable Body. In effect, the Accountable Body is the legal entity nominated to act on behalf of the Tees Valley Partnership to take responsibility for the receipt and use of the Single Programme Grant and the realization of the associated business plan. As the Accountable Body, the Council must sign a legal agreement accepting a series of obligations relating to financial and programme management arrangements. This agreement has to be renewed periodically and the new agreement is set to run from April 2006 to March 2009.

3. SINGLE PROGRAMME DELIVERY PLAN 2005/06

1. The Single Programme is operated on the basis of 3 year Business Plans, with funding being approved annually by One NorthEast. The current Business Plan period runs from April 2005 the March 2008.

2. Within the current Business Plan, the resource allocation for the Hartlepool Package has been limited (compared to previous years). This in some measure is a reflection of previous successes in bringing forward and delivering schemes, partly in view of ongoing commitments towards the Queens Meadow Incubator Units and partly because of the prioritization of a significant proportion of the Tees Valley Programme towards Tees Valley Regeneration projects, including Victoria Harbour. In effect resources for new project activities within the Hartlepool Package are restricted to approximately £375,000 per year. This allocation was prioritised towards activities under the Coastal Arc banner, specifically the Central Area Attractors scheme which seeks to enhance, develop and integrate facilities around the Historic Quay, HMS Trincomalee and Wingfield Castle.
3. Work commenced in January on the first of a two phased Central Area Attractors programme straddling 3 financial years. Activities have included the moving of the Wingfield Castle into dry dock in order to carry out essential repairs; enhancement of existing visitor and disabled access facilities on board and the creation of educational and conference facilities; improvements to the current Fighting Ships audio visual display and the integration of the HMS Trincomalee story and displays.
4. Despite the initial funding restrictions outlined above, two major successes were the receipt of funding for two additional projects following projected underspends elsewhere within the Tees Valley programme. The approvals were; £650,000 towards the Brougham Enterprise Centre development project to go alongside an allocation of £620,000 from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, and; £1.84 million over two years towards a £6.2 million scheme by Rivergreen Developments to provide 80,000 sq. ft. of flexible workspace at Queens Meadow.
5. In terms of scheme progress, despite funding approvals only being granted relatively late in the year, significant progress was made on the Brougham Enterprise Centre project by the end of March. Agreement was then reached with Tees Valley Partnership to carry any underspend over into 2006/07, whilst some spend was also allowed to be brought forward on the Central Area Attractors in order to help with budget management. Unfortunately, the Rivergreen development was not commenced within the financial year primarily because the company was involved in completing another project elsewhere in the region. Agreement was, however, given by the Partnership to allow Single Programme funding for the scheme to be re-profiled into 2006/07 and 2007/08. The table below sets out the originally anticipated and actual Single Programme expenditure for the last financial year.

6. A number of projects approved in previous financial years continued to be supported by the Single Programme in 2005/06. These included the Tees Valley Centre for Offshore and High Value Engineering project which addresses issues of workforce development and recruitment in the Cluster of Offshore and High Value engineering, via a partnership between Hartlepool College of Further Education and businesses.
7. Other projects that continued in 2005/06 with Single Programme support have included Building Futures a collaborative Intermediate Labour Market Project, Queens Meadow Marketing and the Coastal Arc Marketing and Events Project.

Single Programme Expenditure 2005/6

Project	Original Allocation	Outturn Expenditure
Brougham Incubators	£650,000	£248,000
Central Area Attractors 2	£361,731	£414,000
Building Futures	£360,466	£354,938.60
Offshore Engineering	£60,000	£60,000
Queens Meadow Marketing	£28,000	£28,000
Coastal Arc Coordinator	£32,772	£32,772
Marketing & Events	£120,781	£118,117
Management & Admin	£60,000	£60,000
Seaport	£13,269	£10,859.52

4 SINGLE PROGRAMME DELIVERY PLAN 2007/08

1. There are no new projects included in the Hartlepool Package for 2006/07. The main activity will be on the completion of the Brougham Enterprise Centre scheme and the progression of the Rivergreen development and the Central Area Attractor project. In relation to the latter project, it is expected that the phase 1 works will be completed late summer whilst, subject to the securing of match funding contributions from the Heritage Lottery, European Regional Development Fund and other sources, phase 2 should commence later in the financial year and carry over into 2007/8. Single Programme budget allocations for this year are set out in the table below.

Single Programme Allocations 2006/07

Project	Allocation
Management & Admin	£60,000
Building Futures	£753,010
Coastal Arc Co-ordinator	£38,919
Coastal Arc Marketing	£60,000
Coastal Arc Events (HBC)	£5,000
Coastal Arc Events (R&CBC)	£4,500

Central Area Attractors	£309,974
INTERREG Joint Costs	£12,601
Brougham Incubators	£402,000
Rivergreen	Awaiting exact figures and budget profile from One NorthEast for 2006/07.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Projects within the Single Programme package have been individually appraised and approved. Specific contributions from the Council have been previously approved for example in relation to the Central Area Attractors and Brougham Enterprise Centre. This combined with the fact that there are currently no new projects coming forward within 2006/07, means that there are no direct financial implications for the council arising from this report.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Portfolio Holder is requested to:-
 - i) approve the Council's continued role as Accountable Body for the Hartlepool Single Programme Package
 - ii) note progress on schemes included in the 20005/06 programme
 - iii) endorse the proposals included in the 2006/07 programme.

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23 June 2006



Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning
Services

Subject: NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFERENCE
FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Portfolio Holder is requested to endorse the response made by the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services to the Government's National Strategic Reference Framework consultation document.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report outlines the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) Consultation to date and the response for Hartlepool Borough Council as outlined in the report. The NSRF will determine the priorities for European Structural Funds from 2007 to 2013 across the UK. It will be used to determine what the funds will be used for and how the funds will be distributed across the UK in broad terms. Each Region will then develop its own specific details in an Operational Programme.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

Economic Development Issue.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Regeneration, Liveability & Housing Portfolio 23 June 2006

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The Portfolio Holder is advised to endorse the response to the National Strategic Reference Framework consultation by the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services.

Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFERENCE FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The Portfolio Holder is requested to endorse the response made by the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services on the Council's behalf to the Government's National Strategic Reference Framework consultation document.

2. BACKGROUND

1. The National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) will determine the priorities for Structural Funds from 2007 to 2013 and be used to allocate both European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) and European Social Funds (ESF) for the new programmes.

3. CONSULTATION

1. The DTI issued the draft (NSRF) for consultation the 28th of February 2006 with responses required by the 22 May 2006.
2. It is anticipated that the UK will receive approximately 9.4 billion Euros for 2007-2013 compared to 15.85 billion Euros for 2000-2006.
3. This will be divided into:
Objective 1 - Convergence 2.6 billion Euros This objective will assist those areas with GDP of less than 75% of the EU average. In the UK these are Cornwall and West Wales and the Valleys. Its aim is to help the economies of these areas to grow and ultimately achieve at least the average EU GDP while improving the environment and social conditions at the same time.
Objective 2 - Competitiveness and Employment 6.2 billion Euros This objective covers the rest of the UK. Its aim is to build the competitiveness of these areas and improve the skills of the population so that more people can obtain work. This consultation is about this objective. The major consideration is how and where these funds are allocated.
Objective 3 - Cooperation 0.6 billion Euros This objective is to provide funding for international and interregional co-operation. It will provide

funding to tackle common problems and challenges and spread best practice across the EU. It is available in specific programme areas. Hartlepool is eligible for the North Sea and the North Western Europe Programmes.

4. Hartlepool will be eligible for Objective 2 and 3. However this consultation is only about Objective 2.
5. The broad aims and objectives which the Competitiveness and Employment funding set out to achieve are:
Making Europe and its regions more attractive places to invest and work
Improving knowledge and innovation for growth
Creation more and better jobs
6. The NSRF sets out the proposed UK strategy about how this might be done and requests comments on 11 specific questions for the programme in England.
7. To work out a detailed response to the consultation Hartlepool Borough Council officers have worked with officers from the other Tees Valley Local Authorities and JSU to prepare the Tees Valley response and worked with the European Officers Group to prepare the Regional response. The European officer participated in a workshop of the Alliance for Regional Aid, who represent most Local Authorities who have a large proportion of employment in manufacturing and were eligible to Objective 2 funding in the current programme, on the NSRF to develop a common position to report to DTI.
8. As the deadline for replying to the consultation was during the election period it was agreed with the Portfolio Holder that the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services would write to DTI to confirm that Hartlepool Borough Council supported the Tees Valley response to the consultation and that this would go to the Portfolio Holder for endorsement at your regular meeting. The Tees Valley response to the consultation is attached to this report as **Appendix 1**.
9. The Tees Valley response is a fairly technical reply to the consultation but the main issues for Hartlepool are:
 - The strengths and weaknesses outlined in the NSRF are the general UK picture but local variations and needs must be taken into account when developing the regional Operational Programme.
 - The infrastructure of Hartlepool has been greatly improved in recent years but the NSRF should not categorically rule out all infrastructure work, as more still needs to be done.
 - The priorities of the Lisbon agenda (improving skills and employment) are important but eligible activities need to be flexible enough to meet local needs.

- Using the 50/50 split between ERDF and ESF is not the best use of funding. We still have a much larger need for ERDF to fund support for local projects and infrastructure.
- We support the alignment of Structural Funds and Domestic Funding but not to the extent that it takes away the flexibility to meet local needs. Co-financing of ESF with the LSC and Job Centre+ in the last programme was too focused in meeting National targets and excluded some local needs and organisations. If co-financing is to be used in the new programme it needs more local control.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Portfolio Holder endorses the response to the National Strategic Reference Framework by the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services as outlined above.

**Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit Submission to the DTI National Strategic
Reference Framework Consultation.
May 2006**

Summary of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit Response

- I. Tees Valley has suffered from the unfair inclusion of extra region directly leading to exclusion as a Statistical Effect Regions under the Convergence Objective. We call upon the UK Government to make some commitment within the NRSF to allocate additional ERDF funding compensation.
- II. The structural funds must be used reduce the persistent gap in growth rates between regions. There is little sense in spending valuable Structural Funds on the UK richest areas that are concentrated in southern England,
- III. The proposed 50/50 split between ERDF and ESF programmes is unacceptable: ERDF must be prioritised.
- IV. We advocate a stronger regional focus for ESF than outlined in the NRSF.
- V. Alignment of EU funds with domestic funding streams must involve adaptation in both directions. Structural funds must adhere to the principle of additionality.
- VI. Any erosion of local democratic input would be unacceptable

1. Introductory Remarks

1.i The Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit, (JSU) provides support for the boroughs of Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar & Cleveland, Stockton-on-Tees and the Tees Valley Partnership, with a remit to ensure that the decisions and actions of European institutions and national government maximise the attraction of external resources to the sub-region and to ensure that the policies adopted by these organisations cater or the needs of the sub-region.

1.ii The JSU is pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the national consultation. This response is the result of discussions within the JSU and partner operations, including representatives from the Tees Valley Partnership, Tees Valley FE Colleges, Teesside University, and the Tees Valley Voluntary Community Sector. Our comments are based on the English chapter in the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) rather than the chapters dedicated to arrangements in Scotland and Northern Ireland.

1.iii. The guidelines make it clear that Member States may determine the final allocation of its Competitiveness funding across its regions either using the allocation methodology agreed at the European Council or by adopting a modified approach. We support the UK Government decision to use a customised funding allocation.

1.iv We welcome the policy context that there is a Government commitment to make sustainable improvements in the economic performance of all English regions and reduce the persistent gap in growth rates between the regions. This should allow the government to target areas that are undergoing major structural changes or those areas that are in serious relative decline when compared with other areas.

1.v The single indicator for inclusion to EU Convergence status is Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per head at current market prices relative to the EU 15, averaged for the period 2001-2003. To be eligible for transitional effect funding, the value of the indicator for a territory must be less than 75 per cent of the EU15 average. Four English regions, Tees Valley-Durham, Cumbria, Lincolnshire and Merseyside have suffered from the unfair inclusion of extra region, which results in inflated GDP figures and directly led to their exclusion as Statistical Effect Regions under the Convergence Objective.

1.vi Our principal concern is that because of the unique circumstances of extra region the EU does not recognize the economic need of these regions and sufficient structural funding has not been allocated to aid economic regeneration. In England the Government has committed itself to “reduce the persistent gap in growth rates between regions” (HM Treasury 2004) and it is these very regions that display the lowest rate of growth.

Table 1 (Source: ONS/Tees Valley JSU)

Headline Gross Value Added (GVA), Per Head By NUTS2				
Area At Current Basic Prices: Bottom 5 GVA per head Growth Rate				
	£m 1995	£m 2003	% dif 03 v 95	2003 Index UK=100
UNITED KINGDOM	11 015	16 485	50	100%
England	10 956	16 521	51	100%
<i>NUTS Level 2</i>				
East Riding & North Lincs	10 208	13 597	33	82%
Lincolnshire.	9 384	12 489	33	76%
West Wales and the Valleys.	7 983	10 578	33	64%
Tees Valley and Durham.	8 995	11 637	29	71%
Cumbria.	9 980	12 217	22	74%

1.vii. Whilst we acknowledge that it is not possible for the UK to fully compensate these areas for the loss of structural funding from the UK allocation of EU Competitiveness & Employment, we do expect the UK Government to make some

commitment within the NRSF to allocate additional ERDF funding to these regions and provide maximum flexibility on how those additional funds could be spent.

1.viii. Our response has also been informed by our joint work with partners in Durham, Lincolnshire, Merseyside and Cumbria, which are also experiencing similar problems of economic decline.

2. Tees Valley

2.i The Tees Valley has a population of 650,000 people, almost half of whom live within the Teesside conurbation – Middlesbrough, Stockton and Redcar. It displays a polycentric settlement pattern based around the Teesside conurbation and the main towns of Darlington and Hartlepool. Tees Valley still has a strong manufacturing base that contributes nationally to exports. It is important to encourage the Tees Valley manufacturing industry to innovate and improve its productivity. At the same time, we need to develop a service economy particularly in financial and business services.

2.ii. Our key economic challenge is grow the Tees Valley economy faster than the UK economy to narrow the gap in Gross Value Added. GVA per head in the Tees Valley is significantly lower than the rest of the country. The primary cause of the widening gap has been the decline of the manufacturing employment – almost 90,000 jobs were lost in manufacturing between 1971 and 2003. There is an urgent need to increase the stock of businesses in the Tees Valley – in terms of business formation the Tees Valley performs way behind the rest of the UK.

2.iii. We also need to increase economic activity and reduce worklessness: as a rule of thumb, unemployment rates in the Tees Valley are 1½ times the national average. Alternatively, 32% of our working age population is jobless, compared to 26% in Great Britain. We also recognise the need to place a greater emphasis on upskilling the workforce to obtain NVQ3 and 4 level qualifications and to reduce the people of working age with no qualifications.

2.iv. The Tees Valley City Region Development Programme addresses the key economic challenges and identifies the key economic drivers for the area. It has been published as part of the Northern Way and is endorsed by the Tees Valley local authorities, One NorthEast and the Government Office North East. The proposals and programmes are incorporated into the Regional Spatial Strategy, Regional Economic Strategy, Regional Programmes and One North East's Tees Valley Programme. Vital investments are planned for 2006-2016. This investment programme covers the key geographical areas of growth and investment for the Tees Valley. European funding is needed to address our economic challenges and provide added value to our investment programme.

2.v. The current European funding programme has provided additional funding to enable the sub-region to address some of these problems. The Tees Valley has had projects approved to the value of £97 million in the current Objective 2 Programme (reference Table 2). This has made a real difference, financing many projects that

otherwise would not have happened. The Tees Valley has also benefited from the £200 million North East of England Objective 3 Programme.

2.vi. The sub-region has also benefited from Tier 2 Assisted Area status, and in the past 4 financial years a total of £40 million has been offered to Tees Valley companies under the SFIE, RSA and Enterprise Grants.

2.7 Structural funding is extremely important to the Tees Valley and has been a key component of economic development funding. We urge the UK Government to minimise the cuts to our sub-region.

Table 2 (Source GONE)

European Funds offered to projects delivered in the Tees Valley			
As at 01 April 2006 (£s million)			
<u>Programme Activity</u>	<u>ERDF</u>	<u>ESF</u>	<u>Total</u>
Business Finance	£0.72		£0.72
Business Support	£4.27	£3.40	£7.67
Business Technology	£3.78	£5.11	£8.89
Transfer/Clusters			£0.00
Communities	£18.39	£20.09	£38.48
Investment	£20.27	£0.13	£20.40
Technical Assistance	£0.09	£0.02	£0.11
Sub-Total	£47.52	£28.74	£76.27
<i>Tees Valley Su- Region proportion of ERDF funds offered to projects delivered regionally</i>	<i>£20.74</i>		<i>£20.74</i>
TEES VALLEY GRAND TOTAL	£68.26	£28.74	£97.00

Response to the Questions

Question 1: Do respondents agree with the assessment in the draft NSRF of the Economic Strengths & weaknesses of the UK Nations and regions?

1.1 We agree that the assessment of national strengths and weaknesses is broadly correct, but are concerned that the lack of detail on the disparities between regions will lead to insufficient regional flexibility to accommodate a bottom-up approach.

Question 2: Do respondents agree with the proposed priorities for the future convergence and competitiveness Programmes in England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and Gibraltar?

2.1 We accept that UK national priorities are dictated by Brussels – and do not necessarily reflect the key priorities for individual UK regions. We also accept that the NRSF aims to establish high-level priorities for Structural Funds spending. However, as a region that is economically lagging behind, we do have some concern that the focus of the competitiveness programme for England presupposes that the necessary infrastructure for economic growth is in place, which is not the case in the Tees Valley.

Question 3: Do respondents agree that the proposed priorities include a sufficient focus on the Lisbon Agenda?

3.1 We support the LGIB's position that the NRSF should enable all three pillars of the Lisbon agenda to be addressed through the Structural Funds, where appropriate. However we share their concerns that targets should not be imposed at the national level or on Operational Programmes. Lisbon categories of expenditure may not allow the best mix of actions for every region.

3.2 We also support the LGIB's concern that UK government's focus on lower skills neither fully addresses Lisbon agenda nor the needs of regions. Whilst the Tees Valley has a large part of the workforce with no qualifications, it is important for the Tees Valley economy that an emphasis is placed on upskilling the workforce to obtain NVQ3 and 4 level qualifications.

Question 4: Do respondents agree with the proposals in the NSRF for ensuring consistency between Structural Funds programmes and other EU policies and funding streams, in particular spending under the EAFRD and the EFF?

4.1 We endorse the concept for ensuring consistency between funding streams, but are unclear what the proposals are.

Question 5: Do respondents agree with the proposed architecture for future programmes?

5.1 We support the principle of regional ERDF programmes, but do not expect all regions to have one. The structural funds must be used reduce the persistent gap in growth rates between regions. There is little sense in spending valuable Structural Funds on the UK richest areas that are concentrated in southern England.

5.2. We are concerned that a national programme for ESF in England will not allow enough scope for regional flexibility, especially given the shrinking values of the programme. We are concerned that a national programme will not allow ESF funds to provide added value at a regional level, and that ESF will become harder to integrate with regional ERDF expenditure. We advocate a stronger regional focus than outlined in the NRSF.

5.3. We endorse the LGIB focus on the importance of subsidiarity in the NRSF and maximising flexibility at the local level, including the importance of maintaining and enhancing local and sub-regional partnerships.

5.4 We also endorse the North East Assembly's position that delivery arrangements at the regional level require more clarity, especially with regard to how regional partners, such as Local Authorities and the voluntary sector can influence the process. We need the freedom and flexibility to deliver elements of a regional ERDF programme with delegated funding, so as to better respond to more local priorities. It is important therefore that co-financing does not adversely affect the ability to support, for

example, social inclusion projects where the co-financers themselves have no policy remit in that area.

Question 6: Do respondents agree that the UK's competitiveness allocation should be divided equally between ERDF and the ESF at UK level?

61 We do not agree with the proposed 50:50 split, and consider this to be an arbitrary decision that is not based on a strategic allocation of funding. EU funding allocations should be based on bottom up approach.

6.2. The EU's aim is that "the competitiveness objective will play a key role in avoiding the emergence of new imbalances to the detriment of regions that would otherwise experience the negative effects of unfavourable socioeconomic factors without sufficient public aid" (EU InfoRegio 2004). It is obvious that the European Regional Development Fund is the most appropriate competitiveness fund to help underperforming English regions. Restricting ERDF to 50% of the UK's total competitiveness budget will reduce available monies to those regions. Since the Government is committed to reducing the north-south productivity gap, we advocate that ERDF is prioritised and concentrated in underperforming regions.

Question 7: What are the respondent's views on how best to allocate ERDF Competitiveness funding across the regions?

7.1. We endorse the IPPR report (April 2006) that states that "there is little sense in spending valuable Structural Funds on the UK richest areas that are concentrated in southern England", and strongly urge the Government to concentrate English European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) in the three Northern Way regions together with any other underperforming English region.

7.2 The key economic indicators that highlight underperforming regions are: -

- Gross value added per capita and relative growth rates
- Levels of economic activity/worklessness
- VAT stock per capita
- Low skills

Question 8: What are the respondents' views on how best to allocate ESF Competitiveness funding across the UK's ESF Programmes?

8.1 We do not support an allocation formula driven by population levels, since this would spread the funding too thinly. We reiterate the IPPR position that the structural funds should be concentrated in underperforming English regions.

Question 9: Do respondents have views on how to improve co-ordination between structural fund and domestic funding within England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland?

9.1. Structural funds must adhere to the principle of additionality. Alignment of EU funds with domestic funding streams must involve adaptation in both directions. We

are concerned that the Single Programme does not have a social regeneration focus. In order for improved co-ordination, the RDA's must adopt transparent business processes.

9.2. ESF and ERDF programmes must be aligned. ESF priorities should reflect regional ones, which requires a stronger regional focus for ESF than outlined in the NRSF.

9.3 Operational Programmes should be drawn up in close consultation with regional and local partners – as required by EU law in the General Regulations. We accept that the Operational Programmes will become a delivery mechanism for the Regional Economic Strategy, but have concerns that this may highlight areas of opportunity (often core cities) against areas of need (often hinterland).

9.4 The devil lies in the detail – aligning the outputs, application, approval and monitoring process where both funds are to be accessed would be of great benefit. We obviously acknowledge that the NRSF is not the place to tackle the detail.

Question 10: Do respondents agree with the Governments proposal to align ERDF spending with domestic programmes in England? What are respondent's views on how best to achieve this?

10.1 Some but not all ERDF should be aligned to Single Programme – it may be that other sources of domestic funding would be a more appropriate source of match.

10.1 We understand that 26 different funding streams will be going through the Local Area Agreements by 2007. We urge that European funding initiatives that address local issues should be delivered locally, providing they meet a regional or sub-regional strategy such as the Regional Skills Strategy.

Question 11: Do respondents agree that ESF delivery arrangements should bring together ESF and domestic employment and skills funding in England to allow organisations to access a single funding stream?

11.1 We are concerned that co-financing through LSC and Job Centre plus has been a national policy led initiative. Feedback during the appraisal/selection process has been particularly poor. In the Tees Valley this initiative has resulted in a substantial decrease of local projects delivered by the voluntary and community sector. We would therefore like the co-financing process to be opened up to other local or regionally based organisations.

11.2 Outputs/outcomes available via co-financing have led to less flexibility at the local level. We are concerned that payment on outputs stifles innovation.

11.3. We are concerned that the new delivery arrangements may result in cutting off Universities access to ESF.

**REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO
REPORT TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER
23 June 2006**



Report of: Head of Neighbourhood Management

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES DEPARTMENTAL
PLAN UPDATE MARCH 2006

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To agree the update on performance of the Neighbourhood Services Departmental plan for 2005/2006, covering the period from 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Brief description of services and the progress achieved to the end of September in reaching the targets.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The portfolio holder for Regeneration, Liveability & Housing has responsibility for part of the Neighbourhood Services Departmental Plan.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non key.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder, 23 June 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Approval of the Departmental Plan update report.

Report of: Head of Neighbourhood Management

Subject: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES DEPARTMENTAL
PLAN UPDATE MARCH 2006

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To agree the update on performance of the Neighbourhood Services Departmental plan for 2005/2006, covering the period from 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Council's corporate aims have been developed to align with those of the community plan and the Hartlepool Partnership. The Neighbourhood Services Departmental Plan shows how the department will complement and work towards these corporate aims.
- 2.2 This Departmental Plan Update sets out the department's aims and objectives and includes performance to the end of March 2006 against a range of key national and local indicators.
- 2.3 The plan also details service development initiatives that were planned for the year. These are the product of a developing culture that emphasises the importance of outcomes and a focus on customers in planning service delivery. A summary of the progress achieved during 2005 / 2006 has been recorded against these service improvements.
- 2.4 A copy of the plan is attached at **Appendix A** and **B**.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 It is recommended that the update to the Plan be approved.








Plan: **Departmental Plan Indicator Report**

Update to end of: **March 2006**







Performance Indicator

	Reported Annually	1	1.9%
	Neighbourhood Management	1	
	Below Target	8	15.4%
	Neighbourhood Management	5	
	Public Protection & Housing	3	
	Unsure	4	7.7%
	Neighbourhood Management	4	
	On or Above Target	39	75.0%
	Neighbourhood Management	21	
	Public Protection & Housing	18	
Total No. of Performance Indicators		52	








Neighbourhood Management

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
Environmental Action					
BV199d 	The year-on-year reduction in total number of incidents and increase in total number of enforcement actions taken to deal with 'fly-tipping' Craig Thelwell	-		1 - Very Effective	During 2005/6 the number of incident recorded has shown a drop on previous years, whilst the number of actions taken has increased, resulting in a score for this Indicator of 1 meaning 'Very Effective'
BV218a 	Percentage of new reports of abandoned vehicles investigated within 24hrs of notification. Craig Thelwell	95	100	100 %	Procedure established to ensure target is achieved.
BV218b 	Percentage of abandoned vehicles removed within 24 hours from the point at which the Authority is legally entitled to remove the vehicle Craig Thelwell	100	100	100 %	Procedure established to ensure target is achieved.
EM02 	Total number of Abandoned Vehicles removed. Craig Thelwell	400	217	301 Num	Another successful year, which has won the praise of both the Police and Fire Brigade for contributing towards further reductions in arson and vehicle crime.
EM04 	No. of fixed penalty notices issued for dog fouling. Craig Thelwell	100	92	118 Num	Target for year exceeded.
EM05 	No. of fixed penalty notices issued for litter offences. Craig Thelwell	100	156	173 Num	Target for year exceeded.
EM06 	Percentage of reported cases of abandoned / untaxed vehicles inspected within 1 working day. Craig Thelwell	100	100	100 %	Procedure established to ensure target is achieved.








Neighbourhood Management

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
EM80 	Number of vehicles removed under vehicle 'Amnesty' scheme. Craig Thelwell	30	12	17 Num	A combination of the high price of scrap and a very successful campaign to remove nuisance vehicles has impacted on the amnesty scheme. It is unlikely this target will be met.
EM81 	Number of 'untaxed' vehicles removed from the highway and public maintained areas. Craig Thelwell	270	176	249 Num	Another successful year, which has won the praise of both the Police and Fire Brigade for contributing towards further reductions in arson and vehicle crime.
Highway Services					
BV215a 	The average number of days taken to repair a street light fault, which is under control of the local authority. Bob Golightly	3	1.29	1.64 Days	Winter period more faults are identified resulting in longer time to carry out repairs
BV215b 	The average number of days taken to repair a street light fault, which is under control of the a Distribution Network Operator (DNO) Bob Golightly	30	18.5	22.77 Days	Several problems with IUS Sub contractor and length of time by NEDL taken to repair large faults have increased this figure. However yearly average is 22 days
Horticulture					
EM49 	Reduce amount of peat based compost used at Stranton Nursery by 6% Len Young	6	6	6 %	target achieved
Waste Management					
BV199a 	The proportion of relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) that is assessed as having combined deposits of litter and detritus that fall below an acceptable level. Albert Cope	5	16.44	17 %	Development of inspection process (including taking of photos and timing of inspections) and a reduction in vehicle availability has shown a decrease in the level of cleansing in the borough resulting in the outturn achieved this year.





Neighbourhood Management

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
BV199b 	The proportion or relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of graffiti are visible. Albert Cope	-	2.1	2.42 %	New P.I
BV199c 	The proportion or relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of fly-posting are visible. Albert Cope	-	0.17	0 %	New P.I
BV82a(i) 	% of the total tonnage of household waste arising which have been sent by the Authority for recycling Colin Ogden	15	12.27	13.84 %	Increase in participation on kerbside collections has seen upward movement on tonnages and phased introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections will push these up further. Combined total 21.65%
BV82a(ii) 	Total tonnage of household waste arising which have been sent by the Authority for recycling Colin Ogden	6349	3707.04	5440.42 Tonnes	Increase in participation on kerbside collections has seen upward movement on tonnages and phased introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections will push these up further. Combined total 8511.93 tonnes
BV82b(i) 	The % of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion. Colin Ogden	7	9.01	7.81 %	Pilot scheme on alternate collection round increased tonnage from July. Expected tonnage fall during December. Combined total 21.65%
BV82b(ii) 	The tonnage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion. Colin Ogden	2963	2720.36	3071.51 Tonnes	Pilot scheme on alternate collection round increased tonnage from July. Expected tonnage fall during December. Combined total 22%
BV82c(i) 	% of the total tonnage of household waste arising which have been used to recover heat, power and other energy sources Colin Ogden	71.5	60.92	70.70 %	major shutdown of Energy From Waste plant in April and September reduced % Agreement with Tees Valley authorities on tonnages has improved position but further shutdowns in January and March pushed down tonnages.








Neighbourhood Management

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
BV82c(ii) 	Tonnage of household waste arising which have been used to recover heat, power and other energy sources Colin Ogden	30263	18401.75	27796.50 Tonnes	major shutdown of Energy From Waste plant in April and September reduced % Agreement with tees valley authorities on tonnages has improved position but further shutdowns in January and March pushed down tonnages.
BV82d(i) 	% of household waste arising which have been landfilled Colin Ogden	6.5	17.80	7.65 %	major shutdown of Energy From Waste plant in April and September reduced % Agreement with tees valley authorities on tonnages has improved position but further shutdowns in January and March pushed up tonnages.
BV82d(ii) 	The tonnage of household waste arising which have been landfilled Colin Ogden	2751	5375.64	3006.48 Tonnes	major shutdown of Energy From Waste plant in April and September reduced % Agreement with tees valley authorities on tonnages has improved position but further shutdowns in January and March pushed down tonnages.
BV84a 	No. of kgs. of household waste collected per head of the population Colin Ogden	489	334.87	436.32 Kgs	Positive action on promoting home composting with an excellent take up rate for bins helping to keep rate down.
BV84b 	Percentage change from the previous financial year in the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head of population Colin Ogden	7		-2.56 %	Positive action on promoting home composting with an excellent take up rate for bins helping to keep rate down.
BV86 	Cost of waste collection per household Denise Ogden	37.69	£33.05	36.26 £	The cost of refuse collection has increased due to the introduction of alternate weekly collections to increase the amount of household waste recycled in response to the governments waste minimisation and recycling agenda.
BV87 	Cost of waste disposal per tonne municipal waste Denise Ogden	32.38		37.60 £	Increased incineration cost as a result of EU legislation has resulted in upgrades to the EFW plant, which have been borne by the local authority partners. Lengthy shutdowns of the EFWP has resulted in more waste being sent to landfill at additional cost








Neighbourhood Management

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
BV91a 	% of households resident in the authority's area served by kerbside collection of recyclables Clare Scott	100	100	100 %	All households are able to participate in the kerbside collection of recyclables
BV91b 	% of households resident in the authority's area served by kerbside collection of at least two recyclables by 2010 Clare Scott	100	100	100 %	All households able to recycle 2 items kerbside
BVPI 82ab 	Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arisings which has been recycled or composted Colin Ogden	22	21.28	21.65 %	Increase in participation on kerbside collections has seen a slow upward movement on tonnages and phased introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections will push these up further.
EM88 	Increase participation rates of multi materials collection scheme Clare Scott	40	n/a	33 %	This figure is based on 2005 figure however the annual participation survey has been carried out and the findings will be reported in the next quarter








Public Protection & Housing

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
Strategic Housing					
BV183(i) 	The average length of stay (weeks) in (i) bed & breakfast accommodation of households which include dependent children or a pregnant woman and which are unintentionally Lynda Garbutt	1	nil	2 Weeks	During this period we had to provide temporary accommodation for 3 households who stayed for 8, 7 and 27 nights respectively. This last household was a complicated case referred to us from outside the borough and the length of stay in B&B was unavoidable
BV183(ii) 	The average length of stay (weeks) in (ii) hostel accommodation of households which include dependent children or a pregnant woman and which are unintentionally Lynda Garbutt	0	0	0 Weeks	No relevant applicants had to be placed in hostel accommodation during this period
BV202 	The number of people sleeping rough on a single night within the area of the authority Lynda Garbutt	0	0	0 Num	
BV203 	The percentage change in the average number of families, which include Dependent children or a pregnant woman, placed in temporary accommodation under the Lynda Garbutt	0	-	0 %	The average number of applicable cases for 05/06 is 0.25 (A) and for 04/05 is 0 (B) therefore the % change is 0
BV213 	Number of households who considered themselves as homeless, who approached the local housing authority's housing advice service(s), and for whom housing advice Lynda Garbutt	35	68	100 Num	Figure still being produced manually as computer records not being retrieved accurately, therefore percentage per 1000 household is $100/37.385 = 2.67$
BV214 	Proportion of households accepted as statutorily homeless who were accepted as statutorily homeless by the same Authority within the last two years. Lynda Garbutt	2	-	2.54 %	The number 'repeat' homeless applications accepted for this year was 3 and the number of all applications was 118 therefore the percentage for the year is 2.54% - the low number of overall acceptances has lead to us just going over target
BV64 	The number of private sector dwellings that are returned to occupation or demolished as a direct result of action by the local authority John Smalley	56	29	34 Num	Targeting of more houses for enforcement actions on going

Public Protection & Housing

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
L71 	% of homeless applicants assessed and decision given within 33 working days Lynda Garbutt	100	97.6	96.9 %	325 decisions were taken within this period and 315 were completed within 33 days -those taking longer than this were all due to necessary intervention and advice casework that lead to their homelessness being prevented.
L77 	Average waiting time for Disabled Facilities Grants John Whitfield	95	91	95 Days	Average Waiting Time from Application to completion has met target for financial year 05/06.
L78 	The percentage of customers receiving disabled facilities grants who are satisfied or better with the service John Whitfield	99	99	99 %	Of the 105 satisfaction surveys returned of jobs completed for the financial year 05/06, 104 have been satisfied or better with the service provided. See Dec 05 return for details of one poor response.
LPINS10 	Number of long term empty private houses John Smalley	610		545 Num	The outturn performance reflects increased acquisition in the regeneration areas by the council, changes in portfolio holdings and a trend for owners to maintain their portfolio properties.
LPINS11 	The average Standard Assessment Procedure(SAP) rating for dwellings in the 'private sector' Peter Morgan	56.4	N/K	56.8 SAP	None
LPINS12 a 	Provision of additional units of accommodation for vulnerable persons a) Extra care sheltered accommodation for older people provision Penny Garner Carpenter	0	0	0 Num	On target - none expected until 2006-7
LPINS12 b 	Provision of additional units of accommodation for vulnerable persons b) Other vulnerable person provision Penny Garner Carpenter	57	47	47 Num	Young persons scheme expected to be completed by March 2006 delayed - now expected September 2006

Public Protection & Housing

Indicator No:	Indicator Description:	current target:	Previous Qtr outturn	Outturn	Comments on Performance
LPINS9 	Number of dwellings cleared for regeneration Penny Garner Carpenter	24	-	24 Num	Target achieved
PH24 	The proportion of applicants that are satisfied with the way their homeless application was dealt with Lynda Garbutt	90		93 %	From a random sample of all applications taken during the year a survey was carried out and 93% were satisfied or better with the way their homeless application was dealt with
PH25 	% of new tenants receiving support sustaining their tenancy for 6 months Lynda Garbutt	80	100	100 %	All of our floating support clients have successfully maintained their tenancies for 6 months or longer
PH26 	Number of completed contract reviews in line with ODPM Guidance Peter Morgan	100	100	100 %	All reviews signed off by Commissioning Body by March 2006
PH27 	Average SAP rating of all dwellings in the town Peter Morgan	60	Not known	60 SAP	Not all data available figure therefore estimated based on 2004/5.
PH35 	Number of households assisted with Hartwarmers plus grant Peter Morgan	1000	367	1125 Num	
PH43 	The proportion of unfit private sector dwellings that have been made fit or demolished as a direct result of action by the local authority John Smalley	12.19	10.45%	12.56 %	136 houses (cumulative): exceeds target

Neighbourhood Services Department

Departmental Plan - Quarterly Update Report

Appendix B

March 2006

Portfolio

SDI Ref.	Development Initiative 2005/6	Sub references	By When? / milestones	Progress to end of	March 2006
----------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	------------

EH1/05.1

Provide a safe, clean and green environment.

Investigate innovative methods to increase recycling through kerbside collection.2005/6
22%2006/7 26%2007/8 30%

On going

Report now approved and town-wide scheme to be implemented.
Timescale July 06 - June 07.

Reporting Officer: Dave Stubbs



EH1/05.2

Provide a safe, clean and green environment.

Retain the Seaside Award

Mar-06

Seaside award achieved

Reporting Officer: Ralph Harrison



Portfolio

SDI Ref.	Development Initiative 2005/6	Sub references	By When? / milestones	Progress to end of	March 2006
----------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	------------

EH1/05.3

Provide a safe, clean and green environment.

Identify untidy and unused land and buildings throughout the Borough and

Complete identification by May 2005.

Complete.

Reporting Officer: Dave Stubbs



EH1/05.4

Provide a safe, clean and green environment.

Co-ordinate activity to either bring them back into use or ensure that they are brought up to an acceptable standard until they are brought back into use.

Identify and take action on 12 sites by March 06

Plan of action agreed by Portfolio Holder and in the process of implementation.

Reporting Officer: Dave Stubbs



EH1/05.5

Provide a safe, clean and green environment.

Increase environmental enforcement activity - remove all unlicensed vehicles within 48 hours.

By June 2005:

Housing Hartlepool approval given and details of posts now in Vacancy Monitoring procedure prior to advertising. Appointment of 3 officers now imminent.

Reporting Officer: Craig Thelwell



Portfolio

SDI Ref.	Development Initiative 2005/6	Sub references	By When? / milestones	Progress to end of	March 2006
----------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	------------

EH4/05.1

Achieve balance in local housing markets by addressing low demand issues and improving the quality of housing and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable people

Appoint suitable Joint Venture Partner to fund and regenerate Phase I of North Central Hartlepool Regeneration Area (NCHRA)

Nov-05

George Wimpey North East confirmed is Councils preferred developer partner subject to contract

Reporting Officer: Penny Garner Carpenter



EH4/05.2

Achieve balance in local housing markets by addressing low demand issues and improving the quality of housing and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable people

Resolve to make compulsory purchase orders on the first phase of NCHRA and NDC sites

Jun-05

Complete

Reporting Officer: Penny Garner Carpenter



EH4/05.3

Achieve balance in local housing markets by addressing low demand issues and improving the quality of housing and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable people

Agree regeneration option for Phase II (NCHRA)

Mar-06

Approving phase 2 has been postponed due to funding issues - there is currently no funding available to start phase 2.

Reporting Officer: Penny Garner Carpenter



Portfolio

SDI Ref.	Development Initiative 2005/6	Sub references	By When? / milestones	Progress to end of	March 2006
----------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	------------

EH4/05.4

Achieve balance in local housing markets by addressing low demand issues and improving the quality of housing and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable people

Consider the merits and implementation of a Private Landlord Licensing Scheme

Mar-06

This has been put back to October 06 due to delays in Government Guidance being issued.

Reporting Officer: Penny Garner Carpenter



EH4/05.5

Achieve balance in local housing markets by addressing low demand issues and improving the quality of housing and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable people

Complete a review of all Supporting People Contracts

Mar-06

Reviews completed on target.

Reporting Officer: Penny Garner Carpenter



Portfolio

SDI Ref.	Development Initiative 2005/6	Sub references	By When? / milestones	Progress to end of	March 2006
----------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	------------

6

Introduce FPN scheme for wheeled bins left in back streets

The scheme will encourage ownership and deter people from leaving wheeled bins in back streets after collection. This will greatly enhance appearance and prevent bins being purposely set alight and/or used to break into peoples properties

Apr-05

Completed.

Reporting Officer: Craig Thelwell



7

Establish a formal 'vehicle removal' agreement with Housing Hartlepool and other Registered Social Landlords within the town

Such an agreement will enable the EAT to quickly remove abandoned/untaxed vehicles, which at present are immune to current legislation. (reduction in anti social behaviour)

Sep-05

Complete

Reporting Officer: Craig Thelwell



REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY AND HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report to Portfolio Holder
23 June 2006



Report of: Head of Public Protection and Housing

Subject: LICENSING OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE
OCCUPATION (HMOs) – FEE STRUCTURE &
DELEGATION OF POWERS

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek approval for the fee structure in respect of licensing Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and approval for the scheme of delegation.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report sets out a proposed fee structure for activities involved in the licensing of HMOs and a scheme of delegation for the new powers associated with HMO licensing.

3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER

The Portfolio Holder is responsible for Housing Services.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non key decision.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder, 23 June 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

To approve the fee structure for charges in respect of HMO licensing and to approve the scheme of delegation.

Report of: Head of Public Protection and Housing

Subject: LICENSING OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE
OCCUPATION (HMOs) - FEE STRUCTURE AND
DELEGATION OF POWERS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To seek approval for a fee structure in respect of licensing Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and approval for the scheme of delegation.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Culture, Housing & Transportation Portfolio meeting on 19 January 2006 was informed of the new requirement to license certain HMOs and the implications for the Authority.
- 2.2 In order to be granted a licence, the Council must investigate whether:
- a) the proposed licence holder and any person involved in the management of the house is a fit and proper person;
 - b) the proposed management arrangements are satisfactory;
 - c) any person involved in the management of the house is competent and the structures for funding and management are suitable; and
 - d) the HMO is reasonably suitable for the number of persons permitted having regard to the minimum standards for amenities and facilities.
- 2.3 Initial estimates are that there will be 20 HMOs that will be required to be licensed in Hartlepool, although publicity may result in more properties being identified.

3. ENFORCEMENT OF HMO LICENSING

- 3.1 Applications must be determined within a reasonable time-scale. In most cases decisions are expected to be made within six weeks of the date of application.
- 3.2 Once issued, a licence holder may apply for a variation of the licence, for example where there is a change of manager or a change in occupancy levels.
- 3.3 Licences may be revoked:
- a) by agreement, if the property ceases to be an HMO;
 - b) if the licence holder dies (and for three months after the death);

- c) if there has been a significant breach of licence conditions;
- d) if the licence holder or manager is no longer considered to be a fit and proper person;
- e) if the HMO ceases to be licensable;
- f) if the property becomes unsuitable for licensing

3.4 Where an owner of a licensable HMO does not wish to apply for a licence because they are:

- a) planning to cease using the property as an HMO; or
- b) planning to reduce the numbers to a level at which the property would not be licensable,

they may apply for a Temporary Exemption Notice (TEN), which will allow three months for this to take place. A second TEN may be applied for in exceptional circumstances.

3.5 If a manager or person having control of a HMO permits more people than allowed by the licence to occupy the property, or is operating an HMO without a licence, they are committing an offence and may be liable on conviction to a fine of up to £20,000.

3.6 If a manager or person having control of an HMO fails to comply with licence conditions they are committing an offence and may be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale.

3.7 No rent is payable in respect of a property that ought to be licensed but isn't. Any rent that is paid to a landlord during a period when no rent should have been paid may be subject to a Rent Repayment Order. Local Authorities may apply to the Residential Property Tribunal to have any Housing Benefit repaid.

3.8 Where a property ought to be licensed but isn't, and there is no prospect of it being licensed in the near future, or the 'health and safety condition' is met, the Council has a duty to apply to the Residential Property Tribunal for an **Interim Management Order**, which may last for up to 12 months.

The health and safety condition concerns the protection of the health, safety or welfare of the occupiers or persons occupying or having an estate or interest in any premises in the vicinity. If the IMO is granted, the Council must take immediate steps to deal with the health and safety condition and to take steps to either grant a licence, make a Final Management Order or revoke the IMO.

3.9 A **Final Management Order** (FMO) may be made following the service of an IMO to secure the proper management of an HMO on a long-term basis (up to five years) in accordance with a management scheme. A management scheme is a plan setting out the details of the intentions of the Local Authority in managing the house including the financial arrangements.

4. FEE PROPOSALS

- 4.1 The Council may charge a fee for licensing HMOs and other action in relation to HMO licensing. It is expected that the full cost of operating an HMO licensing scheme should be met by the licence fees.
- 4.2 The fee level must be determined by the Council and any fee structure must be transparent and reflect the actual cost.
- 4.3 A financial toolkit has been produced by the LGA and IdeA to assist Local Authorities in determining their fee structures. Estimates of officer time to operate and administer the scheme in Hartlepool have produced an average fee of £655.
- 4.4 There are three suggested options to consider in relation to fee structures:
- a) to charge a flat rate fee of £655 for each property for a five year licence.
 - b) to charge a range of fees on a sliding scale, depending on the number of lettings. The proposed fee structure is set out in **Appendix 1 (Table 1)**.
 - c) To charge a range of fees on a sliding scale, depending on the number of lettings, with a discount of 50% for landlords who are members of the Voluntary Landlord Accreditation scheme. The purpose of offering a discount is to recognise the landlords who have already shown that they are operating at a responsible level and co-operating with the Council. It may also act as an incentive for non-members to join up to the scheme. The proposed fee structure is set out in **Appendix 1 (Table 2)**.
- 4.5 It is recommended that landlords should be able to opt to pay their licence fees by instalments over a maximum 12-month period to spread the cost. Should this option be accepted, it is proposed that an additional charge of £50 be levied in order to cover the cost of administration.
- 4.6 In addition to the charges made for initial applications, it is recommended that further charges will be made for renewing licences at the end of a the five year period, variation of licences and the issuing of Temporary Exemption Notices. The proposed fees are set out in **Appendix 1 (Table 3)**.
- 4.7 It is proposed that a variation of the licence will not be considered until the initial application fee has been paid in full.

5. DELEGATION

- 5.1 In order to exercise its duties under the Housing Act 2004 it is recommended that officers be delegated powers to:

- a) determine whether to grant a licence and to determine the licence conditions;
- b) determine applications to vary licences;
- c) make decisions with regards to the revocation of licences where:
 - i) there is agreement with the licence holder;
 - ii) the licence holder dies; or
 - iii) the HMO ceases to be licensable;
 - iv) there has been a significant breach of licence conditions;
 - v) the licence holder or manager is no longer considered to be a fit and proper person; or
 - vi) the property becomes unsuitable for licensing.
- d) make decisions regarding the service of Temporary Exemption Notices
- e) be responsible for authorising the making of IMOs and FMOs.
- f) approve the initiation of prosecution proceedings in the circumstances outlined in paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 It is recommended that the option set out in 4.4 (c), to use a sliding scale for charging fees with a discount to members of the Voluntary Landlord Accreditation scheme, is approved. The proposed fee levels are set out in **Appendix 1, Tables 1 and 2**.
- 6.2 It is recommended that landlords should be allowed to pay their licence fee over a maximum 12-month period and additional charge of £50 is levied to cover the cost of administration.
- 6.3 It is recommended that the scheme of delegation detailed in 5.1 be approved.

Appendix 1

Table 1:
Proposed Fee Structure for the Licensing of HMOs (Non-Accredited Landlords)

Number of occupants	Basic Fee	Total charge if paying by instalments
5	500	550
6-10	650	700
11-15	800	850
15+	£25 per additional occupant over 15	

Table 2:
Proposed Fee Structure for the Licensing of HMOs (Accredited Landlords)

Number of occupants	Accredited Landlord	Total charge if paying by Instalments
5	250	300
6-10	325	375
11-15	400	450
15+	£20 per additional occupant over 15	

Table 3: Additional Fees in respect of HMO Licensing

Action	
Licence renewal fee	50% of the fee currently in force
Renewal fee for each additional occupant	50% of the fee currently in force
Variation of licence	£50 plus any extra charge for numbers in excess of the permitted maximum. (£25 if accredited)
Issue of first Temporary Exemption Notice	£50 (25 if accredited)
Issue of second Temporary Exemption Notice	£25 (£12.50 if accredited)

**REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY AND HOUSING
PORTFOLIO**

Report to Portfolio Holder
23 June 2006



Report of: Head of Public Protection and Housing

Subject: COMPULSORY PURCHASE OF AN EMPTY
PROPERTY – 45 LANCASTER ROAD

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider compulsory purchase action in respect of 45 Lancaster Road.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report provides information on the condition of the empty house and sets out the courses of action available.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

The Portfolio Holder is responsible for Housing Services.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Non-key.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio holder, 23 June 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

To approve the recommendation to apply for a Compulsory Purchase Order on 45 Lancaster Road.

Report of: Head of Public Protection & Housing

Subject: COMPULSORY PURCHASE OF AN EMPTY
PROPERTY – 45 LANCASTER ROAD

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To outline the condition of the empty property and seek approval to apply for a Compulsory Purchase Order.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The above property is a large end-terraced property in a relatively desirable area and, apart from brief periods, it has been empty since 1997. Council Tax records first record it as empty from July 2001.
- 2.2 Complaints have been made about the physical appearance of the property and the effect this is having on the surrounding environment.
- 2.3 The owner has previously stated an intention to improve the property and return it to occupation but has taken no steps to do so.
- 2.4 The property has been secured using timber sheeting to all windows and doors and its appearance is poor.
- 2.5 Complaints continue to be made regarding the appearance of the property.
- 2.6 It is highly likely that the condition of the property will continue to deteriorate unless action is taken.

3. OPTIONS AVAILABLE

3.1 Compulsory Purchase

Using its powers under section 17(3) of the Housing Act 1985 (as amended), the Council may acquire the property compulsorily and dispose of it to a third party. This tends to provide a long-term solution.

3.2 Purchase by Agreement

If the owner of a property was willing, the property may be acquired by agreement for onward sale. This option would provide a quicker acquisition. However, it would appear from previous discussions with the owner that it is unlikely that a voluntary solution will be achieved.

3.3 Improvement for Sale

The Council may, on acquisition, carry out renovation works on the property and then sell it on the open market.

3.4 Empty Dwelling Management Order

The Council may use the recently introduced power to take over the management of an empty property and arrange for the letting of it. This is intended to provide a short to medium term solution.

4. **HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

- 4.1 Though it is clear that acquisition of property compulsorily is an interference with the individual's enjoyment of property, no breach of the Human Rights Act occurs where the acquisition is justified by the protection of the rights of others is according to law and is accompanied by the payment of appropriate compensation. This would be the case in this instance.

5. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 That further discussions are held with a view to persuading the owner of the property to arrange the sale of the property.
- 5.2 That the Chief Solicitor be authorised to conclude a purchase by agreement at a price to be determined by the Property Services Manager
- 5.3 That approval be given to proceed with compulsory purchase as a long term measure if satisfactory progress is not made towards a voluntary solution.
- 5.4 Should it become necessary to proceed with compulsory purchase, that the Head of Procurement and Property Services and the Chief Solicitor be instructed and authorised to undertake all necessary actions to proceed with the Compulsory Purchase Order, under S17(3) of the Housing act 1985 (as amended).

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23rd June 2006



Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning
Services

Subject: REGENERATION AND PLANNING
DEPARTMENTAL PLAN 2005/06 - OUTTURN
REPORT

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To show the performance of Regeneration and Planning Services in 2005/06 against a number of key actions and targets set out within the annual Departmental Service Plan.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Details of the department's performance are shown in the Outturn Report attached at **Appendix A**.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The portfolio holder has responsibility for Regeneration and Planning Services.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio holder only.

6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED

The portfolio holder is required to note the report.

Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: REGENERATION AND PLANNING
DEPARTMENTAL PLAN 2005/06 - OUTTURN
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The report shows the performance of Regeneration and Planning Services in 2005/06 against a number of key actions and targets set out within the annual Departmental Service Plan.

2. BACKGROUND

1. The 2005/06 Departmental Service Plan described the many areas of activity carried out by Regeneration and Planning and outlined how they contributed towards the Community Strategy and the Corporate Performance Plan. The document was a key part of the department's performance management framework during the year and has been used to enable competing priorities to be managed and progress to be monitored. The plan was approved by the portfolio holder on 4 August 2005.

3. OUTTURN REPORT

1. Details of the department's performance are shown in the Outturn Report attached at **Appendix A**. Four separate tables of information are used to describe the progress made towards achieving milestones and targets.
2. Table 1 shows the highest priority actions identified in the 2005/06 plan and the outcomes achieved by the end of the year. Table 2 highlights the progress made against other important tasks that were set out in the original plan.
3. Table 3 reports the outturn position against the highest priority performance indicators and Table 4 describes how the department has performed against the remaining Government Best Value Indicators and Local Performance Indicators for which it has responsibility.

4. One major additional task did arise after the service plan was completed. In May 2005 Hartlepool Borough Council was invited to apply to join round 2 of the rollout of Local Area Agreements (LAAs) to all local areas in England. LAAs are three year agreements that set out the priorities for a local area and represent a new approach to improve co-ordination and partnership working between central government and local authorities and their partners, working through the LSP.
5. In June it was announced that Hartlepool had been successful in its application and was one of 13 to be able to operate a single LAA pot. The preparation of the bid, and the resulting positive outcome, placed significant additional requirements on the Community Strategy Division. Effectively a new performance framework for the Hartlepool Partnership was required within 6 months and extensive partnership negotiation was undertaken. Following the submission of the first draft in December 2005, the Division was then responsible for co-ordinating the response from central government and Government Office for the North East.
6. No additional resources were made available for the preparation of the agreement and as a result, some other areas of the Division's work were given a lower priority or not completed at all.
7. A number of other actions and targets were contained in the plan. These have been formally monitored and managed on a quarterly basis by the Director and relevant Head of Division. There are no further significant issues to report to portfolio holder.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the portfolio holder notes the report.



Best Value in Hartlepool

Regeneration and Planning Services Departmental Service Plan 2005/06 **Summary Outturn Report**

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: PRIORITY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06

REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
1	Work with Tees Valley Regeneration and the port owners, PD Ports (PDP) to pursue the development framework for the redevelopment of Victoria Harbour.	<p>Liaison with TVR/PDP re development funding, feasibility studies, other site preparatory works and potential first phase of development. (Ongoing).</p> <p>Feasibility study into proposed water-based visitor attraction/recreation facility, the H₂O Centre. (Complete May 2005).</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	<p>Liaison continues. Outline planning permission resolved to approve 8.2.06. Planning agreement being formulated and anticipated to be agreed in June 2006. Section 106 agreement expected to be finalised in December 2006.</p> <p>Currently consulting on proposals to July/August 2006. Funding and procurement options will then be sought September 2006 onwards.</p>
2	Establish a support system for the incubation of new businesses, (including social enterprises) including proposals for a new development at Queens Meadow.	<p>UKSE on site developing 27,000 sq.ft. Innovation Centre at Queens Meadow (Completed December 2005)</p> <p>Potential upgrading of Brougham Enterprise Centre. (Commence September 2005)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. External Refurbishment. (Complete March 2006) 2. Remodelling of reception 3. Create additional units 4. Develop incubation systems further. <p>(Subject to confirmation of funding package. (Ongoing secure further Single Programme resource June 2005).</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Partly Achieved</p>	<p>Innovation Centre now over 70% let and embedded into the incubation system.</p> <p>Single Programme funding approved £1.3m of enhancement works. Upgrading is taking place but completion date for works slipped beyond March 2006 because of late funding approval. NRF secured £100k paf or 2 years for incubation system.</p>

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: PRIORITY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
3	Promote the opportunities and challenges indicated in the Hartlepool Investment Prospectus	<p>Ongoing promotion to prospective public sector funders and private sector investors and developers. (Presentation to key public sector funding Partners. (May 2005)).</p> <p>Continue to drive forward key regeneration schemes included within Investment Prospectus. (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	<p>Prospectus discussed with key public sector funding partners including ONE and GONE. Private sector version to be published July 2006</p> <p>Development work for major projects within the prospectus including at Victoria Harbour, The Headland, Seaton Carew and Wy nyard is ongoing as is marketing of Queens Meadow, Coastal Arc and Maritime Experience development site.</p>
4	Continue work with businesses, residents and agencies to ensure that local residents have the skills and qualification to compete effectively in the local labour market.	Develop and implement Building Futures, a Tees Valley-wide construction labour market initiative. (Single Programme funding confirmed 14.4.05).	Achieved	3 staff recruited, 500sqft office occupied at Stranton. Total of 76 placements achieved during the year.
5.	Work with HCFE to explore the potential to bring forward redevelopment proposals to enhance higher education and vocational training provision	Facility study and masterplan preparation. (June 2005).	n/a	Work has taken place during the year but programme has fundamentally changed. Currently negotiating funding with LSC and there is a need to do further option analysis.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: PRIORITY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
6	Coordinate the implementation of the Community Strategy.	<p>Continue embedding the strategy in the management processes of partner organisations and report progress on implementation of alignment plan at Hartlepool Partnership. (July 2005)</p> <p>Carry out review of Hartlepool Partnership performance using agreed Performance Management Framework. (End of April 2005)</p> <p>Prepare documentation for Government Office for the North East Annual Review of Hartlepool Partnership. (End of April 2005)</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	<p>The Partnership was rated 'Green' by Government Office in its annual performance assessment</p>
7	Support and build upon the partnership and consultative structures in the Borough including the Hartlepool Partnership and related thematic partnerships, Neighbourhood Consultative Forums and the Community Network.	<p>Actions to be undertaken are outlined in the Hartlepool Partnership PMF. (End of April 2006)</p> <p>Continue to support and develop Neighbourhood Consultative Forums. (Ongoing).</p> <p>To review the application of the Community Compact. (End</p>	<p>Not Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	<p>22 out of 28 (78%) of actions set out in the PMF were achieved, narrowly missing the 85% target. This was due to the additional work required to prepare the LAA and lower priority areas of work not being completed.</p> <p>The Council is continuing to support and develop Neighbourhood Consultative Forums</p> <p>The recently completed Best Value review of Strengthening Communities covered a range of issues including the current application of the Council's</p>

3.1
APPENDIX A

		April 2006).		COMPACT with the community and voluntary sector.
--	--	--------------	--	--

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: PRIORITY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
8	Develop, monitor and review Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) and support area based regeneration initiatives that provide a framework for future activity, help to address inequalities and improve local service delivery and access.	Complete NAPs in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Owton Rossmere North Hartlepool Partnership Area (By end of 2005/06)	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Not Achieved</p>	Work on the North Hartlepool NAP extended to allow additional consultation to take place. Completion is now due in June 2006.
9	Achieve balance in local housing markets by addressing low demand issues and improving the quality of housing and meeting the housing needs of vulnerable people.	Appoint suitable Joint Venture Partner to fund and regenerate Phase 1 of North Central Hartlepool Regeneration Area (NCHRA). (November 2005)	Achieved	Selection process commenced in November 2005. Outcome formalised in January 2006. George Wimpey North East confirmed as Council's preferred developer subject to contract
10.	Improve access into treatment for drugs using offenders to reduce their re-offending and criminal activity.	<p>Complete reconfiguration of drugs services. (July 2005).</p> <p>Introduce 'Restrictions on bail' procedures for drugs using offenders. (April 2005).</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	Substance Misuse Service established in year with increased personnel in place. Dual Diagnosis Team developed with active caseload as of October. Intensive proactive contact now implemented and improving referrals. Waiting times achieved.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: PRIORITY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
11.	Co-ordinate services to ensure adequate support is provided to the young people who are at risk of offending.	<p>Extend the remit of the Family support Panel from anti-social behaviour to establish a Youth Inclusion & Support Panel (YISP). (June 2005)</p> <p>Establish protocol for agencies to make a referral. (June 2005).</p> <p>Organise monthly meetings to monitor and review cases. (July 2005)</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	
12.	Co-ordinate a problem solving approach to tackling anti-social behaviour.	<p>Complete the development of LPSA2 under-age drinking projects. (July 2005).</p> <p>Monitor effectiveness of FAST project (which tackles low level anti-social behaviour). (Ongoing).</p> <p>Introduce computerised case management system to ASB Unit. (June 2005).</p> <p>Begin to collect data from Housing providers. (December 2005).</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>Not Achieved</p>	<p>Straightline project for under-age drinking referrals being provided for young people aged 10-17 years. Under aged drinking project included in LAA with reward element.</p> <p>Monitoring throughout year. FAST project now linked to Family Support Panel referral process and consideration of 'enforcement' activity.</p> <p>Flare became operational mid October</p> <p>Despite regular meetings with Housing providers data still not forthcoming. This will be pursued in 2006/07.</p>

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: PRIORITY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
13.	Improve reassurance so as to reduce fear of crime	<p>Co-ordinate promotion and publicity for Safer Hartlepool Partnership. (Ongoing).</p> <p>Implement Operation Clean Sweep in 28 areas of the town. (Ongoing).</p> <p>Review effectiveness of current community warden scheme and develop options to extend into other areas of Hartlepool. (October 2005).</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>n/a</p>	<p>Reassurance messages published as planned however community still feel unsafe. Introduction of Neighbourhood Policing in April 2006 will help to engage better with residents and prioritise their concerns which will have an impact on fear of crime.</p> <p>Operation Clean Sweep undertaken but less than the 28 areas targeted.</p> <p>Review work has been carried out however the Community Warden team continues only within NDC area. Because of the withdrawal of NRF money, the wardens' role in NRF areas has been changed to that of environmental enforcement officer.</p>
14.	Ensure all Council services recognise the contribution they can make to crime reduction	<p>Extend the model from the neighbourhood based community initiative at Burbank to another area. (April 2005).</p> <p>Introduce training programme on responsibility in Section 17, Crime & Disorder Act 1998 to mainstream crime prevention. (December 2005).</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <p>Achieved</p>	<p>Implemented in Rift House/Burn Valley NAP area</p>

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 2: OTHER KEY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06

DEPT PLAN PAGE REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
28	To facilitate the operation and development of the Hartlepool Partnership as an inclusive, effective and strategic body	March 2006	Achieved	Partnership terms of reference were reviewed. Also new induction for Board Members was adopted.
29	Oversee the delivery of the 2005/06 NRF programme	March 2006	Achieved	Less than 1% underspend on programme was achieved. In addition, a positive external evaluation of the programme was received.
40	Make a formal representation on Regional Spatial Strategy	October 2005	Achieved	Formal representations were made by the appropriate deadline to the Regional Assembly on the Consultation Draft of the RSS. Thereafter formal Written Representations have been submitted to the Panel Inspector (details shared previously with Portfolio Holder) on the amended Submission Draft lodged with the Secretary of State. This was the subject of an Examination in Public held during March/ April 2006 and the RSS Panel Report suggesting any proposed modifications to the Secretary of State is anticipated in September 2006.
40	Prepare annual monitoring report on LDF	December 2005	Achieved	The first Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for the year 2004-2005 was submitted to the Government Office for the North East before the end of December 2005. It was endorsed by Cabinet at its meeting on 24 th January 2006. The Report found that the main milestones for plan preparation in the Local Development Scheme had been met in 2005, although the Scheme would need to be updated. It also found that most of the 1994 Local Plan policies remain robust and are an effective tool in both development control and in the economic, social and environmental development of the Borough. A copy of the AMR is on the Council's website at www.hartlepool.gov.uk/downloads/Annual_Monitoring_Report_04-05_1_.pdf

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 2: OTHER KEY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

DEPT PLAN PAGE REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
40	Make bids for HMR resources through Tees Valley Living & Regional Housing Board	August 2006	Achieved	Confirmation and Capital grant has been received from the Regional Housing Board of funding from the Single Housing Investment Pot for Hartlepool which is £2,826,000 for the period 2006/08. Tees Valley Living have been awarded HMR funding for the period 2006/08 and the final announcement of the level of this funding will be made by Government Office on 9 th June 2006. Agreement has been reached within the partnership that Hartlepool will receive a pro rata split of this funding the final amount will be determined by the announcement on the 9 th June 2006
41	Submit Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) to Secretary of State	January 2006	Achieved	The Statement of Community Involvement as agreed by the Council at its meeting on 15 th December 2005 was submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2006. It was subject to a statutory consultation for six weeks during which time 15 representations, primarily representations of support, were received. The submitted SCI will be considered for soundness by an independent planning inspector who will submit a report with recommendations to the Council. These recommendations will be binding on the Council.
41	Delivering key Regeneration Projects and Programmes :- Complete Seaton Carew Interreg Improvements Obtain Coastal Arc central area attractions funding approval Complete Hough Battery SRB project appraisal	July 2005 August 2005 August 2005	Achieved Partly Achieved Achieved	Achieved in 2005/06 however contractual problems meant a delay occurred and works were not completed until March 2006 Single Programme funding application submitted September 2005. Agreed by Tees Valley Partnership Executive in November 2005. Offer letters sent January 2006. ERDF application submitted to JSU in May 2006 and a decision is pending. Achieved in 2005/06. Completed October 2005 and approved by ONE in March 2006. Appraisal completion delayed due to consultant delays in finalising designs and costings.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 2: OTHER KEY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

DEPT PLAN PAGE REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
48	Implement Development Control Section's IT Strategy	New IT system web accessible by 31.12.2005	Achieved	Part of the ongoing process of improving accessibility of services, this achievement of the milestone helped in securing Planning Delivery Grant. In addition, the first implementation within the Council of the new Corporate Electronic Records and Document Management System occurred in Development Control in December 2005.
55	Appoint new Building Control Case Officer; monitor workloads / temporary staff resources	September 2005	Not Achieved	Unable to recruit suitable candidate, so reliant on temporary part time staff. A mini reorganisation was completed in April 2006 and vacancy monitoring procedure being followed to seek to recruit again.
64	Devise systems for dealing with High Hedges complaints	June 2005	Achieved	System has been used in providing information, advice and guidance to householders
64	Revise tree strategy for adoption by other departments	August 2005	Achieved	Strategy formally adopted by Cabinet in November 2005 and being used by other departments
76	Development of Area Tourism Partnership	March 2006	Not Achieved	Progress towards establishment delayed by extended discussions between ONE and TVP regarding governance. Agreement on structure reached in March 2006. ATP Board recruitment to take place June 2006.
102	Develop event for Year 8 pupils to advise them on consequences of various types of Anti Social Behaviour	December 2005	Achieved	All secondary schools in Hartlepool participated. Very successful event. To organise again in 2006.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 2: OTHER KEY DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS 2005/06 continued

DEPT PLAN PAGE REF	ACTIVITY	MILESTONE	ACHIEVED / NOT ACHIEVED	COMMENT
104	Security Guard delivery across council – review service provision, determine future requirements, develop specification and re-tender as required	November 2005	Not Achieved	Existing contract has been extended for a further 6 months to September 2006. Expected re-tendering to take place during June 2006 with new contractor appointed by August 2006.
104	Establish programme to mainstream Community Safety across Council	Programme to commence by September 05	Achieved	Programme established and Members briefed early October 2005. CMT agreed detailed action plan in December 2005 and work commenced in January 2006
105	Reconfiguration of substance misuse service and establishment of dual diagnosis service for drug users	September 2005	Achieved	Extended Community drugs centre opened in September 2005 and services provided from centre re-configured to coincide with opening

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 3 - PRIORITY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR INFORMATION 2005/06

REF	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	ACTUAL 2004/05	TARGET 2005/6	OUTTURN 2005/6	TARGET EXCEEDED/ NOT MET	COMMENTS
1.	No. of jobs created with Council assistance (LPI RP4)	447	420	508	Exceeded	The new Innovation Centre development at Queens Meadow has performed beyond expectations and has already created 62 jobs and has significantly impacted on the outturn. Economy is slowing and unlikely to be able to repeat similar results in 2006/07.
2.	No. of residents assisted into employment (LPI RP5)	745	750	752	Exceeded	The target has been slightly exceeded and is a reflection of a large number of relatively small scale recruitment opportunities.
3.	% gap between Hartlepool and GB unemployment rates (LPI RP10)	1.70%	1.65%	1.9%	Not Met	The economy has shown signs of slowing activity and unemployment has risen nationally. The convergence with GB has however improved since December 2004 from 181% to 170% and convergence with Tees Valley for the same period has improved from 117% to 115%.
4.	No. of new business start-ups (LPI RP 13)	135	140	120	Not Met	The level of VAT registrations has gone down mirroring the national trend. This is mainly due to slowing of the economy.
5.	Domestic Burglary per 1000 households (BVPI 126a)	22.35%	20.25%	16.66%	Exceeded	Domestic burglary has reduced with a total of 631 cases recorded. Various operations and projects implemented by Council, police and partners to reduce domestic burglary have taken place.
6.	Vehicle Crime per 1000 population (BVPI 128a)	14.04%	13.43%	12.10%	Exceeded	Vehicle crime has reduced with 1106 cases recorded. Various operations and projects implemented by Council, police and partners to reduce vehicle crime have taken place.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 3 - PRIORITY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR INFORMATION 2005/06 continued

REF	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	ACTUAL 2004/05	TARGET 2005/6	OUTTURN 2005/6	TARGET EXCEEDED/ NOT MET	COMMENTS
7.	% of residents who feel safe outside after dark (LP1 CS 15)	39%	40%	29.3%	Exceeded	Measured in Viewpoint survey in May 2005.
8.	The % change in the proportion of problem drug users in treatment aged 15-44 years (BVPI 198)	45.6%	4.9%	25.51%	Exceeded	Increased investment has allowed the reconfiguration of specialist treatment services with additional staff to increase capacity and effectiveness. The continuation of the Drug Intervention Programme plus new initiative of Restrictions on Bail have been successful and from 2005/06 young people statistics are now available from NDTMS. Planned service development review and investment programme was more successful than originally forecast. Introduction of national Restrictions on Bail initiative with ongoing Drug Intervention Programme which was expected to cease has allowed additional capacity.
9.	Young Offenders - % re-offending rate (LPI CS16)	56%	55%	52.2%	Exceeded	Youth Justice Board targets requires a 5% year on year reduction
10.	Robbery per 1000 population (BVPI 127b)	1.28	1.36	1.12	Exceeded	Below target is a positive outcome.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 4 – OTHER KEY BEST VALUE/LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2005/06

SERVICE PLAN REF	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	ACTUAL 2004/05	TARGET 2005/6	OUTTURN 2005/6	TARGET EXCEEDED/ NOT MET	COMMENTS
DC9	The % of major planning applications decided within 13 weeks (BV109a)	78.8%	65%	70.59%	Exceeded	
DC10	The % of minor planning applications decided within 8 weeks (BV109b)	70.6%	72%	72.93%	Exceeded	
DC11	The % of other planning applications decided within 8 weeks (BV109c)	82.5%	82%	83.96%	Exceeded	
DC12	The % of planning appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse planning application (BV204)	12.5%	33%	33%	On Target	The total number of appeals is very low (15). One appeal decision allowed can therefore have a significant effect on performance.
DC13	Quality of planning service checklist (BV205)	88.9%	94.4%	100%	Exceeded	The council has achieved 100% during 2005/06 having focussed on maximising performance on the e-planning service.
UP7	The % of new homes on previously developed land (BV106)	55%	57%	55%	Not Met	The target set was based on the best estimations of likely build rates. It should be noted that the Council has no control over the decisions of individual developers and rate of development on sites with planning permission
LPC2	Undertake a Character Appraisal of one of the existing 8 Conservation Areas (BV219a)	n/a	1	0	Not Met	This is a new BVPI. The target for completing an appraisal in 2005/6 was not met. It is anticipated that this first appraisal will be completed during 2006/7.
SS5	The proportion of working days lost to sickness absence (contributes to BV12)	10.08	8.52	6.40	Exceeded	Very little long term sickness absence was experienced and this was the main reason for the target being exceeded.
Com Safety (BV174)	The number of racial incidents recorded per 100,000 population	40	36	58.82	Exceeded	The new Anti-Social Behaviour Unit ensured increased publicity was carried out regarding the reporting of racially motivated incidents and awareness and confidence in reporting mechanisms was raised. In addition, the new policy for schools developed by the Children's Services Department resulted in an increase in the number of racial incidents reported in schools.

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 4 – OTHER KEY BEST VALUE/LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2005/06 continued

SERVICE PLAN REF	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	ACTUAL 2004/05	TARGET 2005/6	OUTTURN 2005/6	TARGET EXCEEDED/ NOT MET	COMMENTS
Com Safety (BV175)	The % of racial incidents that resulted in further action	85.7%	84%	98.11%	Exceeded	Further actions have occurred in almost all incidents reported to the Authority, the only exceptions being in cases where the complainant only wanted the incident to be logged with no further action taken.
ED1 (LPI RP1)	Number of businesses assisted	837	860	870	Exceeded	Outturn has exceeded target primarily due to the continued excellent performance of Worksmart and the development of the NDC Commercial Areas project.
ED2 (LPI RP2)	Number of business enquiries	933	950	1235	Exceeded	Strong performance in Tourism and property/general information service.
ED3 (LPI RP1)	Number of sites developed or improved	5	6	6	On Target	
ED5a (LPI RPI 5a)	Number of residents assisted into employment that were long term unemployed	144	203	265	Exceeded	
ED5b (LPI RPI 5b)	Number of residents assisted into employment that were young unemployed	155	236	157	Not Met	The target is very sensitive to small changes given the relatively low numbers of young unemployed people counted against this indicator. The target is also aspirational and difficult to achieve.
ED6 (LPI RP6)	Number of residents assisted into training	732	740	661	Not Met	The outturn reflects the fact that clients are now requiring more support to enable them to become job ready and compete effectively within the jobs market. This means each client requires more than one training opportunity.
ED6a (LPI RPI 6a)	Number of residents assisted into training who were long term unemployed	219	200	287	Exceeded	The outturn has exceeded target because of continual targeting of this particular sector.
ED6 (LPI RP6b)	Number of residents assisted into training who were young unemployed	122	233	168	Not Met	The target is very sensitive to small changes given the relatively low numbers of young unemployed people counted against this indicator. The target is also aspirational and difficult to achieve.
ED7 (LPI RP7)	The amount of external funding deployed to support the council's	£1.899m	£2.500m	£2.079m	Not Met	The outturn is off target due to the late approval of a key funding component for the Brougham Enterprise enhancement programme and therefore agreement has been reached to a £550k slippage into

3.1
APPENDIX A

	economic regeneration activities					2006/7.
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	---------

3.1 APPENDIX A

TABLE 4 – OTHER KEY BEST VALUE/LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2005/06 continued

SERVICE PLAN REF	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	ACTUAL 2004/05	TARGET 2005/6	OUTTURN 2005/6	TARGET EXCEEDED/ NOT MET	COMMENTS
ED8 (LPI RP8)	The number of business start ups with council assistance	116	120	91	Not Met	The outturn is below target primarily due to the extensive Brougham Enterprise Centre enhancement programme. Due to funding offers being agreed late in the year, the Centre has had to be virtually fully voided to allow the construction works to take place at the appropriate speed.
ED9 (LPI RP9)	Gap between the Hartlepool employment rate and GB rate	12.3%	6.9%	8.3%	Not Met	
ED11 (LPI RP11)	Long term unemployment rate as a proportion of total unemployed	27.7%	27.2%	32.2%	Not Met	There have been significant increases in unemployment across the UK with significant job losses reported in the last year. Although long term unemployment has risen it has shown a reduction of 0.4% from February 2006.
ED12 (LPI RP12)	Youth unemployment rate as a proportion of the total unemployed	34.3%	31.5%	36.9%	Not Met	There have been significant increases in unemployment across the UK with significant job losses reported in the last year. Youth unemployment has increased, however it has shown a reduction of 0.4% from February 2006.

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder

23rd June 2006



Report of: The Assistant Director (Planning & Economic Development)

Subject: CURRENT POSITION ON UNTIDY/DERELICT LAND AND BUILDINGS

SUMMARY

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the Portfolio Holder on the progress on securing improvements to specific untidy/derelict buildings in the town.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

The report outlines progress in relation to 10 identified sites.

3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER

The quality of the environment is a key element of the Portfolio Holder's area of responsibility.

4.0 TYPE OF DECISION

Non-Key.

5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Portfolio Holder.

6.0 DECISION REQUIRED

That the Portfolio Holder notes the current position with regard to identified sites.

REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO

Report To Portfolio Holder
23rd June 2006



Report of: The Assistant Director (Planning & Economic Development)

Subject: CURRENT POSITION ON UNTIDY/DERELICT LAND AND BUILDINGS

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This is an update report to explain briefly the progress on ten problematic untidy/derelict buildings and sites identified in the Borough for action.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Consultants (Ferguson McIlveen, and Jacksons C & PL) have been engaged to enquire into and write to landowners requesting a programme of works to secure environmental enhancements in relation to the 10 sites referred to below. The intention is to be seen as acting even-handed through initial negotiations, yet with a clear imperative that powers under sec. 215 of the Planning Act will be exercised if cooperation or voluntary action from the landowners is not forthcoming.

3 PROGRESS

- 3.1 The sites under consideration are: -

1) Golden Flatts Public House

First warning letter sent. A response has been received from the owner pointing out the site benefits from planning permission to redevelop for housing and the building will be demolished. However, there is a sec. 106 legal agreement needing to be signed by all parties before the planning certificate can be issued. This is nearing completion and it is hoped that early demolition can be agreed. The matter is being kept under review.

2) Longscar Centre, Seaton Carew

First warning letter sent. A response has been received from Solicitors acting for the owner confirming that repairs will be carried out to the roof and rubbish cleared from the rear. Inspection has confirmed that rubbish has been cleared from the rear and new security fencing erected. Officers will ensure roof repairs are carried out.

3) Crown House, Surtees Street

There are ownership complications with the building in that the owning company was removed from the Companies Register. This means the property is currently vested with the Crown. Formal proceedings however are underway to have the company restored to the Companies Register. The company's solicitors have advised that once restoration has been achieved, the company as the sole legal and beneficial owner of the property would address issues relating to the repair and maintenance of the property. A court case management conference was due to be held on 22nd May. Confirmation of the current legal position is awaited from the company's solicitors. The option for action under sec 215 powers is being kept under review.

Land owned by the Council adjoining the site on the corner of Surtees Street and Tower Street, which is also in a poor state, will shortly be tidied up and the unauthorised parking on it will be prevented by the erection of bollards.

4) Former Gas Showroom, Victoria Road

First warning letter sent. A response has been received from the owner who indicated that work has commenced to comply with the planning approval for a new public house. Amendments have recently been submitted that may need the owner to submit a new planning application. Possible action is being discussed in the absence of a detailed programme of works. This programme is to be requested.

5) Former Odeon Cinema, Raby Road

First warning letter sent. While discussions are ongoing about alternative development proposals no response has been received from owner. Ownership to be rechecked.

6) The New Fleece Public House, Northgate

First warning letter sent to the owner, warning of the Council's powers under sec 215 and giving notice of an advertisement offence regarding a hoarding displayed on the building. A separate letter has been sent to Titan outdoor regarding the hoarding.

To date there has been no response to either letter. The two-week period given in those letters for response has expired. Planning permission has been granted to demolish the public house and develop the land. A detailed timetable for the development needs to be agreed with the developer.

7) Victoria Buildings, Middlegate

Negotiations regarding grant applications to develop the building are at a sensitive stage. As a consequence, the matter is to be held in abeyance.

8) Morrison Hall, Church Close

First warning letter sent to the owner. There has been a response and the owner has agreed to carry out remedial works to the building by the week commencing 19th June. This will be monitored.

9) Old United Reform Church, Durham Street

A planning appeal decision for conversion to 10 self-contained flats is awaited. First warning letter sent to deal with immediate issues.

10) Niramax Tyre Depot, Mainsforth Terrace.

First warning letter sent. The owner has responded by confirming that the tyres are being removed from the site at the moment. The wall will be demolished as part of an approved housing development. No timescale has been indicated. It is felt that immediate action is required to reinstate the wall by repairing the holes in it. Notice to be served under sec. 215. This action will be initiated by the consultants, Ferguson McIlveen and Jacksons C & PL.

4. SUMMARY

4.1 In summary, it is clear that property owners are responding to the approach taken, but that there remains a need for officers and the Council's consultants to continue to monitor and chase progress.

4.2 A similar report will be submitted to the Planning Committee.

5. RECOMMENDATION

5.1 It is recommended the Portfolio Holder note the report.