

CABINET

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

11th September 2006

Present:

The Mayor (Stuart Drummond) - In the Chair

Councillors: Peter Jackson (Performance Management Portfolio Holder),
Victor Tumilty (Culture, Leisure and Transportation Portfolio Holder),
Ray Waller (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder).

Officers: Nicola Bailey, Director of Adult and Community Services
Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning
Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services
Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services
Andrew Atkin, Assistant Chief Executive
Chris Barlow, Principal Community Strategy Officer
Sajda Banaras, Scrutiny Support Officer
Tony Brown, Chief Solicitor
Steve Hilton, Assistant Public Relations Officer
Joanne Smithson, Head of Community Strategy
Michael Ward, Chief Financial Officer
Amanda Whitaker, Democratic Services Team Manager

55. Apologies for Absence

Councillors Pam Hargreaves, Cath Hill and Robbie Payne.

56. 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.

57. Declarations of interest by members

None

58. Minutes of the meeting held on 29th August 2006

Confirmed

59. Community Strategy and Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy Review 2006 *(Head of Community Strategy)*

Type of decision

Budget and Policy Framework

Purpose of report

To consider the revised Community Strategy, Hartlepool's Ambition, as a consultation draft.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The Hartlepool Partnership, the town's Local Strategic Partnership, and the Council had agreed a draft Community Strategy in April 2001 and had adopted a final version in April 2002. Hartlepool's Community Strategy set out a timetable for review in five years. In line with this agreement, the Community Strategy Review 2006 had been launched on 5th May 2006 and a new Community Strategy would be in place in April 2007.

The revised Community Strategy built on the 2002 Strategy and set out a revised policy framework for Hartlepool. Key revisions include:

- The Strategy now incorporates the previously separately published Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (2002) and the Sustainable Development Strategy (2001);
- Housing and Environment are established as Priority Aims in their own right and as a result the number of priority aims has increased from 7 to 8;
- Changes to the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy boundary, including the addition of the disadvantaged part of Throston ward as detailed in Appendix Map 1 attached;
- Following over 1100 responses to the consultation, and a series of Theme Partnership workshops, the vision has been revised along with many of the Priority Aims and Objectives.

Consultation on this first revision of the community strategy would run until the 17th November 2006. The consultation draft set out a number of specific questions which were set out in the report. Members were requested to respond to them all, to some and not others, or to write about other issues that had not been covered. Responses to this consultation should be submitted to the Head of Community Strategy no later than 17th November 2006.

During the Consultation period, a number of appraisals of the draft Strategy would be carried out. These would highlight practical ways to enhance the positive aspects of the Strategy and to remove or minimise any negative impacts. These include:

- The Integrated Regional Framework for the North East
- Health Impact Assessment
- Section 17
- Rural Proofing
- Diversity Impact Assessment

More details on these individual assessments is contained in the Community Strategy.

Decision

The revised Community Strategy, *Hartlepool's Ambition*, was approved as a consultation draft.

60. Proposed Selection Criteria – Dealing with Non-Mandatory Scrutiny Topic Referrals from the Authority's Regulatory Panels and Other Committees *(Assistant Chief Executive)*

Type of decision

Non-Key.

Purpose of report

To seek endorsement with regard to the implementation of a selection criteria to be used when considering the appropriateness of undertaking scrutiny investigations following receipt of non-mandatory referrals from the Authority's regulatory panels and other committees

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The report set out the background to the proposed criteria and provided a detailed breakdown of the intended selection criteria to be used by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee when determining the appropriateness of undertaking an investigation upon receipt of a non-mandatory scrutiny referral.

Members of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, at a meeting on 30th June 2006, had welcomed the implementation of the proposed selection criteria as follows:-

- (i) Affects a group of people living within the Hartlepool area;
- (ii) Relates to a service, event or issue in which the Council has direct responsibility for, significant influence over or has the capacity to act as public champion;
- (iii) Not be an issue which overview and scrutiny has considered during the last 12 months;

- (iv) Not relate to a service complaint; and
- (v) Not relate to matters dealt with by another Council committee, unless the issue deals with procedure and policy related issues.

Decision

The proposed selection criteria was endorsed, prior to its consideration by the Constitution Working Group and the Committee Constitution thereafter, for inclusion within the Authority's Constitution.

61. Analysis of Performance Indicators 2005/06 *(Assistant Chief Executive)*

Type of Decision

Non-Key

Purpose of Report

To inform Cabinet of the Council's performance against the set of Performance Indicators for 2005/06 and identify areas of concern.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The report provided information about the Council's performance in 2005/06, and set out a number of different aspects of performance as follows: -

- Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – analysis of how the KPIs identified in the 2004/05 Corporate Plan have performed.
- How does Hartlepool's performance compare with other local authorities
- Performance over time – looking at how performance over a two year period
- Target setting – how the Council has performed in relation to the targets set at the beginning of 2005/06.

Generally the analysis was positive, with over 70% of the KPIs and over 64% of all PIs improving in 2005/06. Over 55% of the KPIs had shown an improvement in each of the last two years. The 2004/05 quartiles could be used as a useful guide to give an indication of how performance had improved in the last 12 months. A 'provisional' quartile had been given based on Hartlepool's 2005/06 outturn, in comparison to the published quartile information for 2004/05. Based on this, and looking at all other English authorities, over 72% of BVPIs (where comparisons could be made) were in the top 2 quartiles, with almost 42% being in the top quartile. This was an increase from 54% and 38% respectively in 2004/05. When comparing with other unitary authorities the picture was very similar, with 71% of comparable BVPIs in the top 2 quartiles, up from 56% in 2004/05. The number of BVPIs in the top quartile had increased from 36% to over 45%.

The report considered a two year period and compared 148 indicators, with almost 40% showing an improvement in each of the last 2 years. Only 7.5% of indicators had deteriorated in each of the last two years, and were shown in appendix 1 to the report. Almost 80% of indicators either achieved the target that had been set for 2004/05 or failed to meet the target by less than 10%. However, this meant that over 20% failed to achieve the target by over 10%.

Decision

Cabinet noted the report and agreed the action to monitor and improve performance, namely: -

- Quarterly reporting to Cabinet (Corporate Plan) and Portfolio Holders (Departmental Plans) highlighting appropriate issues
- Continued development of the Corporate Performance Management Database to further improve the performance monitoring and reporting arrangements.

62. North Eastern Sea Fisheries Committee – Replacement Fisheries Patrol Vessel (*Chief Financial Officer*)

Type of decision

Non Key

Purpose of Report

To consider the funding arrangements for the Authority's share of the costs of replacing the Fisheries Patrol Vessel.

Issue(s) for consideration by Cabinet

The report set out the funding arrangements for the North Eastern Sea Fisheries Committee and the proposal to replace the existing Fisheries Patrol Vessel. The Council was one of the eleven councils with responsibility for funding the annual revenue costs of the North Eastern Sea Fisheries Committee (NESFC). This Council is required to meet 1/36th of the Committee's running costs, which equated to £18,500 for 2006/2007. Provision for this amount is included in the 2006/2007 budget.

At the time the Council was finalising its 2006/2007 Budget notification had been received from the NESFC that the existing Fisheries Patrol Vessel needed to be replaced. At that time details of the cost of replacing the vessel and available funding were not known. As it was not expected that this Council's share of the cost would be significant no provision was included in the 2006/2007 Budget.

The Deputy Clerk of NESFC had recently written to confirm that a replacement cost was now known and European funding of 25% of the total

cost of the vessel had been approved. This was the maximum level for this funding. The remaining cost therefore needed to be funded by the eleven councils covered by NESFC in proportion to their annual contribution. Therefore, this Council was required to meet 1/36th of this cost which amounted to £11,696. As no specific budget existed for this commitment it was suggested that Cabinet approve the virement of this amount from the anticipated saving on the Centralised Estimate Budget.

Decision

Approval was given to the virement of £11,690/**£11696** from the anticipated Centralised Estimates savings to fund the Council's share of replacing the NESFC Fisheries Patrol Vessel.

63. Tees Valley City Region Business Case (*Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*)

Type of decision

Non Key

Purpose of Report

To seek endorsement of the draft Tees Valley City Region Development Programme Business Case and to request delegation of authority to the Chief Executive to approve minor amendments to the document resulting from ongoing consultations.

Issue(s) for Consideration by Cabinet

The report provided background information on the purpose and preparation of the Tees Valley City Region Development Programme Business Case including its relevance to the Northern Way Growth Strategy and the Governments Comprehensive Spending Review. Whilst not a bidding document in its own right, the Business Case set out the main assets and opportunities of the Tees Valley City Region and identified the main barriers to growth which the Government was asked to help address.

In May 2006, a visit by Ruth Kelly, the new Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to the Tees Valley provided the opportunity to present the CRDP and the principal outcomes. As a result of this visit, the Tees Valley had been asked to prepare a Business Case to complement the CRDP. The document, appended to the report, represented the latest draft of the Business Case for Delivery with the Tees Valley City Region and was still being refined. It represented an update of the Tees Valley City Region Development Programme. Supporting the Business Case, a ten year Investment Plan was currently in preparation which would be presented to a future meeting of the Cabinet.

The Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit had taken the lead in pulling the

Business Case together assisted by a Steering Group of relevant bodies. Informal feedback from these agencies to the first draft had been positive. The Business Case was to be submitted to the Department of Communities and Local Government by the end of September. Prior to this a draft version would be presented to private sector members of the Tees Valley Partnership and LSP representatives (5th September) the Tees Valley Chief Executives (6th September) and other interested parties for comment, before the final version is produced. There were no direct financial implications relating to this report as it was not intended to be a bidding document. The report would, however, provide a policy basis for the continuing debate with Government about the future development of the City Region, Government policy implications and future allocation of resources under the Single Programme and other funding streams. Officers had sought to ensure that the interests of Hartlepool are fully recognised within the Business Case.

Decision

The draft City Region Development Programme Business Case was endorsed and the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services was authorised to approve any subsequent amendments following consultations with the Portfolio Holder

64. Local Government Access to Information

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs detailed below in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

Minute 65 - Phoenix Centre, Central Estate (Para 3 – namely, Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

65. Phoenix Centre, Central Estate, Hartlepool *(Director of Neighbourhood Services)*

Type of decision

Non-Key

Purpose of Report

To update Cabinet Members on the position with regard to the Phoenix Centre

Issue(s) for Consideration by Cabinet

Issues considered by Cabinet are set out in the confidential section of these

minutes

Decision

The decision is set out in the confidential section of these minutes.

J A BROWN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 15th September 2006