

# **CABINET**

## **MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD**

27 February 2006

### **Present:**

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond) - In the Chair

Councillors: Peter Jackson (Finance and Performance Management Portfolio Holder),  
Ray Waller (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder).

Officers: Paul Walker, Chief Executive  
Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive  
Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services  
Ian Parker, Director of Neighbourhood Services  
Mike Ward, Chief Financial Officer  
Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services  
Nicola Bailey, Director of Adult and Community Services  
Joanne Machers, Chief Personnel Services Officer  
Tony Brown, Chief Solicitor  
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager  
Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety and Prevention  
Ann Turner, Governor Support Officer  
Ian Jopling, Transport Team Leader  
Steve Hilton, Assistant Public Relations Officer  
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

### **188. Apologies for Absence**

Councillors Stanley Fortune (Policy Co-ordination Portfolio Holder), Robbie Payne (Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder), and Cath Hill (Children's Services Portfolio Holder).

### **189. Quorum**

The Mayor stated that in the absence of a quorum, and in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000 and the Council's Constitution, he would exercise his power of decision, and would do so in accordance with the wishes of the Members present.

### **190. Declarations of interest by members**

None.

**191. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2006**

Confirmed.

**192. Final Report – Scrutiny Enquiry into 20mph Speed Limit Zones Outside Schools** *(Author)*

**Type of decision**

Non-key.

**Purpose of report**

The Chairman of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum, Councillor Cranney, presented the findings of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum following its enquiry into 20 mph Speed Limit Zones Outside of Schools within Hartlepool.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

At the meeting of the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum, held on 12 August 2005, the issue of 20 mph speed limit zones outside of Schools within Hartlepool was referred to Scrutiny Coordinating Committee for further consideration (Minute 28 refers). The report set out the details of the investigation and its findings.

Cabinet Members thanked the Scrutiny Forum for an excellent report which focussed on the safety of children within the borough.

**Decision**

That the detailed recommendations of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum, as set out below, be adopted: -

- (a) That the Authority compiles a 20 mph Speed Limit Zones Policy upon completion of a thorough consultation exercise with members of the public and partners which includes:-
  - (i) An agreed criteria for the implementation of mph speed limit zones outside of schools within Hartlepool;
  - (ii) Alternative traffic calming/road safety measures that may be implemented at sites that are deemed inappropriate for 20 mph speed limit zones;
  - (iii) Proposals to tackle issues of enforcement and prosecution;
  - (iv) Schemes and initiatives to educate children, parents, teachers and residents about road safety; and a
  - (v) Commitment to partnership working.
- (b) That the Authority continues to strengthen links/working relationships with the emergency services, public transport operators, Northern Region Road Safety Engineering Group, Cleveland Safety Camera

Partnership and the Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group;

- (c) That the Authority monitors and evaluates any 20 mph speed limit zones that are implemented at regular intervals;
- (d) That the Authority considers a number of 20 mph speed limit zones pilot schemes outside of schools within Hartlepool;
- (e) That the Authority addresses road safety issues with a 'prevention is better than cure' approach; and
- (f) That the Authority submits a progress report on the recommendations contained within this report, within six months, to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

### **193. Call-in of Decision – Briarfields Allotments Site** (Scrutiny Coordinating Committee)

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

#### **Purpose of report**

In the absence of the Chair of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee, Councillor James, Councillor Cranney presented the report of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee referring the decision of Cabinet made on 24 January 2006 (Minute 173, Decision Item 5.1 refers) back to Cabinet for re-consideration in light of the unanimous recommendation made by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 10 February 2006, as per the Authority's Call-In Procedure.

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

Following the decision by Cabinet to reject the reinstatement proposal on the basis that the issue be reconsidered when the Council's budgetary position was known, a Call-In Notice was issued by three Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on the basis that the decision had been taken in contravention of the principles of decision making as outlined in Article 13.02 of the Constitution. The reasons identified in the Call-In Notice were set out in the report.

The Mayor commented that once the Council's budgetary position had become known, funding for the reinstatement of the allotment site had been included in the proposals submitted to, and approved by, Council on 16 February 2006. Members spoke in support of the reinstatement of the allotments. However, the Mayor stated that he felt their reinstatement was a waste of Council resources as there was already an over provision of allotments in the town and the Council had bent over backwards to accommodate the Briarfields allotment holders elsewhere. The Mayor recognised the views of the Council expressed at a meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> February and of the members present, therefore exercised his powers in

accordance with those views. (see minute 189 above)

**Decision**

That the report of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee be noted and that Cabinet approves the reinstatement of the Briarfields allotment site following Council's approval to the Capital funds for the scheme as part of the 2006/07 Budget and Policy Framework.

**194. Youth Justice Plan 2006/07** (*Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*)

**Type of decision**

Budget and Policy Framework item.

**Purpose of report**

The report set out proposals for the development of the Youth Justice Plan and considered issues for the Youth Offending Service (YOS) during 2006/07.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

Each year the Youth Justice Board requests Youth Offending Services to complete an annual plan as required by Section 40 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The Youth Justice Board Plan requires Youth Offending Services to set out how they are going to respond to the requirements of the Youth Justice Performance Management framework, to address areas of under performance and deliver continuous improvement.

The Corporate Performance Assessment excellent rating for the authority does mean that an annual plan is not required, but the Authority's Constitution requires completion as part of the Budget and Policy Framework. Good practice would dictate that a plan should be produced in order to inform the service delivery for next year.

Youth Offending Service Performance contributes to the assessment of the overall local authority performance via the Annual Performance Assessment (APA) process. The overall score from this assessment and the accompanying performance data will inform the final score for the Children and Young People service block of the CPA. The Youth Justice Plan will be used by the APA inspectors and Youth Offending Services are asked to complete an additional template summarising performance data by the end of April. The APA templates will also be used by inspectors in the Joint Area Review of Children's Services which is aligned with the Joint Inspection of Youth Offending Teams lead by her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. Hartlepool Youth Offending Service is to be inspected in October 2006.

To accommodate the bringing forward of the plan, submission from end of June to end of April, to tie in with the APA, performance data in the plan will only cover the first three quarters of 05/06. The first part of the process in

Hartlepool is to provide an issues paper, which will be used as the basis for consultation with users and partners and for consideration by scrutiny. The annual plan will be available for consideration by Cabinet and full Council in April 2006, and needs to be submitted to the Youth Justice Board by 30th April 2006.

**Decision**

That the issues paper be approved for consultation with partners, young people and for referral to the scrutiny process.

**195. Responses to the Further Proposed Modifications to the Hartlepool Local Plan** (*Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*)

**Type of decision**

Budget and Policy Framework item.

**Purpose of report**

To update Cabinet on the Further Proposed Modifications to the Hartlepool Local Plan following the expiry of the consultation period and to recommend to Council that the Local Plan now be adopted.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The Mayor reported that there had been no duly made objections to the Proposed Further Modifications, and the Council could now proceed to adopt the Local Plan as further modified. The date of the formal adoption will be the day of the Council resolution. Statutory Regulations require that the Council publish notices in the London Gazette and the local press advising of the date of the adoption and coming into effect of the Local Plan, and allowing a period of 6 weeks for any person to challenge the plan's validity to apply to the High Court to have the plan or parts of the plan quashed.

**Decision**

Cabinet recommends Council to adopt, as further modified, the 'Hartlepool Local Plan including mineral and waste policies'.

**196. Concessionary Fares** (*Director of Neighbourhood Services*)

**Type of decision**

Key Decision – tests (i) and (ii) apply.

**Purpose of report**

To report the current status of the Council's negotiations with bus operators regarding the Government's changes to the statutory minimum requirement

for older and disabled persons' travel concessions from the 1st April 2006.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in the Budget on 16th March 2005 that the statutory concessionary fares scheme for bus services would be extended from 1st April 2006. This will provide free off-peak concessionary travel on registered local bus services in England for people aged 60 and over and disabled people. The Government has set aside an additional £350 million to local authorities in 2006/07 to finance the scheme distributed through the Rate Support Grant (RSG) formulae with no ring fencing.

Hartlepool Borough Council currently operates a concessionary bus travel scheme in accordance with the statutory minimum requirements of the Transport Act 2000 with the addition of a number of enhancements made at the Council's discretion to travel times and cross boundary journeys. In 2005/2006, a projected total of 1,239,125 journeys will be undertaken by Hartlepool concessionary pass holders at a total cost to the council of around £450,000.

The previous Cabinet report (23rd November 2005) stated that the projected additional costs for the new scheme were considered to be a considerable under-estimate. This has subsequently been confirmed by the level of funding that bus operators have stated that they require for the new scheme. Average fares have risen by an average of over 14% in the last year as a result of increased costs including fuel, wages, and insurance.

The table below provides projected expenditure for the current financial year and the most recent projected costs negotiated with bus operators for the various options. These costs are significantly greater than the initial projected costs. Expenditure for the current financial year is based on the current half fare scheme, with all day travel for Hartlepool with a cross boundary element for services 1 and 36 to Middlesbrough and Stockton respectively. It was stressed that the costs for the following options were a result of initial negotiations with bus operators. Crucial negotiations are still taking place with bus operators. Revised estimates were reported at the meeting and are reflected below.

The current costed options are as follows:

**Option 1 - Statutory Minimum Scheme** - This represents the minimum statutory Government scheme giving free travel within the Hartlepool area after 09:30 in the morning, with half price before 09:30 but no cross boundary concessions.

**Option 2 - Statutory Minimum Scheme Plus Existing Cross Boundary** - This represents the minimum statutory Government scheme giving free travel within the Hartlepool area after 09:30 in the morning, with half price before 09:30 and includes existing cross boundary services 1 and 36 to Middlesbrough and Stockton.

**Option 3 - Statutory Minimum All Day Scheme Plus Existing Cross**

**Boundary** - This represents free travel all day within Hartlepool, and half price includes existing cross boundary services 1 and 36 to Middlesbrough and Stockton.

**Option 4 - Tees Valley Wide All Day Scheme** - This represents free travel all day throughout the Tees Valley Boroughs (excluding Darlington).

Operator		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	Current Payment	Statutory minimum scheme	Statutory minimum scheme plus existing cross boundary	Statutory minimum all day scheme plus existing cross boundary	Tees Valley wide all day scheme
Total	£453,764	£1,122,413	£1,137,413	£1,148,400	£1,288,683

Given the uncertainty in the additional trips that could be generated by a free travel scheme (increasing operator costs and fare levels), a fixed payment method is being negotiated with bus operators for 2006/07. This method would secure the agreed scheme in budgetary terms and guarantee payments for both the Council and bus operators. It is proposed that the fixed price scheme would operate for a period of one year, with reviews taking place after six months and at the year end. Evidence gathered from these reviews, particularly in relation to usage would then help to form the basis for agreements in 2007/08 and beyond.

The Council in its budget deliberations has included an additional corporate contingency in respect of older peoples purchasing, concessionary fares and ongoing equal pay costs. This sum only included an indicative cost pressure of £600,000 for concessionary fares in 2006/07. The additional costs of the four options were: -

- Option 1 - £669,000
- Option 2 - £684,000
- Option 3 - £695,000
- Option 4 - £834,000

Option 3 was considered to be a 'middle ground' option for the Council to approve, giving residents a scheme similar to that currently in operation, though with the statutory free travel within the borough. This option did, however, create an additional budget pressure for 2006/07 of £95,000. The Chief Financial Officer reported that there may be some flexibility within the General Fund in 2006/07 to meet additional costs over the £600,000 initially identified. However, there was unlikely to be any flexibility in the following years and therefore, Council would need to make the funding of the scheme a priority as it would become a significant budget pressure for 2007/08.

Cabinet Members considered options 3 and 4 in some detail. Members commented that a Tees Valley wide scheme was the preferred option as expressed by residents. Councillor R Waller commented that as the Council's Older Peoples Champion, he supported the Tees Valley option.

Whilst this option would cost over and above the additional amount budgeted, he felt that this cost was one that residents would support. As the scheme proposed was for one year only, the costs could be revisited when it became a priority for funding in 2007/08. Cabinet members questioned whether the costs quoted were dependent on the other borough councils agreeing to the same proposal. The Director of Neighbourhood Services reported that the costs quoted were not dependent on the other councils and related to a one year operation of the scheme only.

The Mayor requested that a report be submitted after six months so that a detailed analysis of the use of the scheme could be considered as part of the budget proposals for 2007/08.

### **Decision**

1. That Cabinet approve the implementation of Option 4 “the Tees Valley wide scheme” as the free concessionary fares scheme for Hartlepool.
2. That the Director of Neighbourhood Services, in conjunction with the Chief Financial Officer, is authorised to complete a final agreement with bus operators before the deadline of 3rd March 2006.
3. That the Cabinet receive a report after six months operation of the scheme detailing an update on the operation of the adopted free concessionary fares scheme for consideration as part of the budget development for 2007/08.

## **197. Friarage Manor House and Surrounding Land – Draft Development Brief** (*Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Key Decision – test (ii) applies.

### **Purpose of report**

The report seeks Cabinet endorsement to the draft development brief for the Friarage Manor House and surrounding land and requests authorisation to carry out public consultation on the draft brief.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

A planning/development brief has been prepared in draft which is intended to provide advice and guidance on suitable developments and would be used to support the marketing of the land. The draft brief was submitted as an appendix to the report for Cabinet’s consideration. The brief sought to ensure the viable restoration of the Manor House within a sensitively designed redevelopment scheme. Guidance was included which sought to ensure that the setting of this building is enhanced as well as the overall character of the Headland Conservation Area. The Mayor noted the tabled comments from the Hartlepool Civic Society. Cabinet noted that the land ownership issues were somewhat complicated and asked that the chief



Solicitor pursue a resolution to these problems with the Charity Commission.

**Decision**

That the draft brief be approved for the purposes of consultation.

**198. Electronic Document, Records Management and Workflow System Phase 2** (*Chief Financial Officer*)

**Type of decision**

Key Decision – test (i) applies.

**Purpose of report**

The purpose of the report was to secure approval to the costs associated with the integration of the current Electronic Document Records Management System and workflow (EDRMS) with the new Financial Management System (FMS) for invoice processing and to the costs of acquisition of a corporate wide software licence for the EDRMS system. This IT implementation would provide the foundations for the future roll out of the document management and workflow solution corporately in line with the Way Forward and would assist in the achievement of future efficiency targets.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The EDRMS / FMS integration required additional users to be licensed to use the EDRMS software. Initial assessments suggested up to 150 extra user licences may be required. However, the ICT Strategy assumed the wider roll out of the EDRMS across the Council into other departments and services / activities which will in future require further licences. As part of EDRMS Phase 1 the Council spent £93,820 on the purchase of 200 user licences, however the supplier gave the Council the option to convert to a corporate licence basis at a fixed price providing the Council was able to make that decision by 31st March 2006. The supplier has granted an extension to this option to 30th June 2006; however, it is willing to offer a discount of £29,775 to the price if the Council makes a commitment to the corporate licence at this stage. Evaluation suggests that the Council should take advantage of the discounted terms offered by the supplier given its forecast future requirements.

The capital costs of EDRMS Phase 2 of the project are £216,634, comprising a corporate licence cost of £157,303 and technical and project management costs of Hummingbird (EDRMS supplier) and Northgate of £59,331. Further details were set out in Section 4 of the Proposal document from Northgate attached as Appendix A to the report. It was proposed to fund the Phase 2 investment from the Way Forward Reserve.

Cabinet Members, while supporting the proposal, asked that a report be submitted to an early Cabinet meeting setting out the expenditure against the Way Forward Reserve.

**Decision**

1. That the EDRMS / FMS integration be approved on a two phased implementation basis and the acquisition of the corporate wide EDRMS licence at the discounted cost also be approved, both items to be funded from the Way Forward Reserve.
2. That the Chief Financial Officer and the Assistant Chief Executive be authorised to conclude any necessary funding or contractual arrangements.

**199. Adoption of The Coast Protection Strategy Study: North Sands to Newburn Bridge** (*Director of Neighbourhood Services*)

**Type of decision**

Key Decision – test (ii) applies.

**Purpose of report**

To seek adoption of the Coast Protection Strategy Study and to inform the Cabinet of the potential risks and financial implications of the options recommended in the plan.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The study has been produced by the consultant, Atkins, and consultation has been undertaken with statutory consultees, including DEFRA, PD Teesport (formerly THPA), the Environment Agency, English Nature, and a substantial number of non statutory regional and local consultees. Consultation with local residents was also undertaken through two public meetings. The study was previously reported to Cabinet on 30 June 2003, and this further report seeks to gain adoption of the study. It has been produced after consideration of the responses to the many consultations, and the additional work requested, and funded, by DEFRA. Contained within the report were a series of appendices setting out the conclusions and recommendations from Stage C (Strategy Plan) of the study (Appendix 1); a summary table of the study findings (Appendix 2); and a plan of the maintenance responsibilities (Appendix 3).

The Director of Neighbourhood Services focussed on the preferred policy options for future years set out in Appendix 1. The table detailed the issues that needed to be addressed in the next five years, five to ten years and ten to one hundred years. In relation to the Town Wall, the Director indicated that the scheme to restore the beach using sand replenishment and control structures met the DEFRA funding criteria and an application for grant for the scheme would be submitted.

The Director stated that at the present none of the other schemes met the DEFRA criteria for funding and therefore over the next ten years it was estimated that some £15m of Capital may be needed to fund the coastal protection schemes recommended in the report. While this was a long term issue, there was a clear requirement to put more funding into coastal protection works. The reserve for this type of works had recently been returned to the General Fund following the Scrutiny investigation into Council reserves. It was now essential that some risk management assessment needed to be undertaken to prioritise schemes.

Cabinet Members highlighted the works required at North Pier (Middleton Pier) and questioned if funding was available to carry out the works. The Director stated that any works would need to be funded from the General Fund. A costed outline scheme could be prepared to submit to DEFRA for funding for the works.

### **Decision**

- 1 That the Strategy Study be adopted by the Council.
- 2 That a copy of the study be placed in the Central Library and in Bryan Hanson House with an electronic copy on the Council's website.
- 3 That presentations of the study findings be given to each of the Neighbourhood Forums.
- 4 That applications be made to DEFRA and all other relevant authorities to attempt to progress the following schemes:
  - (i) The Town Wall scheme (which at present achieves criteria);
  - (ii) A monitoring system for the beaches and structures (which at present it is uncertain whether it meets criteria);
  - (iii) An 'Appropriate Assessment' for the Headland Structures (which at present it is uncertain whether it meets criteria);
  - (iv) That a costed scheme be prepared for the works to the North Pier (Middleton Pier) for submission to DEFRA. The costs of preparing the scheme to be met from the Capital programme.  
(It should be noted that schemes must be submitted to DEFRA for approval even though they do not meet the criteria for grant aid funding. Those schemes not achieving the criteria will require funding from alternative sources.)
- 5 That the Capital requirements are included into any new Strategic Capital and Asset Strategy.
- 6 That the upward pressures on the coast protection revenue budget due particularly to the maintenance of the Headland Structures be noted and considered as part of the 2007/8 budget process.

## **200. Appointment of Local Authority Representatives to Serve on School Governing Bodies** *(Director of Children's Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To request Cabinet consideration and approval to the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee, in respect of the appointment of Local Authority representative Governors to serve on school governing bodies where vacancies exist following the expiry of terms of office of a number of Local Authority Governors.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

Applications were invited from members of the general public, elected members and those governors whose term of office was about to expire who were interested in serving or wish to continue serving as a Local Authority representative governor on school governing bodies.

The criteria for the recruitment of Local Education Authority representatives were agreed by the Borough Council in 2000 and this was detailed in the report. Attached as an appendix was a schedule setting out details of vacancies together with applications received in respect of the vacancies considered by members of the General Purposes Sub-Committee at their meeting held on 15 February 2006.

### **Decision**

That the appointments of LA representative Governors to serve on school governing bodies where vacancies currently exist and on the expiry of terms of offices of governors in February 2006 be approved as follows:-

#### **English Martyrs School**

Mr C Akers

#### **Golden Flatts Primary School**

Councillor C Hill

#### **Barnard Grove Primary School**

No interest expressed – Deferred

#### **Jesmond Road Primary School**

No interest expressed – Deferred

#### **Lynnfield Primary School**

Mr A Armstrong

**Dyke House School**

Mr P King  
Mrs S Sharpe

**Rossmere Primary School**

No interest expressed - Deferred

**Seaton Carew Nursery**

Mr L Brown

**Springwell School**

No interest expressed - Deferred

**St. Cuthbert's R.C. Primary School**

Councillor F London

**Ward Jackson Primary School**

No interest expressed – Deferred

**Fens Primary School**

Mrs A Lilley

**Greatham CE Primary School**

No interest expressed - Deferred

**201. Vacancies Monitoring Arrangements** *(Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder)*

**Type of decision**

Non-key.

**Purpose of report**

The report set out proposed arrangements for a Panel to monitor vacancies in the Council

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

In the absence of the Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder, Councillor Payne, the Finance and Performance Management Portfolio Holder, Councillor Jackson, presented proposals for a Panel to monitor vacancies in the Council. The report set out the proposed process for monitoring vacancies, the posts to which the process would apply and the implications for departments. The Vacancies Monitoring Panel would consist of the Performance Management Portfolio Holder and five elected members (proportional representation), the Chief Executive and the Chief Personnel Services Officer.

**Decision**

1. That the proposals for a Vacancies Monitoring Panel be implemented from 1st April 2006.

2. That a report reviewing the panel's operation be submitted to Cabinet after 6 months of operation; the report also to be circulated to all members of Council.

## **202. Our Health, Our Care, Our Say – A New Direction for Community Services** (*Director of Adult and Community Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To outline the content of the White Paper 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say – A new direction for community services' and to identify the key implementation issues for Hartlepool Borough Council.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The White Paper 'Our Health, Our Care, Our Say' was published on 31st January 2006. It outlined the Government proposals for reforming and improving community based services, by providing health and social care services which focus on prevention and promoting health and well-being, that deliver care in more local settings, and that promote the health of all, and that deliver services that are flexible, integrated and responsive to people's needs and wishes. It provides the framework for a radical and sustained shift in the way services are delivered.

Cabinet Members commented that Hartlepool already had some excellent joint working arrangements with agencies in the town and was to some extent ahead of the game in this respect. Concerns were voiced at the proposals for the realignment of the Primary Care Trusts. Cabinet considered that it was essential that a coterminous PCT was retained.

### **Decision**

That the report be noted.

## **203. Corporate Plan Progress and Revenue Monitoring Report 2005/06 – Quarter 3** (*Assistant Chief Executive and Chief Financial Officer*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To inform Cabinet of: -

- the progress made towards achieving the Corporate Plan service improvement priorities (SIPs) in order to provide timely information and

- allow any necessary decisions to be taken;
- to provide details of progress against the Council's overall revenue budget for 2005/2006.

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

Prior to the Quarter 2 monitoring report, performance information and revenue monitoring information were reported separately to Cabinet. As agreed at Cabinet on 22nd August, 2005, the information has been integrated to form one report that will allow Cabinet to consider performance and expenditure together. This would also address the requirements of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA), to be completed in 2006/2007, which will, amongst other things, assess the extent to which the Council's "performance management is integrated with the management of resources (finance, people and IT), so that resources follow priorities whilst retaining the flexibility to move resources around to respond to performance issues".

This report and Appendices 1-6 contained detailed information by Portfolio, split into two main sections. The first section looked in detail at the performance and progress on service improvement priorities and key performance indicators. The second section looked in more detail at the progress made against the Council's own 2005/2006 Revenue Budget.

Councillor Jackson commented that the report set out good news both on performance and finance. The Chief Financial Officer indicated that departments were meeting their spending targets and overall there was a £2m under spend anticipated. It was highlighted that this was not a surplus in the truest sense as all the funding was committed to schemes in 2006/07.

#### **Decision**

That the current position with regard to performance and revenue monitoring be noted.

### **204. NRF, Capital and Accountable Body Programme Monitoring Report 2005/06** *(Chief Financial Officer)*

#### **Type of decision**

None – the report was for Cabinet.

#### **Purpose of report**

To provide details of progress against the Council's overall Capital budget for 2005/2006 and progress against the Spending Programmes where the Council acts as the Accountable Body and Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF).

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The report provides detailed monitoring reports for Capital for each Portfolio up to 31st December, 2005. The Finance Portfolio report also includes Accountable Body Programme spend for the same period. The report

follows the format adopted for the previous report and budgets are reported by Portfolio Holder and analysed by department, to enable each Portfolio Holder to readily review their area of responsibility. The report reflected the recent changes in departmental responsibilities as well as reflecting the changes in Portfolio responsibilities. The report would be submitted to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 10th March, 2006.

**Decision**

That the report be noted.

**205. Local Transport Plan Capital Settlement** (*Director of Neighbourhood Services*)

**Type of decision**

Non-key.

**Purpose of report**

To inform the Cabinet of the confirmed levels of Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital funding to be provided for 2006/07, planning guidelines for 2007/08 to 2010/11 and proposed distribution of capital funding.

**Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet**

The report provided details of the Government's assessment of Hartlepool's provisional second LTP and most recent Annual Progress Report. It also sets out the confirmed levels of capital funding for the period 2006/07, planning guidelines for 2007/08 to 2010/11 and the proposed revised distribution of capital funding.

**Decision**

That the revised distribution of LTP capital funding for the Hartlepool's final second Local Transport Plan be noted and that the Director of Neighbourhood Services be authorised to develop the final text version of the LTP to be considered for approval by the Cabinet on 13th March 2006.

**J A BROWN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2006**