

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

21 JUNE 2016

The meeting commenced at 3.15 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor Marjorie James (In the Chair)

Councillors: Paul Beck, Sandra Belcher, Brenda Loynes, Jean Robinson and George Springer

Officers: Denise Ogden, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Mike Blair, Technical Services Manager
Steve Hilton, Public Relations Officer
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

1. Apologies for Absence

Councillor Dave Hunter.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Beck declared a personal interest in Minute No. 11 “Hart Primary School Parking”.

Councillor Loynes declared a personal interest in Minute No. 8 “Park Avenue Safety Scheme”.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2016

Received.

4. Minutes of the meetings of the Emergency Planning Joint Committee held on 2 December 2015 and 24 February 2016

Received.

5. Welldeck Road Traffic Regulation Order Objections (Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To report two objections received to proposed double yellow lines on Weldeck Road, and seek approval for a way forward.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Chairman advised the meeting that she had been presented with a petition from residents of Weldeck Road against the proposed traffic regulation order just prior to the meeting commencing. In light of this the Chairman concluded it would not be appropriate to consider the report until officers had considered the petition in detail and were able to respond.

Decision

That consideration of the report be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

6. Local Transport Plan 2015-16 Outturns and 2016-17 Programme *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Key Decision Test (i) and (ii) applies. Forward Plan Reference No. RN09/16.

Purpose of report

To inform the Neighbourhood Services Committee of the progress made under the Local Transport Plan delivery programme during 2015/16, and to identify potential schemes for 2016/17.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that the third Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011-2026, sets out how a Safe and Sustainable Transport system can be delivered within Hartlepool. The strategy is not limited to the 5 year timescale of previous LTP's but was designed to look towards 2026 and evolve over this period. This extended timescale ensures that the LTP is aligned with regional strategies and local development frameworks.

On 31st March 2015, the final year of the LTP Delivery Plan (2011-2015) was concluded. The subsequent LTP Strategic Delivery Plan (2015-2021), had been approved at the Neighbourhood Services Committee meeting on 16th March 2015, covering the 6 year period, (indicative allocations only for the final 3 year periods) as set out in Appendix 1 to the report. Year 1 (2015-2016) of the Strategic Delivery Plan (2015-2021), was completed on 31st March 2016, with Year 2 commencing from 1st April 2016. The tables identifying the works delivered during 2015/16, and the proposed schemes for

2016/17, were shown in Appendix 2 to the report. Details of the Highway Maintenance schemes, completed during 2015/16, were detailed in Appendix 3 to the report.

All works / schemes would be funded via the LTP allocation, from Central Government, as detailed in the Local Transport Delivery Plan (2015-2021), which was approved by the Neighbourhood Services Committee on 16 March 2015. Structural highway maintenance, the 2016/17 LTP allocation would be £1,086,000. Proposed schemes for this funding were approved at the Neighbourhood Services Committee meeting on 29 February, 2016.

It should be noted that if roads deteriorate quicker than has been foreseen then it may be necessary to amend the list of works to be carried out in order to accommodate this. Any such changes will be reported to the Neighbourhood Services Committee as necessary.

Decision

That the works / schemes delivered during 2015/2016 be noted, and the proposed schemes for 2016/2017 be approved.

7. Additional Highway Maintenance Funding *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Key Decision (test (i)/(ii)) Forward Plan Reference No. RN07/16.

Purpose of report

To agree a programme of highway maintenance schemes to the value of the additional funding received from two Government funding initiatives, the Pothole Fund and the Local Highway Maintenance Incentive Fund.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that the Government announced in December 2015, that they intended to introduce an Incentive Fund, to encourage highway authorities to embrace and adopt good practice on efficiencies and asset management, and also reward those already adopting such practices. Following the issue of guidance an application was made to the Incentive Fund and Hartlepool Borough Council has been awarded its maximum allocation for 2016-17 of £66,000.

In addition to the Incentive fund the Government is spending £6.1 billion on local highways maintenance between 2015/16 and 2020/21, giving Councils long-term certainty to plan future work with the aim of preventing potholes and improving local roads, bridges and street lighting. As part of this investment, the Pothole Action Fund will give Local Authorities in England £50 million a year, over the next 5 years, to help them tackle more than 4 million potholes.

Funding is calculated according to the size of the local road network in the area and Hartlepool Borough Council will receive a total of £64,000 in 2016-17 from this fund.

The Technical Services Manager indicated that in order to promote greater transparency the DfT expects the Local Authority to publish an annual report on its website, copied to the Department, showing how much money has been spent, including a quantifiable report of the specific activities that have been undertaken, and the location.

On the basis of the above it was proposed that the total budget of £130,000 be used to resurface entire lengths of road, rather than fill potholes, as it is believed that this is the most efficient, long term, use for the monies.

The programme proposed in Appendix 1 to the report was sourced from year 2 of the recently approved 5 year Highway Maintenance programme together with other schemes that may have become urgent since the programme was developed.

It should be noted that if roads deteriorate quicker than has been foreseen then it may be necessary to amend the list of works to be carried out in order to accommodate this. Any such changes will be reported to the Neighbourhood Services Committee as necessary.

Decision

1. That the list of highway maintenance schemes as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.
2. That the Technical Services Manager be authorised to publish an annual report on the Council's website identifying the progress made in accordance with the government's grant conditions.

8. Park Avenue Safety Scheme *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To consider an objection to the scheme, following its approval at this Committee in January 2016.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that in January 2016, Neighbourhood Services Committee approved the implementation of a safety scheme for Park Avenue. The scheme comprised a raised zebra crossing

linking Ward Jackson Park and the nearby car park at Tunstall Court, a raised informal crossing point at the northern end of Park Avenue, and a 20mph limit for the whole of Park Avenue as shown on the plan at Appendix 1 to the report.

Consultation was undertaken prior to the scheme being approved, with the properties on Park Avenue and Cresswell Road which were adjacent to the scheme. Only one response was received, which was in favour of the proposals. Subsequent to the scheme being approved, an objection has been received from a nearby resident.

The objector claimed that there was no evidence of need, there were only a comparatively small number of properties, traffic use is very light, observed speeds are extremely low, It is inappropriate and unnecessary, a Zebra crossing would be out of place in a conservation area and if one was installed it did not need to be raised, and a full consultation wasn't carried out. All of these issues were addressed in the report and the Technical Services Manager was recommending re-affirmation of the Committee's original decision.

Councillor Loynes, a member of the Committee and Ward Councillor (Rural West) for the area commented that Ward Jackson Park was continually promoted as the main park for all Hartlepool residents yet pedestrian access to the Park Avenue side of the park could be extremely difficult and the proposals agreed by the Committee would resolve those issues and provide an extra level of safety for the elderly and school children accessing the park.

The resident who had submitted the objection, Mr Leech, was present and addressed the Committee with his objections to the proposals. Mr Leech stated he was not against the installation of the Zebra Crossing but did object to the traffic calming measure (raised platforms) and the crossing point near the junction of Park Avenue and Cresswell Road was unnecessary and unsafe being directly on a blind bend.

The Chair of the Park Residents Association, Mrs Johnson, was also present and spoke in favour of the proposed scheme indicating that residents had been seeking a road safety scheme and crossing in the area for some time. Road speeds could be quite high on occasions and the volumes of traffic using Park Avenue to avoid the Elwick Road / Wooler Road Junction often made it difficult to cross Park Avenue.

A representative from the Friends of Ward Jackson Park group was also present and spoke in favour of the proposed scheme.

The Chairman indicated that the referral of the objection to the scheme had been delayed in coming to Committee as it had been considered inappropriate to consider the matter during the pre-election purdah period; and this was the first meeting of the Committee following the elections. The Chairman commented that she did share Members concerns that once a policy committee decision had been made, then that was the end of the

process.

The Chairman considered that the Committee had the option to support the scheme as originally described, amend the scheme or request that officers review the proposals in light of the objection received. Members unanimously endorsed the original decision of the Committee in January and requested that officers seek to commence the works at the earliest opportunity.

Decision

That the original decision of the Committee in relation to approval of the Park Avenue Safety Scheme (25 January 2016, Minute No. 60 refers) be endorsed and the scheme implemented at the earliest opportunity.

9. Proposed 20mph Speed Restrictions - Rift House, Macaulay Road Area *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To seek approval, from the Neighbourhood Services Committee, for the implementation of a 20 mph speed restriction throughout the Macaulay Road area, which includes Drayton Road, Dryden Road, Garrick Grove, Homer Grove, Nash Grove and Swinburne Road.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that following requests from residents, via Ward Councillors, a consultation was undertaken with businesses and local residents, within the area shown on the map at Appendix 1 to the report, to determine the level of support for the potential introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions.

A total of 310 letters and plans were delivered to residential properties. The number of replies received was 93 (30% of the 310 letters which were delivered), with 85 in favour of the proposed scheme (91% of the replies), and 8 were against (9% of those who replied). The scheme would be funded via the Local Transport Plan budget allocation, and the estimated cost would be approximately £1,500.

The Chairman welcomed and endorsed the scheme.

Decision

That the proposed 20mph speed limit scheme as reported and shown on Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

10. Brenda Road Speed Limit Objection *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To consider an objection to the proposed speed limit changes on Brenda Road.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that Members considered a report in October 2015 proposing a reduction in speed limit, from 40mph to 30mph, on the section of Brenda Road between the A689 and B&Q roundabouts.

While this proposal was accepted, it was also questioned whether the section of road from B&Q roundabout to Seaton Lane roundabout should also be reduced to 30mph. It was highlighted that that section of road currently had a 50mph limit, which would obviously require a drop of 20mph to reach a 30mph limit. It was also industrial in nature without direct access to properties, buildings were set back from the road, and is a long straight road which lends itself to a higher limit than 30mph.

In February 2016 a 30mph limit was subsequently approved by Members for both sections of Brenda Road, and a Traffic Regulation Order advertised to facilitate the changes. As a result, a formal objection has been received from Cleveland Police and this was set out at Appendix 1 to the report. The Technical Services Manager highlighted to Members that the Police objection was against the 30mph proposal for the section of Brenda Road from B&Q roundabout to Seaton Lane roundabout; they were in support of the proposed reduction to 30mph between the A689 and B&Q roundabouts.

The Technical Services Manager reported that following the October 2015 Committee meeting, a speed survey was undertaken to assess the actual speeds being recorded on the section of road from B&Q roundabout to Seaton Lane roundabout. This showed that the 24 hour 85th percentile speed for the road was 41mph, suggesting that a reduction from 50mph to 40mph would be acceptable. The survey also shows that the 24 hour average speed is 36mph. A reduction to 30mph would, however, mean a significant number of motorists being well in excess of the speed limit, and at a speed which the Police would be expected to enforce.

PC Neil Empson, Cleveland Police, was present at the meeting and addressed the Committee in relation to the Police's concerns with reducing the speed limit on the section of Brenda Road to 30 mph. PC Empson stated that speed survey showed a 40 mph limit would be more appropriate and would be supported by the Police.

Members commented that the stretch of Brenda Road did lead to 30 mph residential areas at the Seaton Lane end. It was also suggested that 'pinch points' to facilitate pedestrian crossing may also lead to a general reduction in traffic speed. The Chairman commented that the extremely successful changes made to the Tees Bay Retail Park has increased the foot-flow from the residential areas of Seaton Lane and that this was likely to increase further as new housing development takes place. It would seem appropriate to consider the implementation of a crossing point on the section of Brenda Road between the B&Q and Seaton Lane roundabouts. The Chairman suggested that a controlled crossing prioritised for pedestrians rather than traffic together with a 40 mph speed limit, with built out platforms on either side of the road and a central refuge point would address most of the safety concerns in the area and would as a matter of course reduce the overall speed of traffic. The Police representative supported the suggestion stating that there was currently a very good pedestrian safety record for that stretch of road with generally good speed compliance of around 40 mph from drivers.

The proposal for the implementation of 40 mph speed limit together with a request for an appropriately designed crossing to be considered by a future meeting was supported unanimously by the Committee.

Decision

1. That approval be given to the reduction in speed limit on Brenda Road (from Seaton Lane – B&Q roundabout) from 50mph to 40mph.
2. That a further report be submitted to a future meeting in respect of proposals for a controlled crossing on the same section of Brenda Road.

11. Hart Primary School Parking (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To advise of consultation responses to proposed school parking controls at Hart Village, and seek approval on the way forward.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that concerns have been expressed by Hart Primary School over indiscriminate parent parking on Magdalene Drive, and the danger it could pose to school children. A petition, shown at Appendix 1 to the report, had also been received from residents/ carers, asking for road safety measures to be implemented due to the danger

to pedestrians.

There is a car park next to the school associated with the church, which the school feels is large enough to accommodate parents wishing to park, however, vehicles still park on the road adjacent to the school entrance. The south side of the road is residential and, therefore, consultation was required with those residents.

The proposal comprise school time parking restrictions (No Waiting, Loading or Unloading Monday – Friday, 8am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4.00pm) covering the area of Magdalene Drive nearest the school entrance. (See Appendix 2).

The Technical Services Manager indicated that consultation letters were sent to all 13 properties on Magdalene Drive, the School, the Church, Parish Council and Ward Councillors. The results showed 5 residents in favour plus the School, 3 against, and 1 undecided.

Reasons given against the proposals were that the restrictions were unnecessary, there would be a lack of enforcement, parked vehicles would be displaced elsewhere, and the school should create additional parking within their grounds for staff. Officers acknowledged that these proposals would not provide a perfect solution, but this was very difficult to achieve given the geographical constraints of the area. If observed, however, even partially, they would provide a safer environment for pedestrians than exists at present.

Councillor Beck, a member of the Committee and Ward Councillor (Hart) for the area commented that the problems in Magdalene Drive had existed for a number of years with a number of complaints being submitted. The problem was simply due to inconsiderate parking by parents whose children attended the school creating a dangerous situation for their own children and he supported the proposals now reported.

A resident of Magdalene drive and an objector to the proposals, Mr Williams addressed the Committee with his concerns. Mr Williams stated that he had lived in Magdalene Drive for over forty years and agreed there was a significant problem with parents parking indiscriminately but did not feel he should be inconvenienced because of the problems caused by them. Mr Williams considered that alternatives should be discussed with the school as this was a problem they were causing. Mr Williams suggested that bussing the children into the school should be examined.

A Member of Hart Parish Council, Mr Park, was present at the meeting and expressed concerns that parking controls in Magdalene Drive would simply transfer the problem elsewhere in the village. It was considered that better use could be made of the Church car park and the school should look to increase its own car park to remove staff cars from Magdalene Drive.

The Chairman commented that the problems here and at other schools in the area should have been foreseen when the decision not to build a primary School on the Middle Warren development was taken. The resulting need for

expansion of school places at Hart Primary would only exacerbate the problem. The Chairman did highlight to the residents that the yellow lines would only be operational during school opening times. Mr Williams did feel that this would mean that he could not park his, or any visitors he had, car on Magdalene Drive for fear they would overstay into the control period and then be ticketed.

The Technical Services Manager highlighted that this Committee and the Council could only consider controls on the public highway; use of the Church and School car parks were outside of its remit. Use of a school bus was not a cheap option and there was likely to be no funding for such a proposal. It was difficult with any controls to differentiate between those who needed to be there and the parents dropping off and collecting their children.

Mr Williams suggested that an alternative may be to instigate resident parking on the side of Magdalene Drive with residential properties and double yellow lines on the school side of the drive. The Chairman did feel that this may be a potential solution, though residents would need to purchase permits which were £5 per year. The Technical Services Manager stated that such proposals would need formal consultation with all those the scheme would directly impact upon.

The Chairman proposed that double yellow lines on the school side of Magdalene Drive be implemented with residents parking on the other side of the road subject to the outcome of consultation. If the consultation was positive and to allow a quicker implementation of a scheme, the Chairman suggested that authority be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee to implement a scheme before the start of the new school year in September. If this was not possible, then a further report would need to come back to the Committee. The Chairman also undertook to keep the ward councillors updated on any progress. The Chairman indicated that if a scheme was implemented, it would be monitored with a report back to Committee after six months.

Decision

1. That consultation be undertaken with the residents of Magdalene Drive on the implementation of a resident parking scheme on the south side of the drive and double yellow 'no parking' restrictions on the north side of the drive in order to alleviate the parking problems being experienced at school drop-off and pick up times.
2. That subject to the results of the consultation exercise, the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to implement the scheme and report back to Committee after 6 months monitoring of its impact.

12. Proposed 20mph Speed Restrictions – Burbank Street Area *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To seek approval, from the Neighbourhood Services Committee, for the implementation of a 20 mph speed restriction throughout the Burbank Street area, as highlighted in Appendix 1.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that following requests from residents, via Ward Councillors, a consultation was undertaken with businesses and local residents, within the area shown in the map at Appendix 1 to the report, to determine the level of support for the potential introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions.

The consultation was undertaken during April 2016, with letters and plans being hand delivered, to residents and businesses within the area. A total of 340 letters and plans were delivered, and 73 replies were received (21.50% of letters sent). Copies of the letter and plan were also sent to the 3 local Ward Councillors. Of the 73 responses, 68 were in favour of the proposed scheme (93% of those who replied), and 5 were against (7% of those who replied). The scheme would be funded via the Local Transport Plan budget allocation, and the estimated cost would be approximately £1,500.

Decision

The proposed 20mph speed limit scheme be approved in the Burbank Street area, as shown in the map at Appendix 1 to the report.

13. Hartlepool Marina Infrastructure (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To advise Members of the current situation with regard to the maintenance of the roads and highway infrastructure on Hartlepool Marina and seek approval to adopt the highway known as Harbour Walk (including lighting, footways and drainage) from its junction with Navigation Point to The Highlight as part of the Council's Regeneration Masterplan.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that the issue of the adoption of

highways in the Marina area had been an ongoing issue ever since the development was constructed. The Council had been close to reaching an agreement in 2010 but they had broken down principally due to issues with drainage discharging directly into the dock. After this time it was understood that the land was split into two distinct parts. Navigation Point where the majority of businesses and the pay and display car park remained in the ownership of Mandale whilst Harbour Walk, as indicated on the plan at Appendix 1 to the report, was transferred to a company called Hartlepool Marina Estate Road Company limited. Hartlepool Marina Estate Road Company Limited has subsequently gone into liquidation with the implication that the highway infrastructure is not being maintained and is thus deteriorating rapidly.

The liquidator has disclaimed the land as onerous property (unsaleable or not readily saleable land) and the freehold interest in the road will pass to the Crown as bona vacantia (good found without any apparent owner). If the road is in a state of disrepair the Treasury Solicitor is likely to disclaim the Crown's interest if pressed to take action, the interest would then be subject to escheat. This is a common law doctrine which transfers the property of a person who dies without heirs back to the crown or state. It serves to ensure that property is not left in "limbo" without recognised ownership.

The Technical Services Manager indicated that Harbour Walk formed a key route into Navigation Point which was one of the key visitor destinations within the Masterplan area. The Masterplan recommends upgrading the visual appearance of key routes to enhance the visitor experience and connectivity throughout the area. This will also help improve the sustainability of the commercial facilities.

It was proposed that the Council adopt the highway infrastructure on Harbour Walk and maintain it as part of the overall programme in future years. This increased financial liability for the Council both in respect of future maintenance costs of what was a substandard road and potential third party liability claims for accidents resulting from a lack of maintenance. In 2008 it was estimated that all of the roads on the Marina would require around £500,000 of investment to bring them up to adoptable standard. It was proposed, however, to take them over in the current condition and introduce an inspection regime to monitor the condition. The Technical Services Manager highlighted the legal situation and the risks and financial issues that the proposal brought, as set out in detail in the report, but considered that without the Council's intervention the situation could deteriorate significantly.

The Chairman commented that despite the complicated legal situation if the Council was committed to enhancing the Marina area it was appropriate to take on this responsibility. Members expressed concern at the potential costs of bringing the road in particular up to standard. The Technical Services Manager stated that engineers knew the construction of the road was sub-standard but it had been there 20 years now and was in an acceptable condition for the time being. The major issues were the drainage and the street lighting which needed to be addressed now as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That the Council instigate the legal procedures necessary to adopt the highway (including footways, lighting and drainage) on Harbour Walk from Navigation Point to The Highlight as part of its Masterplan proposals.
2. That the necessary works required to the street lighting (£47,000) and drainage (£60,000) are undertaken to bring them up to adoptable standards.

14. Hartlepool Car Club (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

Type of decision

Non-key Decision.

Purpose of report

To seek approval for the Council to support the instigation of a social enterprise car club in the town by way of the provision of discounted parking spaces in the town centre and at Hartlepool Interchange.

Issue(s) for consideration

The Technical Services Manager reported that Co-wheels is the only independently-owned national car club, providing low emission, hybrid and electric cars on a pay-as-you-go basis for organisations and communities across the UK.

Co-wheels is a Community Interest Company, and as such reinvests profit into operations to expand and improve the service. Co-wheels delivers car clubs in over 60 locations across the UK. It has a diverse range of operations, from city centres to villages. Some of their car clubs are used by Local Authorities and Universities as pool cars for staff, whilst others focus entirely on being shared cars for local residents. The company encourage local ownership of their operations which are sometimes run as community car clubs or as a social franchise.

A new social enterprise Club is being set up in the town consisting of, initially, two vehicles that will be located in the car park to the rear of Stagecoach's Office in Avenue Road and at the town's Interchange. The enterprise is being privately funded and the operators have approached the Council to seek support by way of a potential discount on the two parking spaces required to locate the vehicles.

It was proposed that, by way of support for this community enterprise, the Council provide the two business spaces for the price of one. This would show commitment to a sustainable project bringing transport opportunities to

residents of the town who may not have their own means of transport. The Council, in acknowledgement of their, support would be able to display this fact on the vehicles.

The two spaces that would be utilised for the project had been created specifically for this purpose and were hence new business bays, which would generally cost £350 per annum each. Being new bays there was no loss of income by providing one for free, other than the pay and display income that would have been generated from the bays as general spaces in each park.

The Chairman voiced her support for the scheme and the proposed discounted car parking as a way to assist a new social enterprise. The Chairman also informed members that there had been discussion with the Chairman of Regeneration who was more than happy to endorse the recommendations.

Decision

That approval be given to the Council providing two business bays to the Hartlepool social enterprise Car Club for the cost of one on the provision that this support will be advertised on the vehicles.

15. Any Other Items which the Chairman Considers are Urgent

The Chairman ruled that there were no items of business to be considered as a matter of urgency.

The Committee noted that the date of next meeting would be Tuesday 26 July 2016 at 10.00am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool.

The meeting concluded at 4.45 pm

P J DEVLIN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 1 JULY 2016