

# PLEASE NOTE VENUE

## REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY AND HOUSING PORTFOLIO DECISION SCHEDULE



Friday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006

at 10.00 am

in Training Room 4, Municipal Buildings

Church Square, Hartlepool

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

1. **KEY DECISIONS**

None

2. **OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**

- 2.1 The Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places) Regulations 2001 – Results of Consultation – *Head of Community Safety & Prevention*
- 2.2 Family Intervention Project – *Head of Community Safety & Prevention*
- 2.3 Neighbourhood Action Plan (NAP) Review 2006 – *Head of Community Strategy*
- 2.4 Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) – Licence Conditions – *Head of Public Protection and Housing*

3. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- 3.1 Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) Programme 2006-07 Mid Year Update – *Head of Community Strategy*
- 3.2 Neighbourhood Element Fund 2006-10 – *Head of Community Strategy*

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

None

## **REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holder  
20th October 2006



**Report of:** Head of Community Safety & Prevention

**Subject:** THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ALCOHOL  
CONSUMPTION IN DESIGNATED PUBLIC  
PLACES) REGULATIONS 2001 – RESULTS OF  
CONSULTATION

---

### **SUMMARY**

#### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform the Portfolio Holder of the results of consultation carried out on areas which were previously covered by Byelaws and recommend referral to full Council for approval of a Designated Public Places Order.
- 1.2 To outline proposals to identify and approve further areas for designation.

#### **2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

- 2.1 Outline of process to designate areas.  
Consultation results.  
Proposals for designation of further areas.

#### **3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

- 3.1 Community Safety issue

#### **4. TYPE OF DECISION**

- 4.1 Non key

#### **5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

- 5.1 Portfolio Holder to consider consultation results. Council to approve Designation Order.

**6. DECISION REQUIRED**

- 6.1 Support the making of a Designated Public Places Order.  
Refer the matter to full Council for approval.

**Report of:** Head of Community Safety & Prevention

**Subject:** THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION IN DESIGNATED PUBLIC PLACES) REGULATIONS 2001 - RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform the Portfolio Holder of the results of the consultation carried out and recommend referral to full council for approval of a Designated Public Places Order.
- 1.2 To outline proposals to identify and approve further areas for designation.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 At the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2006, approval was given to undertake consultation to replace the areas covered by existing Consumption of Intoxicating Liquor in Designated Places Byelaws listed in **Appendix 1**, with a Designated Public Places Order.
- 2.2 The report outlined the process required to designate areas, which have known anti-social drinking and nuisance associated with them. Briefly the process involves:
  - assessing level of anti-social drinking and disorder in areas proposed for designation
  - consulting police, parish or community councils, licensees, landowners or occupiers and receive representation
  - publishing notice identifying areas proposed for designation in local press.

## **3. CONSULTATION RESULTS**

- 3.1 A notice was published in Hartlepool Mail on 8<sup>th</sup> September, requesting comments from residents on the appropriateness of the areas proposed to be designated. Two responses were received which are attached at **Appendix 2**. One identifies new areas and makes no mention of the existing areas, the second supports the principle, but suggests there should not be a “blanket ban” on the Headland.

- 3.2 In addition, a letter was sent to all licensed premises, the Police District Commander and Parish Clerks. A response has been received from Police District Commander supporting the Designation Order. There has been no response from other consultees.

#### **4. AREAS FOR DESIGNATION IN THE FUTURE**

- 4.1 In line with the suggestion of the Portfolio Holder at the last meeting when this was considered, during the current consultation, residents have suggested new areas designation outside the existing Byelaw areas. New areas will be considered separately, and for two areas, namely Fens shops and St Patricks shops, the evidence required is already being gathered by the Police.
- 4.2 It is proposed that a list of further potential areas for designation be drawn up, based on submissions from:
- Members and resident representatives
  - Police
  - Anti-social Behaviour Unit
  - Trading Standards
  - Licensing Officer
- 4.3 A policy for determining if an area is suitable for designation will be developed and a report prepared for a future Portfolio meeting.

#### **5. RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 The Portfolio Holder is recommended to support the making of a Designated Public Places Order for the locations identified in Appendix 1 and refer the matter to full Council for approval.

Contact Officer Joe Hogan, Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator

#### Background Papers

Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio meeting 21<sup>st</sup> July 2006.  
Consultation responses

## Appendix 1

Existing areas covered by Consumption of Intoxicating Liquor in Designated Places Byelaw s.

### Part 1 - Hartlepool

#### Highways

##### **Avenue Road**

From its junction with Victoria Road southerly to the Middleton Grange Shopping Centre

##### **Back Victoria Homes**

Adjacent to Burn Valley Gardens

##### **Baden Street**

That part which passes through Burn Valley Gardens

##### **Brinkburn Road**

That part which passes through Burn Valley Gardens

##### **Colwyn Road**

##### **Park Road**

From its junction with Osborne Road to its junction with Stockton Street

##### **Roker Street**

##### **South Road**

From its junction with Avenue Road to its junction with Back York Road

##### **Stockton Street**

From its junction with Hucklehoven Way/Park Road to its junction with Upper Church Street

##### **Swainson Street**

##### **Unnamed Road**

Adjacent to the north western edge of Burn Valley Gardens

##### **Victoria Road**

From its junction with Upper Church Street to its junction with York Road

##### **Villiers Street**

##### **York Road and Back York Road East**

From its junction with Victoria Road to its junction with Park Road

#### Car Parks

##### **Multi-story car park**

Junction of Park Road and Stockton Street

##### **Surface level car park**

West of Stockton Street

##### **Surface level car park**

East of Back York Road, including car park beneath the Market Hall

##### **Surface level car park**

North of Park Road

##### **Central Library car park and its precincts**

Parks, Gardens and other Public Leisure Facilities

**Burn Valley Gardens**

Lying south of Colwyn Road and extending west as far as the unnamed footpath which runs north west to the junction of Queensberry Avenue and Elwick Road

**Rossmere Park (south of Rossmere Way)**

Open Amenity Areas

**Open space**

To the east of Burn Valley Gardens.

**Open space**

On south side of Colwyn Road adjacent to Burn Valley Gardens

**Open space**

At Raby Road, adjacent to Wesley Chapel

Church Precincts

**Wesley Chapel**

Swainson Street/Victoria Road/Raby Road

**Part 2 – Headland**

Highways

**Albion Terrace**

**Bath Terrace**

**Cliff Terrace**

The southern footpath only from its junction with Radcliffe Terrace to its junction with Bath Terrace

**Croft Terrace**

**High Street**

The southern footpath only from its junction with Sandwell Chare to its junction with Croft Terrace Path

**Radcliffe Terrace**

**Sandwell Chare**

**South Crescent**

**The Headland Promenade**

**The Promenade**

Between Headland Promenade and York Place.

**Town Wall**

From the western boundary of number 30 Town Wall to its junction with Croft Terrace.

**Unnamed Path**

From Moor Terrace to the site of the former gun placement

**Unnamed Path**

Between High Street and Croft Terrace

## **York Place**

### Parks, Gardens and other Public Leisure Facilities

**Croft Garden, (east of Sandwell Chare)**

**Band Stand, the Promenade**

**Redheugh Close Gardens, including the War Memorial (between Radcliffe Terrace and Cliff Terrace)**

Open Amenity Areas

### **Open Space**

Between Harbour Public House and Croft Gardens

### Fronts and the Foreshore

#### **Front at Headland**

- ii) All that area of the front and foreshore including the paddling pool and all steps, ramps, paths, platforms and bankside from time to time situated between the low water mark of medium tides and Town Wall and the Promenade and between:
  - a) an imaginary line running south from a point on the western boundary of number 30 Town Wall; and
  - b) an imaginary line running from number 14 south Crescent along the south western elevation of the Heugh Breakwater
- ii) Pilot Pier, also known as the Old Pier, is excluded from this area.

### Other Areas

**Area around the Heugh Lighthouse between Bath Terrace and the Promenade Car Park which forms the eastern extension of Moor Terrace**  
**Heugh Battery Old Gun Placement**

## **Part 3 – Seaton Carew**

Highways

**Ashburn Street**

**Charles Street**

**Church Street**

From its junction with The Front to the Holy Trinity church

**Coronation Drive**

From the Swimming Baths Car Park to its junction with The Cliff

**Green Terrace**

**Major Cooper Court, (Charles Street)**

**The Cliff**



**The Espanlade**

**The Green**

**The Front**

**Unnamed Road**

Leading from The Front to and alongside the Amusement Park

**Unnamed Road**

From The Front adjacent to Café royal to The Espanlade

**West View Terrace**

Car Parks and Bus Terminus

**Bus Terminus**

East of The Front, including the verges, benches and shelters

**Rocket House Car Park**

South of Longscar Hall, The Front

**Seaton Carew Car Park**

Within Seaton Carew Park

**Wainwright Walk Car Park**

East of Coronation Drive

Parks, Gardens and Other Public Leisure Facilities

**Crazy Golf Course**

East of The Front

**Lawns and Gardens and Paved Areas**

East of The Front, The Green and The Cliff

**North Shelter and Public Toilets**

East of The Front

**Paddling Pool**

East of The Front

**Putting Green**

East of The Front

**Seaton Carew Park**

South of Station Lane

**South Shelter, Clock and Public Toilets**

East of the Bus Terminus

Open Amenity Areas

**Open Space**

East of The Front and The Cliff

**Open Space**

On south side of Station Lane at its junction with The Front

**Open Space**

East of Ashburn Street

**Open Space**

West of Ashburn Street

**Open Space**

East of Wainwright Walk

### **Open Space**

The Green (including the War Memorial)

### **Fronts and the Foreshore**

#### **Front at Seaton Carew**

All that area of the front and foreshore, including all steps, ramps, paths, platforms and banksides from time to time situated between the low water mark of medium tides and the Esplanade and between:

- a) an imaginary straight line running in a generally easterly direction from a point on the Esplanade at its junction with the unnamed slipway road which runs between the Putting Green and the Amusement Park: and;
- b) an imaginary straight line running in a generally easterly direction from a point on Coronation Drive at its junction with the Northern boundary of number 20 Wainwright Walk.

**Appendix 2**

Dear Mr Hogan

I would like to respond to the public notice.

Under the section for Seaton Carew, the Sand Dunes south of the coach park are not mentioned. There is good reason for them to be included. The dunes, which are situated on HBC land, are designated Local Nature Reserve and also a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Designations apart, Seaton Dunes is the finest example of this habitat along the east coast and it is delicate. It is also appreciated by both locals and visitors and is an undervalued asset in the town's list of tourist attractions. Increasingly, the dunes south of the coach park are being abused by large gangs of 'Revellers', at times 100 strong who consume large amounts of alcohol. A terrific amount of debris, much of it in the form of broken glass is left behind. Council employees are left to clear up (I am one of them). The police do their best but any extra powers would help. Please consider including the dunes in the list of locations.

I have a request as a resident of the Fens Estate. I am also chair of the Residents Association. The estate is bordered on its southern side by amenity grass and landscaping known as the 'grassy banks'. On its western edge it is bordered by amenity grass and the Greatham Beck Local Nature Reserve. Both areas can suffer from drinkers, in particular the grassy banks.

Another area, Spalding Green, although peaceful at the moment can be a magnet for drinkers. Please consider including these areas. I also noticed that Greatham Village was not mentioned. Please contact me if more comment is needed.

Dear Mr Hogan,

We wish to object to this proposed byelaw in respect to the Headland area of Hartlepool with especial reference to:

- 1) The Heugh Battery which is now undergoing restoration as a living museum. The volunteers doing this work within the boundaries of the Battery should be allowed, without any let or hindrance, to have a drink whether they are working or having a social event there.
- 2) The proliferation of no drinking signs which were erected in many areas of the Headland, in the past, gives the impression that this is a hot spot for drunken behaviour. Yes we have had a few problems in the past with teenage drinkers but with the removal of the old Swimming Pool shelter and the reinstatement of the walling at the Battery this problem has virtually ceased.

In promoting the Headland as a tourist area the high number of such signs leads to many of our visitors believing that the Headland has a serious public drinking problem which is not the case. This also could have a serious effect on house prices within this area.

We agree that if there is a problem the Police should have the power to confiscate and dispose of any alcohol where there is reason to believe that its drinking will create a public order offense but we do not believe that there should be blanket ban on the Headland.

## **REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holder  
20th October 2006



**Report of:** Head of Community Safety & Prevention

**Subject:** FAMILY INTERVENTION PROJECT

---

### SUMMARY

#### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To seek approval to submit an application to the Government's RESPECT UNIT to establish a Family Intervention Project (FIP) in Hartlepool.

#### **2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

The report outlines the national context, explains what a family intervention project will do to tackle anti-social behaviour and the impact similar projects have had elsewhere in the country. The links to our existing Hartlepool Intervention Project (HIP) are explained.

#### **3. RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

Project aims to tackle anti-social behaviour.

#### **4. TYPE OF DECISION**

Non key

#### **5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio holder

#### **6. DECISION REQUIRED**

Approval to submit an application for funding.

**Report of:** Head of Community Safety & Prevention

**Subject:** FAMILY INTERVENTION PROJECT

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To seek approval to submit an application to the Government's RESPECT UNIT to establish a Family Intervention Project (FIP) in Hartlepool.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Government's RESPECT Action Plan, which was published in January 2006, states that "stable families and strong, cohesive communities are important for children, young people and adults. They are the essential foundation within which individual potential is realised, quality of life maximised and our social and economic wellbeing secured".
- 2.2 The Action Plan further states that "the conditions for respect in society are not difficult to define. They depend ultimately on a shared commitment to a common set of values, expressed through behaviour that is considerate of others".
- 2.3 The Action Plan includes a range of interventions to tackle anti-social behaviour such as:
- Improving behaviour and attendance at school
  - Improving activities for children and young people through sport and the arts
  - Supporting families with a new approach to the most challenging families
  - Strengthening communities.

## **3. THE ISSUE – turning a family around within a short period**

- 3.1 In some communities there are a small number of highly problematic families that account for a disproportionate amount of anti-social behaviour. Although much has been done to tackle these problem families, it is clear that we need to go further; for their sake and the sake of the wider community.

- 3.2 Sometimes these families have multiple problems that require multiple solutions. But we need those multiple solutions delivered in an effective way – one that adds up to a change in the behaviour of all members of the household.
- 3.3 Many of these families have severe problems and are damaging themselves and their children, as well as those around them. Problems for the children include:
- Disrupted education through frequent changes of school and poor attendance
  - Disrupted access to health services leading to crisis intervention rather than prevention
  - Constant changes of address affecting children's ability to make lasting friendships or get involved in regular activities
  - Living in wholly unsuitable accommodation, with an increased likelihood of being exposed to risk
  - Involvement in anti-social behaviour often escalating into crime
  - An increased risk of children being looked after within the statutory care system

#### **4. RESPECT ACTION**

- 4.1 Based on evidence, we now know that this small number of families need an intensive, persistent and, if necessary, coercive approach. The Family Intervention project will support and challenge families to increase their motivation to change their behaviour. This new approach will consider the needs of whole families and balance these with the needs of the community. This will ensure that destructive behaviour is not allowed to be passed from generation to generation and blight not only these families but entire communities.
- 4.2 This work is very much targeted at those whose anti-social behaviour is threatening their tenancies, putting their children at risk or is likely to lead to them facing significant enforcement action.

#### **5. WHAT DOES THE PROJECT DO?**

- 5.1 The project uses a two-track approach which includes help for families to address the causes of their behaviour, alongside supervision and enforcement tools to provide them with the incentives to change.

5.2 Family intervention projects use intensive tailored action with supervision and clear sanctions to improve the behaviour of persistently anti-social households. A key worker ‘grips’ the family, the causes of their poor behaviour and the agencies involved with them, to deliver a more coordinated response. This involves a multi-agency approach to ensure all the necessary services are involved, including:

- Social services
- Health departments
- Children’s trusts
- Education departments
- Youth offending teams
- Criminal justice
- Police services

5.3 The key tool in the Family Intervention project is the Family Contract. This involves each family member and all the agencies which are already working with the family. It identifies areas where changes are needed for each family member and draws up actions with timescales and sanctions for each issue identified.

## 6. OBJECTIVES

- 6.1 The primary objective of family intervention projects is to stop the anti-social behaviour of families and restore safety to their homes and to the wider community.
- 6.2 These projects also tackle the causes of poor behaviour which involve issues such as drug and alcohol misuse, poor health, domestic violence, worklessness and debt. As a result these projects also deliver other objectives such as preventing homelessness, enabling families to sustain tenancies and helping achieve the five *Every Child Matters* outcomes for children and young people.

## 7. TYPES OF INTERVENTION

7.1 There are some projects around the country that are already working with the families to be targeted by family intervention projects, and although they all have similar objectives and features they do vary in who they help and the level of problems they present with.

7.2 There are three distinct models of intervention which can be applied:

### 7.2.1 Intensive outreach programme to families in their own homes

Families are visited by project staff within their own home and provide/refer to structured individual and family sessions to work with



the family on a range of issues identified as causing their anti-social behaviour.

#### 7.2.2 Intensive outreach programme to families in dispersed accommodation

Families are provided with a non-secure tenancy by the project. Staff visit and provide/refer to structured individual and family sessions to work with the family on a range of issues identified as causing their anti-social behaviour. If the family complies with interventions and behaviour improves sufficiently then the tenancy can be made secure.

#### 7.2.3 Intensive support programme in supervised accommodation

Families in this type of provision receive 24 hour support and supervision from staff in accommodation provided by the project. Families are likely to be involved in many structured sessions complemented by daily unstructured observation. If the family complies with interventions and behaviour improves sufficiently then they will be able to move into one of the above.

### 8. **IMPACT**

- 8.1 The Dundee families' project (an intensive support programme in supervised accommodation) has an 84% success rate with the most difficult families.
- 8.2 Sheffield Hallam University have recently conducted an evaluation of six family support projects in the North West. This study has found:
  - 84% improvement in school attendance
  - 80% reduction in the threat of possession action
  - The projects are strong on their primary objective of reducing incidents and complaints about anti-social behaviour – an 85% reduction in anti-social behaviour was recorded.

### 9. **HOW WOULD THE SCHEME OPERATE IN HARTLEPOOL?**

- 9.1 Hartlepool already has a less intensive intervention project, which provides a range of support and enforcement measures – the Hartlepool Intervention Project (HIP). Typically, families which are supported by HIP have a history of moving regularly within the private sector, exhibit many risk factors associated with criminality and lack a holistic long-term approach to their problems.

9.2 The HIP is a multi-agency panel with senior level representation from:

- Youth Offending Service
- Police
- Anti-social Behaviour Unit
- Housing Hartlepool
- Connexions
- Fire Brigade
- Barnardos (Hartbeat)
- HBC Housing
- Children's Services (Education, Social Care and Children's Fund)
- Child & adolescent mental health services (CAMHS)

9.3 Families are referred that are causing concern to more than one agency.

The panel meets monthly to accept referrals (or refer cases elsewhere), and review cases. Once a case has been accepted full assessment is carried out to identify if there are issues besides those presenting at referral. An action plan is then agreed with the family. Thus the people involved and the process are closely aligned to the Family Intervention Programme (FIP).

9.4 Differences are that the HIP aims to get involved at an early stage and does not take on cases where a young person has passed the final warning stage with the Youth Offending Team.

9.5 The family members have a say in who is involved in the focus group process at present. This would not be the case with the FIP.

9.6 Officers have discussed possible models with RESPECT Unit staff and it is agreed one of the two outreach models would suit the Hartlepool "way of working" (i.e. the models outlined in paragraphs 7.2.1 and 7.2.2).

9.7 Further reports will be brought to the Portfolio holder with more detailed scheme proposals, should any application be successful.

## 10. APPLICATION FOR FUNDING

10.1 Hartlepool has been invited by the RESPECT Unit to submit an application to establish a family intervention project.

10.2 There is start-up funding of £100,000 available for 2006/07 and further £100,000 available in 2007/08.

10.3 Thereafter, there is an expectation that the FIP will be mainstreamed by the Council and partners.

- 10.4 This intensive approach has already been identified by the Anti-social Behaviour Unit as a sensible approach to tackle anti-social behaviour associated with families and a bid for increased funding made through the Council's budget process for 2007/08.
- 10.5 If a successful application is made to RESPECT Unit, officers would monitor the effectiveness of the FIP, in relation to possible budget savings to the Council and partners. This will help the decision making on future funding beyond 2007/08.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

- 11.1 The Portfolio holder is recommended to agree an application for funding is made to the RESPECT Unit for £100,000 in both 2006/07 and 2007/08 to establish a Family Intervention Project.

Contact Officer Sally Forth, Anti-social Behaviour Co-ordinator

Background Papers RESPECT Action Plan

## **REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holder  
20<sup>th</sup> October 2006



**Report of:** Head of Community Strategy

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP)  
REVIEW 2006

---

### **SUMMARY**

#### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to seek Portfolio Holder agreement to the recommendations made in NAP Review 2006.

#### **2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

In April 2006 NAPs were completed in all the priority neighbourhoods as set out in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS). It is important for the continued improvement in NAPs, and ultimately to improved services, that a review is undertaken of NAP development, implementation and monitoring with a view to improving the NAPs from 2006 onwards.

The NAP Review 2006 makes 30 separate recommendations for improving how NAPs are developed, implemented and monitored.

#### **3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

Neighbourhood Renewal is within the remit of the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio.

#### **4.0 TYPE OF DECISION**

Non-Key Decision

## **5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holder decision.

## **6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

The Portfolio Holder is requested to agree the NAP Review 2006 as a way to improving the future development, implementation and monitoring of NAPs.

**Report of:** Head of Community Strategy

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP)  
REVIEW 2006

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Portfolio Holder agreement to the recommendations made in NAP Review 2006.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 In April 2006 NAPs were completed in all the priority neighbourhoods as set out in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS). It is important for the continued improvement in NAPs, and ultimately to improved services, that a review is undertaken of NAP development, implementation and monitoring with a view to improving the NAPs from 2006 onwards. The NAP Review 2006 is attached as **Appendix 1**.

## **3. SCOPE OF THE NAP REVIEW 2006**

- 3.1 The NAP review considered the following issues:
- Enhancing the involvement of residents in NAP development;
  - Meeting the needs and aspirations of local residents;
  - Enhancing service provider involvement;
  - Improving and developing an enhanced monitoring system, including options for local neighbourhood outcomes and targets linked to Neighbourhood Element funding;
  - Reviewing NAP boundaries and the NRS area as the geographical basis for NAPs
  - Reviewing the delivery of NRF Residents Priorities Fund; and
  - Clarifying the roles of key players on NAP development and monitoring

## **4. DELIVERING UPON THE NAP REVIEW**

- 4.1 The NAP Review 2006 makes 30 separate recommendations for improving how NAPs are developed, implemented and monitored. A separate action plan to monitor the implementation of each recommendation will be prepared and monitored.

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The majority of the recommendations made in the NAP Review 2006 can be implemented with no additional cost to the Council.

**6. RECOMMENDATION**

The Portfolio Holder is requested to agree the NAP Review 2006 as a way to improving the future development, implementation and monitoring of NAPs.

---

hartlepoolpartnership



# NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION PLAN (NAP) REVIEW

*October  
2006*



## Executive Summary

This report outlines the good progress that has been made in developing Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) in Hartlepool. Consultation has highlighted that there is a relatively high level of satisfaction with the way that NAPs are developed and the way in which actions are implemented. But there is still more that can be done.

In developing NAPs the report recommends a number of areas for improvement. There needs to be greater publicity of the availability of crèche and childcare facilities, and support to get to meetings by paying for buses and taxis to enable residents to attend community meetings. This support is currently available.

The report recommends that greater efforts need to be made to involve the business community in NAP development and local NAP Forums. The involvement of young people in the NAP process needs to be sustained beyond the development of the NAP, and the report recommends a more structured approach to involving the BME community through the BME Reference Group.

The report recommends that local NAP Forums take a key role in determining the nature of the consultation and pace of reviewing their NAP. Consultation also highlighted that the NAP documents are not 'user friendly' so it is recommended that a summary document is produced. The report also sets out the key principles by which local NAP Forums should operate.

The report recommends that within each organisation or department there is a dedicated 'NAP Champion' who is the key contact for NAPs and is responsible corporately for raising the importance of the neighbourhood agenda within their organisation.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation the report highlights the need for each NAP to have its own set of outcomes against which progress can be monitored.

The NAP review concludes that NAPs are a key tool in narrowing the gap between the disadvantaged communities and the rest of the town. It is recommended therefore that NAPs are only developed in those neighbourhoods set out as a priority in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

## **Contents**

## **Page**

<b>Section 1 – Introduction to NAP Review</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 2 - Enhancing Resident Involvement in NAP development</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Section 3 – Further meeting the needs and aspirations of local residents</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Section 4 – Enhancing Service Provider Involvement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Section 5 - Developing an Enhanced Monitoring System</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Section 6 – Review NAP Boundaries</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Section 7 - Options for Extending NAPs</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Section 8 - NRF Residents Priorities Fund (RPF) &amp; Neighbourhood Element Funding (NEF)</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Section 9 – Roles &amp; Responsibilities</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Section 10 – Conclusions</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Section 11 – Summary of Recommendations</b>	<b>48</b>

## Section 1 – Introduction to the NAP review

### 1.1 Background to Neighbourhood Action Plans (NAPs) in Hartlepool

In January 2001 the Prime Minister launched 'A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: A National Strategy Action Plan'. This strategy sets out the Government's ideas about how to narrow the gap between deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country so that within 10-20 years, no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live.'

The Government identifies that a key task in achieving this is for Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) to prepare a Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS). The Government also indicates that all neighbourhoods that need priority status at the local level should be identified in the NRS, and local action plans (or neighbourhood action plans – NAPs) for each of these neighbourhoods should be prepared. Where a number of plans need to be prepared the NRS should include sequencing priorities.

The Government also wants local residents and community groups to have a central role in turning their neighbourhoods around and stressed that NAPs are important in encouraging local people and organisations to work together to narrow the gap between the most deprived wards and the rest of the country. The objective of the NAP is to integrate policies at the local level to improve the way that services are provided.

There is no particular model prescribed for the NAPs, or any indication of how neighbourhoods should be defined (e.g. size, coverage, etc.). There is, however, an indication that they should back up the NRS, and the LSP will need to work closely with neighbourhood organisations to develop them.

The NRS identifies priority neighbourhoods and provides an initial analysis of key issues for each of these. For the Burbank, Dyke House/Stranton/Grange, North Hartlepool (St Hilda and Brus), Owton, Rossmere, Rift House/Burn Valley and New Deal for Communities (NDC) areas key problems, resources and programmes, gaps in service provision, and priorities are outlined.

## 1.2 The Need for the NAP Review

By April 2006 NAPs had been completed in all the priority neighbourhoods as set out in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS). Before taking this work forward to the next stage it was felt important that a review be undertaken of NAP development, implementation and monitoring with a view to improving where necessary the NAPs produced from 2006 onwards. The Council's Best Value Review of Strengthening Communities also makes reference to NAPs, and the need to implement any actions arising from the NAP Review, including the need to further develop NAP consultation processes and questioning the extent to which NAPs have the potential for being extended into other areas of Hartlepool.

## 1.3 Scope of the NAP Review

The NAP review explored the following issues

- The need to enhance involvement of residents in NAP development;
- The need for NAPs to meet the needs and aspirations of local residents;
- The need to get Service Provider buy in at all stages – NAP development, implementation and monitoring;
- The need to improve and develop an enhanced monitoring system, including options for local neighbourhood outcomes and targets linked to Neighbourhood Element funding;
- The need to review NAP boundaries, particularly links with the NDC area;
- The need to consider the options for extending NAPs to neighbourhoods outside the current NRS area;
- The need to review the management of NRF Residents Priorities Fund; and
- The need to clarify the roles of key players on NAP development and monitoring

Each of these is considered in more detail in Sections 2 to 9 of this report.

## 1.4 Methodology of the Review

This review has been coordinated and compiled by the Partnership Support Team (PST). It has included interviews and meetings with a range of service providers plus structured questionnaires and focus groups with residents from NAP areas

and a range of organisations delivering services in our more disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Questionnaires were sent to all residents who had attended a NAP event or meeting with 78 completed questionnaires returned. In addition 58 Service providers completed questionnaire surveys.

## Section 2 - Enhancing Resident Involvement in NAP Development

### 2.1 Introduction

The participation and full engagement of local residents in NAP development is crucial. Without the involvement of local residents there is no NAP. Understanding what the real issues are within a community gives the best chance of interventions being put in place to really make a difference.

### 2.2 The 'Management Team'

A number of organisations have had significant involvement in managing the development of NAPs:  
Hartlepool Borough Council Regeneration & Planning Services (including the Partnership Support Team (PST) and Regeneration Division (REGEN));  
Hartlepool Borough Council Neighbourhood Services (Particularly Neighbourhood Managers (NM));  
Hartlepool Community Network (HCN); and  
Housing Hartlepool Resident Involvement Team (HHPOOL)

These organisations, to varying degrees, are responsible for ensuring residents are engaged in NAP development.

### 2.3 Existing Ways of Involving Residents

Traditionally there have been a number of methods used to involve residents in the development of NAPs, such as Community Conferences and Drop-in Sessions. These are publicised through -

- New sletters to every household
- Local residents associations
- Posters displayed throughout the area

- Neighbourhood Consultative Forum presentations
- Hartlepool Mail
- Hartbeat magazine
- Publicity at local community venues (libraries, community centres, doctors surgeries, dentists)
- Local community/voluntary groups and youth groups
- The Hartlepool Community Network (HCN).

A local NAP Forum is now in place in every NAP neighbourhood. The North Hartlepool (Brus & St Hilda) NAP has three separate sub-forums focusing upon the distinct communities of the Headland, Central Estate and West View/King Oswy. These sub-forums are responsible for prioritising Neighbourhood Renewal monies allocated by the Hartlepool Partnership. These will be used as further vehicles for further publicising NAP related and other events.

The key issues are-

- What more can be done to engage more residents in future phases of revising NAPs;
- How can existing levels of involvement be sustained; and
- How do we develop the quality of the feedback that is given to constituent groups from representatives who attend local NAP Forums.

## 2.5 Community Based Consultation

The residents' questionnaire results show that 71% believe that there should be a lot more resident involvement in the Neighbourhood Action Plan process. The challenge is how we achieve this.

When asked what more should be done to encourage more resident involvement the most popular suggestion was increased publicity (68% of responses). Half of all responses suggested that different meeting times and venues would attract more residents to be involved. This is discussed further in section 3 of this report.

Other popular suggestions included increased training/capacity building from within the community and help with getting to meetings. This includes paying for bus fares, taxis, baby sitters and providing child care facilities. This support is currently available.

A third of responses highlighted that a telephone survey of registered stakeholder groups could be undertaken. Other suggestions included better use of a dedicated NAP website and vouchers/rewards to encourage attendance.

The Residents Focus Group suggested that all residents in the area be surveyed to prioritise the activities. In conjunction with NDC a household survey is undertaken every two years by MORI. A survey is to be undertaken in summer 2006 with results due in December 2006. This will provide a sample of views and is used to identify priorities in the NAP development. It may be that local NAP Forums or individual Residents Associations wish to carry out more localised consultation. The HCN and HHPOOL may be able to assist in identifying funding to resource this.

## 2.6 Engaging the BME Community

The Community Cohesion agenda is still a priority. At the present moment no additional special effort is taken to involve the BME Community in the development of NAPs and engaging the BME in the Local Forums although events are held in venues where alcohol is not sold. There is also the opportunity to have NAPs interpreted into additional languages if requested. The HCN facilitate a BME Reference Group and this is a conduit for developing enhanced consultation and involvement from the BME Community.

**It is recommended that REGEN liaise with HCN early in the NAP Development Process to identify BME community contacts to be approached.**





## 2.7 Engaging the Business Community

The Business Community have an important role in improving disadvantaged neighbourhoods. They provide employment opportunities and services for the local community and own and manage property and land.

At the moment efforts to secure the involvement of the business community in the development and delivery of NAP priorities has met with varied success and where successful was led by the need for local businesses to respond to issues raised by residents. The NAP is a framework for improving the quality of life in a disadvantaged community, and the business community are a key stakeholder in this process.

**It is recommended that REGEN consider opportunities to further involve the business community in NAPs, in liaison with local NAP Forums.**

## 2.8 Engaging Young People in the NAP Process

Whilst this section of the NAP review is focussing upon NAP development, the issue of involving and engaging young people in the NAP process for a sustained period of time has to be considered. The perception that young people need to be more involved was highlighted in the NAP Review consultation.

Special efforts are taken to include young people in the development of NAPs. Local schools are approached and do become involved, as are local youth groups and projects. The main area of improvement is that the input of young people needs to be sustained once the NAP has been approved and is being implemented.

A group of children and young people are currently supporting Children's Services to develop a Participation Strategy. The time scale for this Strategy is the acceptance of a shared vision statement by April 2007 and full implementation of strategy and standards by April 2008. This strategy will ensure the development of a town wide children and young people's forum that will include a Youth Parliament supported by the Youth Service and a range of interest led sub groups that will be time limited and outcome focussed. The actual process for this is currently unclear as it will need to be set by children and young people. There is the opportunity for strong links between the NAP process and the forum to ensure that participation in the

local planning process is maintained. In addition to this the Hartlepool Participation Network, a network of professionals who have participation as a key role, are committed to supporting children and young people to attend and be an integral part of their local area NAPs. This is already happening in several areas with some success. Children and young people need to be engaged fully in this process and as well as having a say in how regeneration funding is spent they could also be given the opportunity to manage a proportion of the funding. It may be that a new system would need to be put in place to facilitate this.

**It is recommended that REGEN liaise with local NAP Forums to discuss opportunities to involve more young people, including possibly setting aside a proportion of the NRF Residents Priorities Fund to be allocated directly by young people.**

## 2.9 Electronic Consultation

The Council currently operates a system of electronic consultation via the internet. There is the opportunity to explore gathering local issues and priorities in an online setting. This will provide the opportunity for those residents who are either too busy, not willing, not able or confident enough to attend the more public community conferences to express their views and priorities. There is also the opportunity to provide the electronic consultation onto local neighbourhood websites, such as the Burbank Forum website.

Electronic consultation will only be used by a proportion of the population. Access depends upon firstly being literate, secondly being computer literate and thirdly having access to a computer. It will be part of the ongoing capacity building to tackle these issues.

**It is recommended that within the programme of capacity building to be led by HCN and HHP OOL that literacy and IT skills are considered and taken forward.**

**It is recommended that REGEN and PST develop an enhanced system by which stakeholders can use electronic consultation methods in NAP development.**

## **2.10 Diversity Impact Assessment**

Every NAP completed from 2006 will be reviewed by the Diversity Impact Assessment Group to ensure that an assessment is made of how the NAPs affect different groups in different ways.

## **Section 3 – Further Meeting the Needs and Aspirations of Local Residents**

### **3.1 Introduction**

It was important to collect the views and aspirations of local residents and Councillors. A questionnaire was sent to all residents and Councillors who had ever attended a NAP meeting and a focus group session was held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2006 with those residents and Councillors actively involved with NAPs and local NAP Forums. The findings from both these exercises are summarised within this section with recommendations for improvements.

The consultation findings include many positive comments on how NAPs have led to improvements and enabled residents to have a stronger role in improving their area. Satisfaction with the overall NAP process is relatively high. 85% of residents are satisfied with the NAP development process, 74% are satisfied with the NAP Document, 75% of residents are satisfied with the Local NAP Forum and 75% are satisfied with the progress that has been made on carrying out the NAP actions.

In order to continuously improve the system of developing and delivering NAPs it is, however, important to focus upon any aspects which can indeed be improved. Key issues that need to be carefully considered in this regard are

- Not to raise expectations as to what can be delivered;
- Frustration that certain initiatives take so long to implement after they have been identified;
- Missed opportunities to further engage residents in wider activities to improve their community; and
- Commitment of service providers and Councillors needs to be maintained and improved.

### **3.2 Important stages of developing and delivering the NAP**

Residents were asked for their views on how important certain aspects were to the success of the NAP. The most important aspect was deciding the area priorities (74% very important) closely followed by monitoring progress on actions (73%).

Involving residents from the start of the NAP process is therefore crucial and the recommendations set out in Section 2 will

make this more effective. The setting up of a Local NAP Forum (62%) and Resident Association Meetings (56%) were also seen as very important in taking NAPs forward.

### 3.3 NAP Development

Residents thought that the NAP development process was a useful way of bringing the community together, including schools and youth groups. It allowed for lots of issues to be discussed and debated openly between residents and service providers and included in the NAP.

There were a number of areas identified for improvement. There was a feeling that some NAPs were developed too quickly and more time was needed to assess whether issues are real or just perceptions based on a small minority of the communities views. It was also reported that some of the key actions were coming from service providers and not based on issues raised by residents.

**It is recommended that local NAP Forums themselves decide on the timetable for developing their revised NAP**

**It is recommended that NAP Champions work alongside REGEN in checking the appropriateness of emerging priorities in the draft NAP.**

The consultation highlighted that some actions were thought to be too aspirational and not deliverable. This could raise expectations above what can be realistically delivered. NAPs do include a range of short, medium and long term priorities for the improvement of the neighbourhood. It is important that the long term priorities, even if there is no identifiable solution when the NAP is developed are included as it then provides a framework should additional funding become available. NAP Champions will be responsible during NAP development for identifying which draft actions are more longer term, aspirational priorities.

**It is recommended that greater consideration be given to outlining in the NAP document which priorities are to be tackled in the short term and which are long term, more aspirational priorities.**

It is clear from the consultation that there are highly committed and skilled residents who are well placed within their communities to spread the word about NAPs and explain issues in a straightforward manner to fellow residents. This is a valuable resource in getting a greater number of residents involved in improving their neighbourhood.

**It is recommended that NAP Forums discuss ways in which all agencies and individuals, including residents, can enhance resident involvement in NAPs.**

The review has highlighted that some forms of consultation used in developing the NAP were not particularly well attended and the scheduling of meetings at inconvenient times was mentioned. In the NAP development efforts have been taken to be flexible and hold a range of drop in sessions at different times of the day. Local NAP Forums should be involved in determining the scale and nature of the community consultation when NAPs are to be updated. The branding of the NAP consultation also needs to be carefully considered. Residents highlighted that the term 'Community Conference' sounds intimidating and more informal methods, branded as coffee mornings perhaps need to be considered. Other suggestions include undertaking consultation at special community safety events or at bingo or pie and pea suppers organised at weekend evenings in community venues.

**It is recommended that NAP Forums are closely involved in determining the scope of Community Consultation around NAP development, including agreeing meeting times, venues and branding.**

It was raised that some people were intimidated and did not speak up at the outset of NAP meetings and that there was an overall lack of resident participation. There is therefore a role for the HCN, HHPOOL, and the local community themselves to support all people to actively engage in the NAP development process. There is the opportunity, through the Residents Priorities Fund allocated to NAP Forums to utilise this to support the development of capacity building in the local community.



### 3.4 NAP Document

For some residents a NAP document is not considered to be user friendly, with some of the jargon perceived as difficult to understand and the NAP document itself simply too big and extensive to read. At the review workshop residents suggested that a summary NAP document be developed that focuses solely on the key actions and this seems a reasonable approach to take. A jargon buster does accompany each of the main NAP document, but perhaps more needs to be done. It is also important that officers and service providers adapt their language to suit the particular audience.

**It is recommended that a summary NAP is developed together with more 'accessible' publicity material that can be more easily understood and distributed to the local community.**

**It is recommended that a 'jargon check' is made on all draft NAPs by REGEN and the local NAP Forum.**

### 3.5 Community Involvement

The questionnaire asked how important each group is to the success of NAPs. 95% believed that residents were very important. Community Associations and Groups were seen as very important by 63%. The Community Network and the Council's Neighbourhood Managers were both seen as very important by 57% of respondents. In terms of influence over the NAP process exactly half felt that residents had too little influence.

There was high awareness of when all the key NAP meetings were and how residents could get involved, but 71% of respondents believed that the level of resident involvement in the Neighbourhood Action Plan process should still be a lot more. The key question is how to further increase the levels of involvement. Residents felt that this could be best achieved through increased publicity (68%) having different meeting times/venues (50%), telephone surveys of registered stakeholder groups e.g. people who are unable to attend meetings (31%), help with getting to meetings e.g. bus fares/taxi fares (29%) and crèche/child care/babysitting costs (28%). Many of these are to be progressed through recommendations previously made in this report. Assistance with bus fares/taxis and crèche/childcare is already available upon request.

**It is recommended that publicity is increased around paying for bus fares/taxis and crèche/childcare as this is currently available to residents who wish to attend NAP development meetings.**

During the resident consultation it was highlighted that more formalised Residents Associations need to be developed in some neighbourhoods. HCN and HHPOOL will work to develop capacity in these neighbourhoods, as set out in more detail in Section 9.

**It is recommended that the HCN and HHPOOL prepare an annual schedule outlining the capacity building work they will undertake in NAP neighbourhoods.**

**It is recommended that all organisations who deliver 'capacity building' initiatives in Hartlepool be brought together to examine opportunities to improve coordination and reduce duplication.**

**It is recommended that the £20,000 from the Community Coordination allocation (Neighbourhood Element) for 2006/07 is allocated to support capacity building in NAP neighbourhoods.**

### **3.6 Councillor Involvement**

Councillors are involved in the NAP development process and in local NAP Forums. The degree of involvement varies by each NAP Forum and by individual Councillor.

The current arrangements for NAP Forum governance are based upon participative democracy rather than representative democracy. The current NAP Forum governance arrangements have developed from the approach undertaken in the NDC area.

Sections 3 and 4 of this report outline the importance of different stakeholders in the NAP process, and there is general consensus that the current arrangements are working well. There is a need to balance the role of Councillors, who are directly elected to represent the constituency, and the need to involve as many residents as possible in taking an active and



meaningful role in improving their neighbourhood. The White Paper on Local Government due out later in 2006 may lead to a further development of how NAP Forums operate.

**It is recommended that the PST review Councillor involvement in Forums following analysis of the Local Government White Paper.**

### 3.7 Local NAP Forums

Local NAP Forums are in place in all the established NAP areas. In North Hartlepool (Brus & St Hilda) sub-groups have been set up and the full NAP Forum has yet to meet.

A number of contradictory views were expressed during the consultation. For example some residents believed that the involvement of the service providers, including the voluntary and community organisations was too much in NAP Forums, while an alternative view that greater presence by service providers and local voluntary and community sector groups would strengthen the NAP Forum.

The location of NAP Forums meetings in Burn Valley/Rift House and Rossmere has caused some problems. In Burn Valley/Rift House finding a venue to accommodate the number of residents attending meetings has proved difficult. In Rossmere the A689 road creates a barrier between the two distinct communities, and while meeting venues are alternated this does affect attendance significantly.

**It is recommended that the Rift House/Burn Valley and Rossmere NAP Forums discuss meeting venues at forthcoming meetings.**

The consultation highlighted that the agendas for NAP Forums are frequently dominated by the need to allocate funding. This has reduced the opportunity to discuss some of the real substantive issues affecting life in the community. Section 8 of the report outlines recommendations as to how the funding could be allocated more strategically that will lead to more time in meetings being allocated to discussions around wider neighbourhood issues.

There is the view from residents that NAPs were more controlled in the beginning with residents being guided by service providers and that the process is now resident led.

During the consultation the view was expressed that NAP Forums need to be involved in more than just the contents of the NAP. The desire for NAP Forums to evolve so that they are involved early in the process of development plans within their neighbourhood was expressed. It was seen as a priority that needs to be addressed if the concept of fully involving people in improving their neighbourhood is to be achieved.

**It is recommended that opportunities to strengthen the role of NAP Forums are considered on matters such as increasing the involvement in statutory land use planning.**

### 3.8 Principles for NAP Forums

Local NAP Forums need to be open and transparent and to apply the same ten principles as the Hartlepool Partnership, as set out in the Draft Community Strategy:

#### **Effective partnership working**

Working together as equals to deliver sustainable communities within Hartlepool and having a clear understanding of shared decision-making, risks, responsibilities and accountabilities.

#### **Efficient partnership working**

Increasing efficiency and achieving value for money through improved procurement, financial reporting and management. Delivering high quality local services and making the most of the resources available including people, money, property, data and information.

#### **Skills and knowledge**

Developing our own capacity and skills to improve performance, whilst providing opportunities for the community to improve their skills, capacity and life chances.

**Decision making and communication**

Communicating openly and honestly with the community in Hartlepool making the Partnership publicly accountable for its decisions. Decision-making will be rigorous and transparent and decisions will be based upon the best information available at the time.

**Involvement and inclusion**

All parts of the community regardless of their gender, race, ethnicity, colour, disability, religion, sexual orientation, family and other circumstances, language, national or social origins, age or any other status, are encouraged to be involved at all stages in the development, delivery and monitoring of this strategy.

**Integrity**

Acting with honesty, selflessness and objectivity, declaring interests and dealing with straightforwardness and completeness.

**Sustainable development**

Considering economic, social and environmental goals equally and in an integrated way ensuring the long term and global aspects of strategy and decision making are considered.

**Performance Management**

Actively managing the delivery of the strategy and, where information for monitoring purposes is not forthcoming, striving to address this.

**Leadership and Influence**

Leading by example in applying these principles and using influence to encourage other partners and suppliers to do the same.

In addition to these ten key principles a Code of Conduct for how NAP Forums Operate has also been circulated to NAP Forums.

**It is recommended that NAP Forums operate within the Hartlepool Partnership ten key principles and the Code of Conduct (2006).**

## Section 4 – Enhancing Service Provider Involvement

### 4.1 Introduction

Service Providers are important in the delivery of the range of services in the disadvantaged communities. A questionnaire was sent to service providers and a focus group session was held on the 10<sup>th</sup> April 2006 with service providers who are actively involved within NAPs.

Satisfaction with the overall NAP process amongst service providers is relatively high. 77% are satisfied with the NAP development process, 78% are satisfied with the NAP Document, 61% of service providers are satisfied with the Local NAP Forum and 53% are satisfied with the progress that has been made on carrying out the NAP actions.

Service providers were asked for their views on how important certain aspects were to the success of the NAP. The most important aspect was implementing actions set out in the NAP (73% very important) closely followed by consultation of the draft NAP (70%). These activities are about agreeing the priorities are correct in the NAP and then delivering upon what has been agreed.

### 4.2 Stakeholder Importance and Influence

The questionnaire asked how important each group is to the success of NAPs. 91% believed that residents were very important, followed by Community Associations and Groups (70%), mirroring the results of the Resident questionnaire survey.

In terms of influence over the NAP process 32% felt that residents had too little influence, although 58% believed the current level of influence to be about right. In terms of the level of influence held by Councillors 36% believed that they have too much influence and 62% thought the level of influence was about right. 73% of service providers thought they had about the

right amount of influence, 22% believing they had slightly too little influence and 6% thinking they have far too little influence in the NAP process.

Three in five service providers interviewed felt that their organisation/department could be more involved in the NAP process than currently, with increased publicity and different meeting times/venues cited as methods to encourage this increased involvement. Thirty-nine of the 58 respondents felt it would be useful to have a 'NAP Champion' within their organisation/department, and 32 people suggested they were the most suitable individual for this role.

### 4.3 Job Description for NAP Champions

As an additional piece of work it is recommended that a generic 'Job Description' be drawn up for NAP Champions. This could include responsibility for:

- Driving the implementation of NAP priorities within their department/organisation
- Coordinating their department/organisations involvement in the development of NAPs
- Being the main contact to ensure that draft NAPs are correct and organise internal consultation on NAPs
- Being the main contact on monitoring whether actions attached to their department/organisation have been delivered or not;
- Attending NAP Forums as and when required, or coordinating the organisation/department attendance and involvement in NAPs; and
- Attendance and influence at the corporate level of organisations.

**It is recommended that the PST contact organisations and Council Departments to identify NAP Champions.**

### 4.4 NAP Development

Service providers had concerns as to whether the views contained within the NAP were the legitimate views of the wider community or just the more vocal residents. This accords with the views of the resident consultation exercise as discussed in para 3.3. A common view was expressed that more needs to be done in the NAP development stage to ensure that the

views of the wider community are included and not just a minority of more active residents. This may be just a perception but it is recommended that all key priorities are more thoroughly tested. This is to be coordinated by REGEN in compiling the NAP document, but service providers themselves need to be more actively engaged, reviewing draft NAPs and identifying potential discrepancies at as early stage as possible.

Further efforts need to be made to increase the resident involvement in NAPs, and this is a key role for Residents Associations, HCN and HHPOOL. There is also the perception from service providers that the process is rushed and that more time needs to be taken to ensure the NAP development is appropriately carried out. This view was also made by residents of NAP neighbourhoods.

**It is recommended that service providers engage early in the NAP development process and contribute towards developing the NAP.**

**It is recommended that REGEN contact NAP Champions to ensure actions identified in the NAP document in relation to their field of expertise is appropriate.**

## Section 5 - Developing an Enhanced Monitoring System

### 5.1 Introduction

The Hartlepool Partnership has agreed a process for monitoring how the NAP is being implemented. This involves individual Neighbourhood Managers regularly updating the NAP Forum on how identified actions within the plan are being progressed. Theme based information is taken to the respective Theme Partnership, and then the summary is taken to the Hartlepool Partnership Board for discussion.

Under current arrangements the monitoring is based purely on a 'yes, no or underway' answer to each of the identified actions in the NAP. But monitoring needs to be developed to tackle the following questions -

Do residents know how their area has changed?

Do residents know how their neighbourhood compares to other neighbourhoods?

Do service providers know which neighbourhoods they need to focus upon because of the greatest need?

Enhanced performance management provides NAP Forums with the opportunity to set out how they would like their neighbourhood to be in 2010, and monitor progress towards this vision.

### 5.2 Tracking Change in Neighbourhoods

Each NAP includes information on baseline conditions for each theme. This includes data on smoking rates, unemployment rates and the domestic burglary rate. While this sets an important context to the NAP it is easy to lose the impact of the statistical information highlighting acute disadvantage. This is because the data is 'lost' in the NAP document and it is not meaningful to residents. The information needs to be presented in a straightforward and meaningful way that is easily understood. One example would be to measure the actual number of smokers in the neighbourhood and to use the actual number of domestic burglaries.





### 5.3 Outcome Targets for NAPs

There is a need to move forward the use of performance information due to requirements attached to Neighbourhood Element Funding provided by Government. Four neighbourhoods are benefiting from this funding but it seems reasonable to extend a neighbourhood approach to performance management to the other NAP neighbourhoods of Rossmere and Rift House/Burn Valley.

It is important that individual NAP Outcome Frameworks:

- Are not overly complicated and can be understood and interpreted by everyone;
- Measure the key community priorities but are linked to the Local Area Agreement indicators;
- Do not add significantly to the level of bureaucracy; and
- Add value to the process of improving neighbourhoods.

Table 1 following sets out a potential basket of outcomes that could be chosen by, in this example, the Owton Forum. It is expected that there will be two or three outcomes chosen for each theme, with more chosen for the Neighbourhood Element Priority Theme for that neighbourhood. This approach to performance management was suggested and supported during the service provider consultation event.

**It is recommended that an Outcome Framework is developed for each neighbourhood and agreed by service providers and local NAP Forums.**

## Table 1 – BASKET OF NAP OUTCOMES

Outcome	Baseline	Target
<b>Jobs &amp; Economy</b>		
Unemployment rate	% Residents unemployed (Annual Average 2002-2004) is xx	Reduce the Owton unemployment rate to xx by March 2010
<b>Lifelong Learning</b>		
Number of adults who are supported in achieving at least a full first level 2 qualification or equivalent.	No. Owton residents achieving Level 2 Qualification – xx (2005)	Increase the no. Residents achieving Level 2 Qualification to xx by March 2010
KS2 Level 4 Maths/English 2005	% Owton pupils achieving Level 4 KS2 – xx (2005)	Increase the % Pupils achieving Level 4 KS2 xx by March 2010
KS3	% Owton pupils achieving Level 5 KS3 – xx (2005)	Increase the % Pupils achieving Level 5 KS3 xx by March 2010
5+ GCSE A*-C 2005	% Owton pupils achieving – xx (2005)	Increase the achievement rate to xx by March 2010
<b>Health</b>		
The prevalence of smoking amongst adults	Residents smoking – 46% (2004)	Reduce the number of residents who smoke to xx by March 2010
Male life expectancy	Life Expectancy is 68.4	Increase Life Expectancy to xx by March 2010
Female life expectancy	Life Expectancy is 74.1	Increase Life Expectancy to xx by March 2010
Under 18 conception rate	Average no. under 18 conceptions (3 yr average)	Reduce the number of Owton under 18s conceiving to xx by March 2010
<b>Community Safety</b>		
Domestic Burglary per 1000 households (2004/05)	Domestic burglary rate – 31 per 1000 households	Reduce the number of burglaries in the neighbourhood to xx by March 2010
Personal, social and community disorder reported to the police	No. of Personal, Social and Community Disorder incidents reported to the Police is xx (2004/05)	Reduce the No. of Personal, Social and Community Disorder incidents reported to the Police to xx by March 2010
How safe people feel out in the neighbourhood after dark	% people feeling safe out in the neighbourhood after dark is 57% (2004)	Increase the % people feeling safe out in the neighbourhood after dark to xx by 2010
<b>Environment &amp; Housing</b>		
Litter and rubbish	Percentage of people identifying litter and rubbish as a problem in the area – 60% (2004)	Reduce the % residents identifying litter and rubbish as a problem in the area to xx by March 2010.
Increase the proportion of people satisfied with their local area as a place to live (2004)	% residents satisfied with their local area as a place to live is 80% (2004)	Increase the % residents satisfied with their local area as a place to live to xx by March 2010.

<b>Culture &amp; Leisure</b>		
Satisfaction with public parks/open spaces	Satisfaction with public parks/open spaces - 55% (2004)	Increase the satisfaction with public parks/open spaces to 70% by 2010
<b>Strengthening Communities</b>		
Percentage of adults who feel they can influence decisions that affect own area	% residents who feel they can affect decisions that affect own area - 25% (2004)	Increase the % residents who feel they can affect decisions that affect their own area to xx by March 2010
Proportion of people undertaking voluntary work/community activity	% residents who undertake voluntary work/community activity - 18% (2004)	Increase the xx residents who undertake voluntary work/ community activity to xx by March 2010

## 5.4 Demonstrating Success

Currently the NAP Forums receive NRF funding to deliver NAP priorities. Four of the six neighbourhoods also receive Neighbourhood Element Funding from 2006. The amount allocated to each neighbourhood is based on population and relative level of disadvantage. Both these funding streams are incorporated within the Hartlepool Local Area Agreement (LAA) and are linked to particular targets. The future of continued funding devolved to local NAP Forums depends to a large extent on demonstrating effectiveness in terms of contributing to the achievement of real outcomes, and the NAP Outcome framework provides a basis for this, with baselines closely tied in with the baselines of the LAA Outcomes.

## Section 6 – Review NAP Boundaries

### 6.1 Introduction

The current NAP boundaries have largely remained the same since the NRS was agreed in 2002. Minor changes to the Owton NAP boundary were agreed during 2005 to include the 'I' and 'M' Blocks that are part of the natural Owton Manor Neighbourhood.

The NAP Areas are generally based on the previous Ward boundary arrangements when NRF was first allocated to Hartlepool in 2001. There are no real issues with the NAP Area to the North (Brus, St. Hilda) and the South (Owton, Rossmere). In the centre of the town the NAP Area boundaries are designed around the NDC area and this has led to what looks like some odd looking boundaries.

### 6.2 North Hartlepool Boundary

The area reflects exactly the Brus and St. Hilda wards, which is a positive point as much of the health data is based on ward information. The North Hartlepool area is the biggest of all the NAP areas and largely reflects the current North Hartlepool Partnership SRB area. The NAP is currently being prepared as one NAP for both wards. There has been some views that the NAP area of this scale is too large although guidance from Government has indicated that the optimum size for a successful neighbourhood management model is a population of around 10,000, similar to that in the North Hartlepool NAP area. In practice the NAP has been developed using the three distinct communities of West View/King Oswy, Central Estate and the Headland. The Hartlepool Partnership has agreed that budgets be allocated for each of these three sub-neighbourhoods.

### 6.3 Dyke House/Stranton/Grange Boundary

This NAP Area boundary includes the whole of the Dyke House Ward and parts of the old Jackson ward that are not in the NDC area. In the boundary changes of 2005 the Jackson ward was replaced in part by Stranton and Grange Wards.

The Dyke House/Stranton/Grange NAP is now a recognisable neighbourhood by the people who live there, even if on a map it looks like an odd boundary. If you were to look at what the most natural boundary would be then the Stranton and Grange parts of the NAP Area would be within the adjoining NDC boundary. There are a number of issues with altering the boundary to reflect this. Firstly, the Stranton and Grange parts of the NAP Area now see themselves as being part of the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange NAP and residents from these areas are actively involved in the NAP Forum. In addition, the NAP Forum has recently been allocated funding from the Hartlepool Partnership through NRF and Neighbourhood Element and may see their eligibility to access this funding reduced if they are no longer in the NAP neighbourhood. Also, the NDC Steering Group may not wish to see an extension to their boundary especially as the NDC boundary already marginally exceeds the recommended population for an NDC neighbourhood of 10,000.

The Draft Community Strategy and NRS (September 2006) highlighted that Bright Street and Wilson Street should be added to the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange neighbourhood.

### 6.4 Burbank Boundary

The Burbank area is all within the Stranton Ward boundary. There is an issue with the current boundary as set out in the NRS that it is too wide and includes areas of the marina. The current Burbank NAP Area states that the focus for the NAP is the actual Burbank estate, as this is by far the most disadvantaged part of the NAP area.

## **6.5 New Deal for Communities (NDC) Boundary**

The NDC boundary was agreed in 2000 before the NAP process began in Hartlepool. The boundary cuts across five different wards. A major factor in deciding the initial NDC boundary was the need to maximise the number of properties within disadvantaged areas accessing the NDC programme, regardless of ward.

The NDC boundary is widely recognised by key stakeholders and is to continue to receive funding from Government to 2011. NDC have a range of targets based on their existing boundaries and it is understood that at the present time there is no option to change the NDC boundary. It is recommended that the current boundary is retained but is reviewed again by 2009 when the NDC programme is nearer to the end of its funding period.

## **6.6 Rift House/Burn Valley Boundary**

The boundary includes the majority of the Rift House and Burn Valley wards. The identifiable Rift House neighbourhood is included. There is a view expressed during the consultation that the Rift House and the Burn Valley areas need to be separated and have their own NAP, although a further view was expressed that the two areas have effectively come together through their NAP. There is an issue of the boundary to the east where the NAP Area joins the NDC area. NDC have a range of targets based on their existing boundaries. It is recommended that the current boundary is retained but is reviewed again by 2009 when the NDC programme is nearer to the end of its funding.

## **6.7 Owton Boundary**

The boundary for the Owton NAP Area was amended prior to the NAP development commencing in 2004/05 to include the 'I' and 'M' blocks. The new boundary is reflected in the Draft Community Strategy and NRS (September 2006).

## **6.8 Rossmere Boundary**

The Rossmere boundary reflects the ward boundary. The IMD2004 now shows that much of the area is no longer in the most deprived 10% areas in the country, and none of the adjacent areas are either, suggesting that the boundary does not need to be expanded to include any adjacent areas.

## 6.9 Conclusions

Boundary lines for regeneration purposes are an emotive issue. It is a line often between those households who can access particular funding from those who can not. What is important is that NAPs continue to be focussed on those areas classified as being disadvantaged. There is no urgent pressure to radically change from the current boundaries, but as the NDC moves towards the end of its natural life there will be the opportunity to reconsider the issue in the future.

## Section 7 - Options for Extending NAPs

### 7.1 Introduction

Excellent progress has been made in the production of NAPs for the Hartlepool NRS area and the individual plans are well received by the communities they cover. This positive response to NAPs has also become apparent through the process of conducting the Strengthening Community Best Value Review to the extent that the community groups involved in the Best Value Review have suggested that consideration should be given to extending the NAP approach into other areas of the town currently outside the agreed Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy area.

The current policy framework for NAPs is Neighbourhood Renewal and their main objective is to close gaps between the most deprived wards and the rest of the town.

Since April 2006 all of the NRS Priority Neighbourhoods have a NAP and work is continuing with residents, service providers and communities to ensure these plans are implemented, monitored, updated and evaluated, for effectiveness. This presents a considerable workload for all involved in the NAP process including Council Officers (PST, REGEN, NM plus support from other Departments), HCN, HHPOOL, service providers, voluntary and community groups, residents, the Theme Partnerships and the Hartlepool Partnership.

### 7.2 Focussing Resources on Deprived Communities

A more focused approach could, therefore be considered more appropriate. NAPs are currently produced for all deprived areas which fall within the 9 wards that are within the most deprived 10% of wards nationally (as defined by the national Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2000 and the IMD 2004). The IMD 2004 now identifies deprivation data at a sub ward level (Super Output Areas – SOA's).





The draft Community Strategy and Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (Sept 2006) recommends that the NRS Neighbourhood is extended to include the disadvantaged part of Throston ward. Although not in the 10% most disadvantaged of SOA's, nationally, the neighbourhood does display a high degree of deprivation for the Employment, Health and Crime domains (being within the 10% most disadvantaged of SOA's for each of these domains).

Consultation is currently underway until November 2006 and the final Community Strategy and NRS is scheduled for final agreement in April 2007.

**It is recommended that for 2006 onwards that NAPs only be prepared in locations within the Neighbourhood Renewal area, as set out in the draft Community Strategy and NRS.**

**It is recommended that Bright/Wilson Street be added to the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange neighbourhood (subject to approval within the Community Strategy and NRS approval process).**

**It is recommended that the disadvantaged part of Throston ward be included within the NRS neighbourhood (subject to approval within the Community Strategy and NRS approval process).**

### 7.3 Capacity to Deliver More Neighbourhood Based Plans

NAPs are clearly popular with residents and it is understandable that there may be a desire from other parts of the town to have NAPs, or similar, developed in their particular area. Whilst this may also be appropriate in terms of good practice for achieving community engagement at the grass roots level, for the reasons outlined earlier it would prove counter to the objective of bridging the gap between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the more affluent areas. An alternative option to consider however might be to look at developing neighbourhood service improvement plans for areas outside of areas of disadvantage. These would **not** be used to influence the allocation of future resources or have NRF money spent in the areas in question, but would act as a catalyst to bring service providers and residents together to identify neighbourhood issues and to fine tune services delivery. These could be linked in with emerging action plans for Neighbourhood Policing priorities. These plans could follow a similar but less intense preparation process and format as that used for

Neighbourhood Action Plans but would be materially different in terms of functions. Again there could be issues with this approach in terms of incentives, encouraging interest, establishing 'early wins' and managing expectations.

Further thought and discussion is required before this option is delivered, certainly in light of the Local Government White Paper due out shortly that may well provide direction as to how widely terms such as 'double devolution' are to be administered.

In addition if there were to be a number of these plans, and if the preparation process, monitoring, evaluation and review arrangements replicate those of the existing NAP then investment would be required to put in place the necessary structures to deliver. This not only includes the staff directly involved in NAP development, such as REGEN, TCMs, CEN and HHPOOL, but also the range of service providers who will have to further respond to an expanding neighbourhood dimension to their service delivery.

If NAPs were extended into other areas they could therefore, dilute this effort of targeting the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods in terms of existing and future resources and would consequently jeopardise closing gaps. The consultation has highlighted that some service providers are pressed to get fully involved in all the NAP activities, including having the time to adequately respond to the content of draft NAPs. Some service providers have highlighted that it is difficult to attend all NAP Forums and this would be even worse if the NAP approach was extended to non-NRF areas. In addition the consultation has highlighted the need for service provider representatives who attend NAP Forums to be able to engage with residents and make decisions.

The need to continue to give priority to disadvantaged areas is supported in the Council's Corporate Best Value Performance Plan 2005/06, which states that:

*"Relatively affluent areas are not eligible for additional investment specifically aimed at tackling high levels of disadvantage. Affluent Wards in the Borough are therefore non-priority areas for a range of activities focused on tackling disadvantage. Funding programmes include Neighbourhood Renewal Fund programmes and other geographical priority area programmes such as Single Regeneration Budget and New Deal for Communities."*

**It is recommended that PST and REGEN meet key service providers to discuss how organisations are structured to deliver on the neighbourhood agenda.**

**It is recommended that further consideration be given to developing neighbourhood service improvement plans outside the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy Area on a similar but less intense process and format to NAPs once the Local Government White Paper is published, and further research on organisations capacity to deliver has been undertaken.**

## **Section 8 - NRF Residents Priorities Fund (RPF) & Neighbourhood Element Funding (NEF)**

### **8.1 Introduction**

Neighbourhood Managers were responsible for managing the NAP Residents Priorities Budget for 2004-2006. For 2006-08 the budget for each NAP will be managed by REGEN.

### **8.2 NRF Evaluation**

An independent evaluation of the NRF programme for 2004-06 was undertaken during the autumn of 2005 by the Centre for Local Economic Strategies (CLES). The evaluation focussed upon the NRF funding that had been allocated to the Rift House/Burn Valley Neighbourhood and the Burbank area to meet residents priorities.

The evaluation found that the funding had mainly been used for capital investment projects directed by the local forums. The NAP process has helped to develop a level of trust and confidence in the community, which is enabling them to become an active partner in the improvement of the environment. The evaluation also concluded that the NAP Residents Priorities Fund had influenced wider mainstream provision.

The evaluation also highlighted that there needed to be better awareness of the impact upon key targets – and this has been covered further in Section 5. The evaluation report also suggested that funding allocation guidelines should be produced for local forums. That is the aim of this section of the review.

### 8.3 Decision Making

The NAP Forum is the decision making body for the RPF and NEF. The Priority Actions within the NAP provide the framework by which funding shall be prioritised.

There are pressures from Government Office, as the funding body, to ensure that expenditure is maximised and carry over of below 5% from year to year is achieved, and this places NAP Forums under pressure to allocate funding and deliver schemes within the correct financial year. In an ideal world this situation would be relaxed, and this may lead to a more considered prioritisation of the spend. During the consultation it was highlighted that the meetings are dominated by prioritising funding. In some areas this has created tensions between individuals and groups that have proved counter-productive in terms of getting the community working together to improve their neighbourhood.

At the moment organisations who can deliver upon key actions come forward and submit a case, via a set proforma, to deliver an intervention on behalf of the local NAP Forum. In order to deliver better outcomes, and to ensure that all appropriate options are considered for delivering, a commissioning type approach to allocating RPF and NEF should be considered rather than allocating funding on a project by project basis.

**It is recommended that all local NAP Forums adopt a more strategic commissioning approach to allocating funding to directly tackle priorities outlined in the NAP and that are clearly linked to the priorities set out in the local NAP Outcome Framework.**

NAP neighbourhoods vary in size from 1500 people in Burbank to around 10,000 in North Hartlepool (Brus & St. Hilda). NAP neighbourhoods such as Rift House/Burn Valley and Rossmere are medium sized but comprise distinct neighbourhoods. It is important that residents from all areas, i.e. either side of the A689 for the Rossmere NAP, attend the NAP Forum to ensure that when funding decisions are being taken there is representation from the full range of communities. It is the responsibility of the NM and HCN or HHPOOL to ensure this is the case. A good example of this is in Dyke House/

Stranton/Grange where the range of residents associations come together under the Communities Acting Together (CAT) umbrella group.

**It is recommended that individual NAP Forums membership is balanced by residents from across the whole neighbourhood prior to funding decisions being taken.**

#### **8.4 Terms of Reference for NAP Forums**

At the moment each NAP Forum is responsible for agreeing its own Terms of Reference but these need to be re-assessed to ensure they are still suitable. On a separate point the role and remit of NAP Forums needs to be discussed alongside that of the three Neighbourhood Consultative Forums. Once this has been undertaken it may be necessary to look to formalise the role of NAP Forums in the Councils Constitution.

**It is recommended that the NM ensure refreshed Terms of Reference are in place for each Local Forum, taking into account a standard set of terms as to what the LSP expects of NAP Forums.**

**It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Services Dept consider how the emerging role of the local NAP Forums fits in with current and future expectations of how Neighbourhood Consultative Forums operate.**

## Section 9 – Roles & Responsibilities

### 9.1 Introduction

We need to clarify the roles of key players such as PST, REGEN, NM, HCN and HHPOOL on NAP development and monitoring. This section outlines the range of tasks to ensure a NAP is produced and delivered effectively.

### 9.2 Leading on NAP Development

Under current arrangements REGEN lead on the NAP development process. There are relatively high levels of satisfaction with the NAP development process. One reason for this is the flexibility of REGEN staff in what can be quite an intense period of Community Conferences and Drop-In Sessions. Key tasks involve

- Preparing an Issues Paper and analysis of statistics
- Pre meetings with Members, HCN, residents associations, existing community and voluntary sector groups
- Organising Community Conferences, including venues, mailing lists and publicity and managing the content of the meetings, briefing facilitators, etc.
- Preparing 1<sup>st</sup> Draft report for consultation, and drop in sessions and individual meetings with interested stakeholders.
- Preparing and presenting reports to Neighbourhood Consultative Forums, Portfolio Holder and the Hartlepool Partnership
- Follow up meetings with service providers, residents associations, youth groups, schools, etc.
- Organising design and printing of final NAP documents, and circulation to key stakeholders

### 9.3 NAP Forum Support

Under current arrangements NMs are responsible for managing Local Forums and this is to continue from 2006 onwards. The NMs will be responsible for working with the local NAP Forums' residents on specific issues, supporting the Local Forum

and any Sub-Groups, including arranging the meeting dates and the agenda alongside NAP Forum Chairs. NMs will be responsible for sending out minutes and agendas prior to meetings. The upcoming appointment of Neighbourhood Development Officers will support the NMs in this role.

#### **9.4 NAP Forum Minutes**

The HCN initially indicated that they had allocated resources to minute all the NAP Forum meetings. However this is proving more time consuming than initially realised. Therefore Neighbourhood Services will continue to take the minutes of the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange NAP Forum. In those forums where the CEN will take the minutes the responsibility for circulation remains with the NMs.

#### **9.5 Action Monitoring**

Under current arrangements NMs lead on collating NAP monitoring reports. The NM report these to the Local Forum. Under current arrangements the PST take the NAP monitoring info and prepare and present reports to each of the Theme Partnerships and the LSP. The level of work required by NM to complete this task, even on an annual basis, will increase as more NAPs have been prepared and are now monitored.

#### **9.4 Outcome Monitoring**

The monitoring of Neighbourhood Targets, as set out in Section 5 is a new task for 2006. The PST will lead on this.

#### **9.6 Capacity Building**

Under current arrangements the capacity building role has varied by neighbourhood and organisation. For example HHPOOL have provided this role in Dyke House/Stranton/Grange, benefiting from being located at the Chatham Road Community House. The HCN have supported NAP Forums in other NAP areas but have also been responsible for writing minutes (alongside REGEN) rather than focussing on a community development type role. It is evident from the NAP Review consultation that there is still a degree of capacity building to be undertaken and the HCN and HHPOOL, alongside



local residents groups, are best placed to undertake this. To avoid duplication it has been agreed that HHPOOL provide the lead in Dyke House/Stranton/Grange, Burbank and Central Estate with the HCN taking the lead role in all other NAP areas.

### **9.7 NRF Residents Priorities Fund (RPF) Budget Management**

NMs were responsible for managing and monitoring spend in 2005/06. While this is working relatively well (albeit with slightly different systems of allocation) there is a fundamental issue with the workload of the NM and it has been agreed that REGEN will manage and administer this budget for 2006-08.

### **9.8 Neighbourhood Element Budget Management**

It has been agreed that £80,000 per annum be set aside for the next four years to manage the Neighbourhood Element Funding and ensure the continued development of NAPs. The four neighbourhoods of North Hartlepool, Dyke House/Stranton/Grange, Burbank and Owton each have to prioritise only one theme upon which to focus the funding.

As a range of different themes have been chosen as the priorities for Neighbourhood Element funding it follows that generic project management skills are required to deliver the programme. The Neighbourhood Element will be coordinated by REGEN, with the exception of Dyke House/Stranton/Grange. This neighbourhood has identified Community Safety as its priority, and with the area also being a focus for the new Neighbourhood Policing model the Neighbourhood Element funding for this neighbourhood will be coordinated and managed by the Community Safety team of the Council. Central Estate and West View/King Oswy have also chosen Community Safety as their priority theme upon which Neighbourhood Element Funding will be prioritised.

**Table 1 – NAP Roles & Responsibilities**

	<b>North Hartlepool</b>	<b>Dyke House/ Stranton/Grange</b>	<b>Burbank</b>	<b>Rift House/ Burn Valley</b>	<b>Owton</b>	<b>Rossmere</b>
<b>NAP Development</b>	RE GEN	RE GEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	RE GEN
<b>NAP Forum Support</b>	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM
-set dates of meetings	NM	NM	HCN	HCN	HCN	HCN
-agenda	NM	NM	REGEN	HCN	HCN	HCN
-minutes	HCN	HCN	HCN	HCN	HCN	HCN
-send out papers	NM	NM	HCN	HCN	HCN	HCN
<b>NAP Sub Group Support</b>	NM	HHPOOL	NM	N/A	REGEN	RE GEN
-set dates of meetings	HCN	CAT	HCN	N/A	REGEN	RE GEN
-agenda	HCN	CAT	HCN	N/A	REGEN	RE GEN
-minutes	HCN	CAT	HCN	N/A	REGEN	RE GEN
-send out papers	HCN	CAT	HCN	N/A	REGEN	RE GEN

	North Hartlepool	Dyke House/ Stranton/Grange	Burbank	Rift House/ Burn Valley	Owton	Rossmere
<b>Process Application Forms (including presenting projects / schemes to the Neighbourhood Forum and any associated Sub Groups, issuing offer letter and processing invoices).</b>	NHP	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN
<b>NRF Residents Priority Budget</b>	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN
<b>Neighbourhood Element Funding</b>	REGEN	COM SAFETY	REGEN	N/A	REGEN	N/A
<b>Collation of Monitoring Forms</b>	NHP	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN	REGEN
<b>Co-ordinate Monthly Meetings</b>	TBC	TBC	NM	NM	NM	NM
<b>Action Monitoring</b>	NM (with support from NHP and HCN when required)	NM (with support from REGEN and HCN when required)	NM (with support from REGEN)	NM (with support from REGEN and HCN when required)	NM (with support from REGEN and HCN when required)	NM (with support from REGEN and HCN when required)

	North Hartlepool	Dyke House/ Stranton/Grange	Burbank	Rift House/ Burn Valley	Owton	Rossmere
			and HCN when required)	required)	required)	required)
<b>Outcome Monitoring</b>	PST	PST	PST	PST	PST	PST
<b>Capacity Building</b>	HCN*	HHPOOL	HHPOOL	HCN	HCN	HCN

\* HHPOOL are working with the community in Central Estate, and it is recommended that they take the lead on the capacity building role in this area, with HCN focussing on the Headland and West View/King Oswy area.

**It is recommended that the roles and responsibilities are agreed as set out in Table 1**

## SECTION 10 – CONCLUSIONS

### 10.1 A Good Start

NAPs are popular with residents and are delivering improvements in neighbourhoods. Statistics, independent evaluation and residents and service providers themselves are telling us this. Results of consultations have highlighted that-

*“Burbank has improved dramatically over the last year”*

*“Experience of dealing with the NAP has made me a lot wiser and more confident”*

*“Residents from different Residents Associations have worked together to deliver improvements”*

*“Residents are able to see the bigger picture and see the benefit of working together”*

*“Residents have taken the lead in organising activities themselves”*

*“High resident involvement”*

*“Inclusive process which has brought people together”*

*“Residents are able to prioritise issues”*

*“Real attempts to build contact with young people and more activities for young people”*

*“Gives residents a voice”*

*“Local priorities awarded money”*

*"Discussion of issues and problems is regular now"*

*"Stopped the 'them and us' with service providers"*

*"Residents ideas listened to"*

*"People can see achievements and come together as a partnership"*

*"Lots of things flagged up in the NAPs are tackled"*

*"Some visible improvements such as better lighting, removal of bushes, reduced litter and dog dirt"*

*"Good involvement from a wide variety of service providers"*

*"The benefit of NAP priorities is that they deal with localities"*

*"Service providers refer to NAPs when directing resources and services"*

*"Resident groups have used NAPs when putting together applications for funding"*

*"Catalyst for service providers and residents coming together"*

## **10.2 NAP Action Plan**

There are 34 recommendations within this report that need to be delivered. A separate NAP Action Plan will be developed and monitored on a six monthly basis to ensure that the recommendations within this report are acted upon.

## **SECTION 11 – SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. It is recommended that REGEN liaise with HCN early in the NAP Development Process to identify BME community contacts to be approached.**
- 2. It is recommended that REGEN consider opportunities to further involve the business community in NAPs, in liaison with local NAP Forums.**
- 3. It is recommended that REGEN liaise with local NAP Forums to discuss opportunities to involve more young people, including possibly setting aside a proportion of the NRF Residents Priorities Fund to be allocated directly by young people.**
- 4. It is recommended that within the programme of capacity building to be led by HCN and HHPOOL that literacy and IT skills are considered and taken forward.**
- 5. It is recommended that REGEN and PST develop an enhanced system by which stakeholders can use electronic consultation methods in NAP development.**
- 6. It is recommended that local NAP Forums themselves decide on the timetable for developing their revised NAP**
- 7. It is recommended that NAP Champions work alongside REGEN in checking the appropriateness of emerging priorities in the draft NAP.**
- 8. It is recommended that greater consideration be given to outlining in the NAP document which priorities are to be tackled in the short term and which are long term, more aspirational priorities.**

9. It is recommended that NAP Forums discuss ways in which all agencies and individuals, including residents, can enhance resident involvement in NAPs.
10. It is recommended that NAP Forums are closely involved in determining the scope of Community Consultation around NAP development, including agreeing meeting times, venues and branding.
11. It is recommended that a summary NAP is developed together with more 'accessible' publicity material that can be more easily understood and distributed to the local community.
12. It is recommended that a 'jargon check' is made on all draft NAPs by REGEN and the local NAP Forum.
13. It is recommended that publicity is increased around paying for bus fares/taxis and crèche/childcare as this is currently available to residents who wish to attend NAP development meetings.
14. It is recommended that the HCN and HHP OOL prepare an annual schedule outlining the capacity building work they will undertake in NAP neighbourhoods.
15. It is recommended that all organisations who deliver 'capacity building' initiatives in Hartlepool be brought together to examine opportunities to improve coordination and reduce duplication.
16. It is recommended that the £20,000 from the Community Coordination allocation (Neighbourhood Element) for 2006/07 is allocated to support capacity building in NAP neighbourhoods.
17. It is recommended that the PST review Councillor involvement in Forums following analysis of the Local Government White Paper.
18. It is recommended that the Rift House/Burn Valley and Rossmere NAP Forums discuss meeting venues at forthcoming meetings.



19. It is recommended that opportunities to strengthen the role of NAP Forums are considered on matters such as increasing the involvement in statutory land use planning.
20. It is recommended that NAP Forums operate within the Hartlepool Partnership ten key principles and the Code of Conduct (2006).
21. It is recommended that the PST contact organisations and Council Departments to identify NAP Champions.
22. It is recommended that service providers engage early in the NAP development process and contribute towards developing the NAP.
23. It is recommended that REGEN contact NAP Champions to ensure actions identified in the NAP document in relation to their field of expertise is appropriate.
24. It is recommended that an Outcome Framework is developed for each neighbourhood and agreed by service providers and local NAP Forums.
25. It is recommended that for 2006 onwards that NAPs only be prepared in locations within the Neighbourhood Renewal area, as set out in the draft Community Strategy and NRS.
26. It is recommended that Bright/Wilson Street be added to the Dyke House/Stranton/Grange neighbourhood (subject to approval within the Community Strategy and NRS approval process).
27. It is recommended that the disadvantaged part of Throston ward be included within the NRS neighbourhood (subject to approval within the Community Strategy and NRS approval process).
28. It is recommended that PST and REGEN meet key service providers to discuss how organisations are structured to deliver on the neighbourhood agenda.

29. It is recommended that further consideration be given to developing neighbourhood service improvement plans outside the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy Area on a similar but less intense process and format to NAPs once the Local Government White Paper is published, and further research on organisations capacity to deliver has been undertaken.
30. It is recommended that all local NAP Forums adopt a more strategic commissioning approach to allocating funding to directly tackle priorities outlined in the NAP and that are clearly linked to the priorities set out in the local NAP Outcome Framework.
31. It is recommended that individual NAP Forums membership is balanced by residents from across the whole neighbourhood prior to funding decisions being taken.
32. It is recommended that the NM ensure refreshed Terms of Reference are in place for each Local Forum, taking into account a standard set of terms as to what the LSP expects of NAP Forums.
33. It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Services Dept consider how the emerging role of the local NAP Forums fits in with current and future expectations of how Neighbourhood Consultative Forums operate.
34. It is recommended that the roles and responsibilities are agreed as set out in Table 1

## **REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

Report to Portfolio Holder

20 October 2006



**Report of:** Head of Public Protection and Housing

**Subject:** LICENSING OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE  
OCCUPATION (HMOs) – LICENCE CONDITIONS

---

### **SUMMARY**

1. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**  
The purpose of this report is seek approval for the conditions to be attached to licences for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).
2. **SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**  
The report details the mandatory conditions that must be applied to all licensed HMOs and sets out discretionary conditions that are considered to be of importance in relation to the management of such properties.
3. **RELEVANCE TO CABINET**  
The Portfolio Holder is responsible for Housing Services
4. **TYPE OF DECISION**  
Non-key
5. **DECISION MAKING ROUTE**  
Portfolio Holder, 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006.
6. **DECISION(S) REQUIRED**  
To approve the conditions and related standards to be applied to licensed HMOs.

**Report of:** Head of Public Protection and Housing

**Subject:** LICENSING OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE  
OCCUPATION (HMOs) – LICENCE CONDITIONS

---

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the conditions to be attached to a licence for a House in Multiple Occupation.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Culture, Housing and 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 HMOs of three or more storeys in size with five or more residents must be licensed, although certain exemptions will apply.
- 2.3 Before a licence is issued, the Authority must be satisfied that:
- 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 must be suitable; and
  - d) the HMO is reasonably suitable for the number of persons permitted having regard to the minimum standards for amenities and facilities.
- 2.4 A licence must include a number of mandatory licence conditions and may include other conditions as determined by the Local Authority.
- 2.5 If an HMO is not considered suitable for the number of persons, work or action may be required under the terms of the licence to make the property suitable within a specified timescale.

## **3. LICENCE CONDITIONS**

- 3.1 The Housing Act 2004 specifies that a licence must include the following conditions:
- the licence holder must produce an annual gas safety certificate (if gas is provided)
  - the licence holder must keep electrical appliances and furniture provided in a safe condition, and to supply a declaration on demand as to their safety

- the licence holder must ensure that smoke alarms are installed and kept in a proper working order, and to supply a declaration on demand as to their position and condition
- the licence holder must supply the occupiers of the house a written statement of terms on which they occupy it.

3.2 Licences may also include conditions that the local housing authority considers necessary to regulate:

- the management, use and occupation of the house; and
- its condition and contents

Such conditions may include dealing with anti-social behaviour, providing facilities and equipment to make the house suitable for the number of occupants and requiring the licence holder or manager to attend appropriate training.

3.3 Whilst specific guidance has been issued in the form of regulations relating to the provision of baths/showers, wash hand basins and water closets, no guidance has been produced in relation to other amenities, such as for food preparation or fire safety. Similarly, no guidance has been issued in relation to the size of accommodation provided. It is expected that each Local Authority should produce their own standards taking local conditions into account.

3.4 In order to achieve consistency on a sub-regional level, officers from the Tees Valley authorities- Darlington, Stockton, Redcar & Cleveland, Middlesbrough and Hartlepool agreed to establish joint standards in respect of licensable HMOs. In addition, the Cleveland authorities have liaised with the Cleveland Fire Brigade to establish guidance in relation to fire safety that can be applied to all HMOs.

3.5 It is proposed that the standard licence conditions as set out in Appendix 1, together with the more detailed guidance in relation to space standards and amenities, fire safety and management (set out in Appendices A, B & C) are formally adopted in Hartlepool.

3.6 Most conditions will require compliance with immediate effect, such as the provision of a gas safety certificate, whilst timescales will be specified for carrying out specific work or action. The timescales will be set on an individual property basis, taking risk factors into consideration.

#### **4. PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

4.1 Prior to granting a licence, the authority must serve a notice on the applicant and other relevant persons of their intention to issue a licence. This must set out the reasons for granting the licence, the main terms of the licence and the date of the end of the consultation period. Any representations made must be considered and modifications made where necessary.

- 4.2 It is proposed that where a dispute arises and agreement cannot be reached between the proposed Licence Holder and the Local Authority that a report should be brought to the Portfolio Holder.

**5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 It is recommended that the proposed licence conditions are adopted and applied to all licensed HMOs.
- 5.2 It is recommended that the Portfolio Holder considers any disputes in relation to the conditions applied and makes decisions as necessary.

## **Housing Act 2004, section 67**

### **Licence Conditions**

The following licence conditions relate to the licence issued on <date> relating to the House in Multiple Occupation known as <address>

The licence conditions must be read in conjunction with the documents relating to the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (England) Regulations 2006 and the Hartlepool Space Standards and Amenities.

#### **1. Gas Safety**

The Licence Holder must ensure that an annual safety check is carried out by a Council of Registered Gas Installers (CORGI) recognised engineer on each gas appliance in the house and must submit to the Local Authority a safety certificate obtained within the last 12 months in respect of the house and thereafter on an annual basis.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

#### **2. Safety of Electrical Appliances**

The Licence Holder must ensure that all electrical appliances provided by them are maintained in a safe condition. All appliances must be inspected for defects at least every two years or at the start of any new occupancy. The tests must be carried out by a person competent in the use of testing equipment and who has the appropriate electrical knowledge and training, such as a competent electrician or person in possession of a City & Guilds Certificate 2377.

The Licence Holder must provide a declaration to the Local Authority on demand as to the safety of electrical appliances.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

#### **3. Safety of Electrical Installations**

The Licence Holder must ensure that the electrical installation in the house is kept in a safe and proper working order.

The Licence Holder must provide to the Local Authority a copy of a valid electrical certificate (Periodic Inspection Report) , where applicable, relating to the following installations in the house: -

- a) Fire Alarm System
- b) Smoke/Heat Detection System
- c) Emergency Lighting System

**d) General Electrical Installation**

The Licence Holder must ensure that a full periodic inspection of the electrical installation in the house is undertaken in accordance with BS 7671 (or any British Standard which subsequently replaces this) at intervals of no more than 5 years.

The Licence Holder must ensure that this inspection is carried out by a competent person. A competent person in this respect includes NICEIC enrolled contractors or ECA members who regularly inspect, and are qualified to inspect domestic electrical installation systems and whose work is subject to regular assessment.

The Local Authority may, at its own discretion, request the provision of a further full periodic inspection report when the following circumstances apply:-

- a) substantial change in property configuration.
- b) fire damage.
- c) extensive vandalism.
- d) evidence of regular/frequent poor property management by the responsible person responsible.

**This condition must be met within three months of the date of the licence. (May be omitted if there is a current report).**

**4. Smoke Alarms**

The Licence Holder must ensure that smoke alarms are installed in the house and are kept in proper working order. A declaration regarding the positioning and condition of the alarms must be provided to the Local Authority on demand.

**This condition must be met within <insert compliance period>**

**5. Fire Safety Precautions**

The Licence Holder must ensure that appropriate fire precaution facilities and equipment must be provided of such type, number and location as is considered necessary. Reference should be made to the Fire Safety Guidance for Houses in Multiple Occupation document attached in Appendix A.

**This condition must be met within <insert compliance period>**

**6. Safety of Furniture**

The Licence Holder must ensure that all furniture provided by them complies with the Furniture and Furnishings (Fire) (Safety) Regulations 1988 (as amended).



The Licence Holder must provide a declaration to the Local Authority on demand as to the safety of furniture.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

## **7. Natural Lighting**

All habitable rooms must be provided with an area of clear glazing situated in either window and/or a door, equivalent to at least  $\frac{1}{10}$ th of the floor area of the room.

All kitchens, bathrooms and water closet compartments must comply with this requirement. Where this is not practicable, adequate artificial lighting shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of Condition 8. All glazing to windows in bathrooms and water closet compartments shall be obscure.

Underground rooms used as habitable rooms must comply with the above. Where this is not practicable, adequate artificial lighting must be provided in accordance with the requirements of Condition 8, to the satisfaction of the Local Authority.

All staircases, landings and passages must be provided with an area of clear glazing in a window. Where this is not practicable, adequate artificial lighting shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of Condition 8.

**This condition must be met within <insert compliance period>**

## **8. Artificial Lighting**

All habitable rooms, kitchens, bathrooms, water closet compartments staircases, landings and passages must be adequately lighted by electricity.

Time switches should only be allowed to common landings, passages and staircases and should stay on for an adequate time to allow a person to climb stairs and enter a room.

There should be sufficient switches to operate the artificial lighting on each landing, corridor or passage and each switch should allow adequate lengths of corridors, passages and stairways to be illuminated at the same time.

**This condition must be met within <insert compliance period>**

## **9. Heating**

The Licence Holder must provide an adequate means of space heating within each unit of living accommodation that is capable of maintaining an indoor

temperature of at least 19°C when the outside temperature is -1°C.

Heating may be by means of:

- a) Central heating;
- b) Gas heaters connected to a suitable flue or terminal outlet;
- c) Oil heaters connected to a suitable flue or terminal outlet;
- d) Electricity. Any electrical heater should be a fixed installation and connected via a fused spur for the sole use of the appliance.

The Licence Holder must not permit the use of portable paraffin or oil fired heaters and liquefied petroleum gas heaters (LPG) (Bottled Gas heaters) under any circumstances.

Portable or removable heating appliances will not be acceptable and the Licence Holder must not permit such appliances to be used.

**This condition must be met within <insert compliance period>**

## **10. Space Standards**

The Licence Holder must ensure that the numbers of households and/or persons permitted to occupy the property does not exceed the number stated on the licence. The numbers specified are subject to the minimum room sizes for the type of accommodation offered and the amenities available. The standards are set out in the Hartlepool Space Standards and Amenities document attached in Appendix B.

**This condition must be met within <insert compliance period>**

## **11. Amenities**

The Licence Holder must ensure that the house complies with the amenities standard as set out in the Space Standards and Amenities document attached in Appendix B.

**This condition must be met within six months of the date of the licence, except in relation to requirement to install wash hand basins within each unit of accommodation.**

## **12. Terms of Occupation**

The Licence Holder must supply the occupiers of the house with a written statement of terms on which they occupy it.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

### **13. Compliance with the Management Regulations**

The Licence Holder must ensure that the property is managed at all times to comply with the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (England) Regulations 2006 or any regulations that subsequently replace these and any Approved Code of Practice issued under section 233 of the Housing Act 2004.

A summary of the Regulations is attached in Appendix C.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

### **14. Management Arrangements**

The Licence Holder must ensure that any persons involved with the management of the house, including themselves, to the best of their knowledge are 'fit and proper' persons for the purpose of the Housing Act 2004. Any factors that may affect any person's involvement in the management of the house must be reported to the Local Authority in writing.

The Licence Holder must consult the Local Authority of any proposed changes to the layout, amenity provision, fire precautions or mode of occupation of the house.

The Licence Holder must notify the Local Authority immediately if a transfer of ownership or management is proposed.

The Licence Holder must ensure that a copy of the licence is displayed within the common parts of the house for the benefit of all tenants.

The Licence Holder must display within the common parts of the house his/her contact details together with those of any manager or agent appointed in connection with the running of the house.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

### **15. Property Condition**

The Licence Holder must ensure that the property is maintained in a reasonable condition and have a procedure in place to deal with reports of disrepair.

### **15. Occupation**

The Licence Holder must not permit the house to be occupied by more than the number of persons and/or households specified in the licence.

The Licence Holder must ensure that common areas, including shared living rooms, kitchens, hallways etc of the house are not used for sleeping, either by tenants or their guests.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

#### **16. Anti-social Behaviour**

The licence holder must take reasonable practical steps to prevent or where appropriate reduce, antisocial behaviour by persons occupying or visiting the house. They must also reasonably cooperate with the Local Authority over any action being taken in respect of the same.

The Licence Holder shall ensure that each occupier is made aware of any conditions imposed by the Council relating to the behaviour of occupants, and that compliance with any such conditions is made a condition of occupancy.

Those conditions are that occupants shall:-

- Not cause nuisance and annoyance to other occupants or to neighbouring residents.
- Comply with arrangements made by the manager for the storage and disposal of refuse.
- Not cause damage to fixtures, fittings, fire precautions or premises.
- Not use abusive or threatening behaviour.
- Allow access to the agents/landlord/local authority staff to maintain communal areas and with reasonable notice to carry out works/carry out inspections within the occupant's own accommodation.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

#### **17. Training**

The Licence Holder or manager must, if required by Hartlepool Borough Council, attend relevant training or otherwise demonstrate competence.

**This condition must be met with immediate effect.**

## **Fire Safety Guidance for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)**

### **Type 1- Two Storey Property**

The following guidance relates to HMOs comprising ground and first floors only, where there are no more than three occupants.

#### **Fire Safety Requirements**

1. Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) system comprising interlinked hard wired smoke detectors situated within the staircase enclosure.
2. Fire resisting lining to understairs cupboard.
3. No requirement to underdraw ceilings that are in sound condition, no requirement for fire doors, self-closers, fire fighting equipment or alarm system.

### **Type 2A –Two Storey Property**

The following guidance relates to two storey HMOs with more than 3 occupiers.

#### **Fire Safety Requirements**

1. Interlinked Automatic Fire Detection system to staircase enclosure and escape corridors to BS 5839: Part 6 to LD3 standard (D = dwellings).
2. Recommend that, in addition, independent AFD to be fitted to all bedsits/flats with approach lobby/corridor; this is battery operated smoke/heat detectors, complying with BS 5446.
3. However, if the flats are self-contained units with its own lounge/kitchen, bathroom etc and a lobby, then the lobby should have the BS 5446 detector and not each room.
4. FD30S (30 minute fire resistant doors) to all rooms that lead onto the staircase enclosure, (single door protection to staircase), kitchen may not require a fire door if a fire door exists between the kitchen and the staircase (e.g., lounge access).
5. Stairs to be underdrawn to achieve 30 minutes fire resistance.
6. Cupboards/stores to be fire resisting or permanently sealed.
7. Emergency lighting to all escape routes unless there is good borrowed street lighting.
8. No manual alarm system.

9. Fire fighting equipment - 1 x 13A extinguisher on exit route  
1 x fire blanket to each kitchen  
1 x dry powder extinguisher to each kitchen (following risk assessment).
10. Check fire alarm and emergency lighting are wired onto landlord's electrical circuit and not through a plug or key meter.

### **Type 2B – Three or Four Storey Property**

The following guidance relates to HMOs that are three or four storeys in size.

#### **Fire Safety Requirements**

1. Complete L2 automatic fire detection system throughout to British Standard 5839: Part 1. Detection to be provided to the main staircase and rooms/lobbies leading onto it, including risk rooms, e.g., kitchen closer to exit than bedroom.
2. FD30S (30 minute fire resisting doors) to staircase enclosure (single door protection).
3. Stairs underdrawn to achieve 30 minutes fire resistance.
4. Cupboards/stores permanently shut or made fire resistant.
5. Emergency Lighting to escape routes unless there is good borrowed street lighting.
6. Break glass call points to each storey exit.
7. More than 300m<sup>2</sup> floor area (BS 5839 Part 1) premises must be zoned floor by floor, less than 300m<sup>2</sup> no requirements to zone, however, a known key holder should be available.
8. If property has self contained flat units, it is considered unreasonable to require two door protection, provided an L2 system is installed, however, where access to the staircase enclosure requires the occupants to pass a risk room, i.e., kitchen/lounge, then a FD30S should be fitted to the risk rooms.
9. Fire fighting equipment 1 x 13A extinguisher on exit route  
1 x fire blanket to each kitchen  
1 x dry powder extinguisher to each kitchen following risk assessment.
10. Check fire alarm and emergency lighting are wired onto landlord's electrical circuit and not through a plug or key meter.

**Type 2C – Five or Six Storey (or greater) Property.**

Due to the complex construction of this size of property, each will need to be assessed. The guidance contained within Approved Document 'B' Fire Safety and the guide to Fire Safety Risk Assessment in Sleeping Accommodation offers an acceptable approach to achieving a reasonable standard. Guidance on such properties will be issued after consultation between the Fire Brigade and the Local Authority.

**NOTE**

Any proposals to provide alternative means of protection in the event of a fire, such as sprinkler systems will be considered after consultation between the Fire Brigade and the Local Authority.

**FIRE RISK ASSESSMENT**

The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 requires that all premises carry out a fire risk assessment and that the responsible person implements fully its findings. The fire risk assessment must be in writing where the premises are licensed or where 5 or more persons are employed to work, however, Cleveland Fire Brigade strongly recommends and advises that all fire risk assessment should be recorded or written down. If requested your completed fire risk assessment can be forwarded to Cleveland Fire Brigade for comment.

## HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL

## SPACE STANDARDS AND AMENITIES FOR HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION

## CONDITION 10 – SPACE STANDARDS

The following space standards apply to Houses in Multiple Occupation Categories A, B and D, as defined below. These standards should be used to determine the suitability of each letting for accommodation by the number of occupants.

<b>Category A</b> Bedsits/Flatlets	Houses occupied as individual rooms where there is some exclusive occupation (usually bed/living room) and some sharing of amenities (bathroom and/or toilet and/or kitchen). Each occupant lives otherwise independently of all others).
<b>Category B</b> Shared Houses	Houses occupied on a shared basis. These would normally be occupied by members of a defined social group such as students. The occupiers each have exclusive use of a bedroom but would share other facilities including a communal living space.
<b>Category D</b> Hostels, B&Bs and hotels providing long term accommodation	Houses generally referred to as 'hostels', 'guesthouses' and 'bed & breakfast hostels'. These will provide accommodation for people with no other permanent place of residence as distinct from hotels, which provide accommodation for temporary visitors to an area. This category includes establishments used by local authorities to house homeless families pending permanent placement and similar establishments which provide accommodation for people who would otherwise be homeless.

Please note that the definitions are taken from earlier guidance and Category C is no longer used.



### Category A – Bedsitting Rooms & Flatlets

The following space standards should be used as a guide for the accommodation shown. The maximum number of persons who may occupy any room or rooms, as a separate family must not exceed the numbers indicated.

#### One-person units of accommodation

One-room units: 13m<sup>2</sup> including kitchen facilities;  
10m<sup>2</sup> where provided with separate shared kitchen

Shared kitchens should provide 3m<sup>2</sup> per person using the facility.

#### Two person units of accommodation

One-room units: 20m<sup>2</sup>  
Two or more roomed units: Each kitchen - 7m<sup>2</sup>  
Each living/kitchen - 15m<sup>2</sup>  
Each living room - 12m<sup>2</sup>  
Each living/bedroom - 14m<sup>2</sup>  
Each bedroom - 10m<sup>2</sup>

These figures are based on a two-person occupancy. For occupancies of more than two persons, please refer to the Private Sector Housing Enforcement Team.

#### Measurement of Attic Rooms

When calculating the floor area of a room, any area with a floor to ceiling height of less than 1.5m is excluded from the calculation of room size.

**Category B - Shared Houses**

**One-person units of accommodation**

Each bedroom: 10m<sup>2</sup> except where a separate living room is provided which is not a kitchen or a kitchen/dining room, in which case the bedroom should be at least 6.5m<sup>2</sup>

**Two person units of accommodation**

Each bedroom: 15m<sup>2</sup> except where a separate living room is provided which is not a kitchen or a kitchen/dining room, in which case the bedroom should be at least 11m<sup>2</sup>

**Common rooms**

Kitchens:	used by 1-5 persons	7m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 6-10 persons	10m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 11-15 persons	13.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 16+ persons	16.5m <sup>2</sup>
Dining/Kitchens:	used by 1-5 persons	11.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 6-10 persons	19.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 11-15 persons	24m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 16+ persons	29m <sup>2</sup>
Living Rooms and Dining Rooms:	used by 1-5 persons	11m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 6-10 persons	16.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 11-15 persons	21.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 16+ persons	25m <sup>2</sup>

**Category D - Hostels, Bed & Breakfast Establishments and  
Hotels providing Long Term Accommodation**

**Bedrooms**

A notice should be prominently displayed in each sleeping room, in all relevant languages, setting out the maximum number permitted to sleep in the room.

Bedrooms that accommodate up to 4 members of the same household may be permitted, but in all other cases, a maximum of two persons per room will be allowed.

All bedrooms to be as follows:	used by 1 person	8.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 2 persons	11m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 3 persons	15m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 4 persons	19.5m <sup>2</sup>
	used by 5 persons	24m <sup>2</sup>

For each additional person above 5 persons there should be an additional 4.5m<sup>2</sup> of floor area.

**Living Room**

A minimum provision of 3m<sup>2</sup> per person will be required.

**Dining**

A minimum provision of 2m<sup>2</sup> per person will be required.

**Combined Living/Dining areas**

A provision of 4m<sup>2</sup> per person will be deemed to be adequate if the floor areas of lounge and dining rooms are combined.

**Kitchen**

Each occupancy should have its own kitchen separate from the sleeping room and of an area of 4m<sup>2</sup>. Where this is not practicable, each occupancy should have its own kitchen facilities within the unit of accommodation and an additional 4m<sup>2</sup> should be added to the floor area of the sleeping room.

## CONDITION 11 – AMENITIES

For all categories of Houses in Multiple Occupation the following standards will apply:

### Washing/Personal Hygiene Facilities

Where units of living accommodation do not contain bathing and toilet facilities for the exclusive use of the individual household:

and where there are four or fewer occupiers sharing those facilities

- there must be at least one bathroom with a fixed bath or shower and a toilet (which may be situated in the bathroom);

and where there are five or more occupiers sharing those facilities there must be:

- one separate toilet with wash hand basin (WHB) with appropriate splash back for every five sharing occupiers; and
- at least one bathroom (which may contain a toilet) with a fixed bath or shower for every five sharing occupiers; and

Where there are five or more occupiers of an HMO, every unit of living accommodation must contain a wash hand basin with appropriate splash back (except any unit in which a sink has been supplied to comply with the food preparation standard).

Table 1 summarises the requirements.

**Table 1 - Amenity Provisions**

Schedule of amenity provisions in relation to number of persons	
1-4 persons	At least 1 bathroom and 1 WC (the bathroom and WC may be combined) WHB not required in bedrooms
5 persons	1 WHB required in each sleeping room plus 1 bathroom AND 1 separate WC with WHB (the WC may be contained within a second bathroom)
6-10 persons	1 WHB required in each sleeping room plus 2 bathrooms AND 2 separate WCs with WHBs (one of the WCs may be contained within one of the bathrooms)
11-15 persons	1 WHB required in each sleeping room plus 3 bathrooms AND 3 separate WCs with WHBs (but two of the WCs can be contained within 2 of the bathrooms)

Each bath, shower and wash-hand basin must be provided with an adequate supply of hot and cold water. Hot water may be provided by any of the following methods:

- a) Piped from boiler and storage
- b) Immersion heater
- c) Fixed gas appliance e.g. multipoint
- d) Instantaneous electric heaters (only to wash hand basins and electric showers) having a minimum rating of 6KW.

Where there are no adequate shared washing facilities provided for a unit of living accommodation, an enclosed and adequately laid out ventilated room with a toilet, wash hand basin and bath or fixed shower supplying a constant supply of hot and cold water must be provided for the exclusive use of the occupiers of that unit either within the living accommodation, or within reasonable proximity to the living accommodation.

Bathrooms and water closets must be suitably located not more than one floor distant from sleeping accommodation.

**Facilities for Storage, Preparation and Cooking of Food - Where all or some of the units of accommodation within the HMO do not contain any facilities for the cooking of food:**

There must be a kitchen, suitably located in relation to the living accommodation, and of such layout and size and equipped with such facilities so as to enable those sharing the facilities to store, prepare and cook food. Kitchen facilities should not be more than one floor away from the sleeping accommodation unless a separate dining room is provided within one floor of the kitchen facilities.

The kitchen must be equipped with the following equipment, which must be fit for the purpose and supplied in a sufficient quantity for the number of those sharing the facilities-

**a) Sinks with draining boards**

Sinks should be provided at a ratio of one sink for 5 persons. Where 6 persons occupy a house, the provision of a double-bowled sink, or a dishwasher (in addition to a sink) may be treated as meeting this standard where the Council considers that such provision adequately meets the occupiers' needs.

Each sink must be provided with an adequate supply of hot and cold water. Hot water may be provided by any of the following methods:

- i) Piped from boiler and storage
- ii) Immersion heater
- iii) Fixed gas appliance e.g. multipoint
- iv) Instantaneous electric heaters having a minimum rating of 6kw with a 7-litre storage reservoir.

**b) Installations or equipment for the cooking of food**

Kitchens must be equipped with cookers with a minimum of 4 rings, a standard sized oven and grill, at a ratio of one per 5 persons sharing the kitchen. Where an HMO is occupied by 6 persons the provision of a cooker with more than 4 rings and more than one oven, or a combination microwave oven (in addition to a cooker with 4 rings, an oven and a grill) may be treated as meeting this standard where the Council considers such provision adequately meets the occupiers needs.

**c) Electrical sockets:**

In addition to sockets provided for appliances required by these standards, a minimum of two double sockets should be provided and located in a safe and

accessible position above worktop height. Additional sockets should be provided at a ratio of one double socket for every two persons using the kitchen to a maximum of four double sockets.

### **d) Worktops for the preparation of food;**

Worktops shall be a minimum of 500mm depth and a length of 2m per 5 persons using the kitchen, in addition to any work surface taken by an appliance, sink unit or cooker.

A suitable splash back should be provided to any work surface that abuts a wall.

All worktops should be capable of being readily cleaned and should be securely fixed.

### **e) Cupboards for the storage of food and kitchen utensils;**

Each household must be provided with an adequately sized cupboard for the storage of food and kitchen utensils, having a capacity of not less than 0.3m<sup>3</sup>. This may be located either in the kitchen or unit of accommodation. Cupboards sited in the kitchen should be lockable. The space located below the sink should not be treated as a food cupboard for the purpose of this standard ventilated or otherwise.

### **f) Refrigerators with an adequate freezer compartment (or, where the freezer compartment is not adequate, separate freezers);**

A refrigerator of sufficient capacity to meet the reasonable needs of the users should be provided.

### **g) Appropriate refuse disposal facilities**

Suitable receptacles must be provided for the proper collection of refuse within the kitchen.

## **NOTE**

Where all meals are provided by the landlord, some self-catering facilities will need to be provided. The Council will consider the circumstances of the case and decide the self-catering services that are required to adequately meet the occupier's needs.

**Facilities for Storage, Preparation and Cooking of Food -**

**Units of living accommodation with exclusive use of amenities**

Where a unit of living accommodation contains kitchen facilities for the exclusive use of the individual household, and there are no other kitchen facilities available for that household, that unit must be provided with:

**a) Adequate appliances and equipment for the cooking of food**

The minimum requirement is two rings/hot plates together with a minimum of 28 litre oven and grill.

For occupancies of two persons the requirement is three rings/hot plates together with a minimum of 28 litre oven and grill.

For occupancies of three or more persons a full size cooker is required.

**b) A sink with an adequate supply of cold and constant hot water**

- i) Hot water may be provided by any of the following methods:
- ii) Piped from boiler and storage
- iii) Immersion heater
- iv) Fixed gas appliance e.g. multipoint
- v) Instantaneous electric heaters having a minimum rating of 6kw with a 7 litre storage reservoir.

**c) A work top for the preparation of food**

A suitable work surface a minimum of 0.5m deep and a length of 0.5m plus 0.5m per person using the facility shall be provided.

**d) Sufficient electrical sockets**

In addition to sockets provided for appliances required by these standards, a minimum of two double sockets should be provided and located in a safe and accessible position above worktop height. Additional sockets should be provided at a ratio of one double socket for every two persons using the kitchen to a maximum of four double sockets.

**e) A cupboard for the storage of food and kitchen utensils**

An adequately sized cupboard for the storage of food and kitchen utensils should be provided. The space located below the sink should not be treated as a food cupboard for the purpose of this standard.

**f) A refrigerator**

An adequately sized refrigerator with freezer compartment should be provided.



**THE MANAGEMENT OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (ENGLAND)**  
**REGULATIONS 2006 – SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS**

If the licence holder is also the manager of the property, he/she will be required to comply with the requirements of Regulations 3 to 9 of the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (England) Regulations 2006 (*Statutory Instrument 2006 No. 372*). If the licence holder is not also the manager of the property, then the licence holder will be required to ensure that the manager complies with the requirements of the Regulations.

In addition to the requirements of the Regulations, the licence holder will be required to comply with certain additional requirements relating to licensable HMOs.

The following is a brief summary of the Regulations, together with the additional management responsibilities of the licence holder.

**Regulation 3**

- The manager must provide the occupiers with details of his/her name, address and contact telephone number and must display such details in a prominent position within the HMO.

**Regulation 4**

- The manager must ensure that the property has a safe design and construction.
- The manager must also ensure that any means of escape from fire are maintained and free from obstructions, that all fire precautions are maintained, and that any fire notices are clearly visible.
- **In addition**, the licence holder will **also** be required to ensure that means of escape and fire precautions are maintained, and that electricity supplies to automatic fire detection and emergency lighting systems are not disconnected or threatened with disconnection due to non-payment of monies owed to the relevant statutory undertaker.
- The licence holder will also be required to provide to the Council copies of annual inspection and test certificates for automatic fire detection systems, and for emergency lighting systems, where provided.

**Regulation 5**

- The manager must maintain the water supply and drainage system to the property.
- The manager must also ensure that there is no unreasonable interruption to the water supply or drainage.

### Regulation 6

- If requested by the Council, the manager must supply, within 7 days, the latest gas safety inspection certificate for the property as carried out by a CORGI registered engineer.
- The manager must ensure that the property's electrical installation is inspected and tested at least every five years, and that, if requested, the latest inspection certificate is supplied to the Council within 7 days.
- The manager must also ensure that there is no unreasonable interruption to the gas or electricity supplies used by any occupier.
- **In addition**, the licence holder will be required to ensure that gas or electricity supplies to common parts or shared amenities are on landlords supplies via quarterly credit meters and that they are not disconnected or threatened with disconnection due to non-payment of monies owed to the relevant statutory undertaker.
- Similarly, where rents are inclusive of gas or electricity the licence holder will be required to ensure that gas or electricity supplies to units of accommodation are not disconnected or threatened with disconnection due to non-payment of monies owed to the relevant statutory undertaker.
- The licence holder will be required to ensure that any remedial works identified following inspections of gas and electrical installations and appliances are carried out within a reasonable time period.
- The licence holder will also be required to provide to the Council copies of annual gas safety inspection certificates.

### Regulation 7

- The manager must ensure that all common parts, fixtures fittings and appliances are well maintained.
- The manager must also ensure that outbuildings, yards, gardens, and boundary walls, fences and railings are well maintained and safe.

### Regulation 8

- The manager must ensure that units of accommodation and any furniture supplied are clean and in good repair at the commencement of a tenancy, and that any fixtures, fittings or appliances within the letting are clean and in good working order.

### Regulation 9

- The manager must ensure that a sufficient number of rubbish bins are provided for the occupiers, and that, where necessary, arrangements are made for the disposal of refuse and litter.

NB: If you require full details of the Regulations you can obtain a copy from Stationery Office Ltd or on-line at: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si200603.htm>

## **REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holder  
20<sup>th</sup> October 2006



**Report of:** Head of Community Strategy

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND (NRF)  
PROGRAMME 2006-07 MID YEAR UPDATE

---

### **SUMMARY**

#### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to notify the Portfolio Holder of the NRF spend at the mid-point of 2006/07 financial year.

#### **2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

The report sets out the current spend position of the current years NRF programme.

#### **3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

Neighbourhood Renewal is within the remit of the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio.

#### **4.0 TYPE OF DECISION**

Item for Information Only

#### **5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holder

#### **6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the 2006/07 NRF Mid-Year financial position.

**Report of:** Head of Community Strategy

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND (NRF)  
PROGRAMME 2006-07 MID YEAR UPDATE

---

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to notify the Portfolio Holder of the NRF spend at the mid-point of 2006/07 financial year. A copy of this report is enclosed as **Appendix 1**.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The overall NRF allocation for 2006/07 is £4,849,210. This includes the carry over from 2005/06 of less than 1%. Government will require a carry over into 2007/08 of no more than 5% of this years allocation.

**3. NEIGHBOURHOOD ELEMENT PRIORITIES**

- 3.1 The NRF spend to the end of September 2006 is £1,283,849. This is 26.5% of the overall budget and is generally in line with the mid-year NRF spend position in previous years. At the mid point of the previous financial year 27.7% of the total budget had been spent and the eventual overall carry over was minimal.

**4. PROGRAMME PROJECTIONS**

- 4.1 Discussions have been held with key project leads and at the moment no major problems are anticipated regarding NRF Programme delivery.
- 4.2 The Health & Care Strategy Group met earlier in September and agreed a course of action should approved projects begin to predict an underspend.
- 4.3 Financial monitoring will continue to be undertaken on a monthly basis and further NRF progress reports will be brought back to the Portfolio Holder towards the end of 2006/07.

**5. RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the 2006/07 NRF Mid-Year financial position.

APPENDIX 1 Project	Budget 2006/07	Qtr 2 Spend
<b>Education</b>	<b>£495,000</b>	
Primary/ Secondary Schools	£396,000	£109,218
General Projects (Project Coordination, Education Business Links, Contingency, New Initiatives)	£99,000	£24,842
	<b>£495,000</b>	<b>£134,060</b>
<b>Community Safety</b>	<b>£1,238,417</b>	
Community Safety Small Grants Fund	£10,000	£2,500
ASB Officer & Analyst	£66,100	£18,793
Env't. Enforcement Wardens	£150,000	£81,850
Safer Streets & Homes	£180,000	£20,342
Streetlighting	£44,000	£144
Dordrecht Prolific Offenders Scheme	£105,000	£1,596
NRF Project Assistant	£22,500	£13,144
COOL Project	£61,600	£43,300
FAST*	£187,668	£235,972
Burglary Prevention - Endeavour HIA*	£58,104	£1,611
Landlord Accreditation Scheme	£10,000	£9,710
LIFE - Fire Brigade	£33,000	£0
ADDvance	£22,947	£11,462
PINS	£23,040	£0
Neighbourhood Policing	£273,000	£0
	<b>£1,246,959</b>	<b>£440,424.00</b>
<b>Jobs &amp; Economy</b>	<b>£1,214,884</b>	
Targeted Training	£50,956	£0
Women's Opportunities	£37,454	£56
Jobs Build	£77,792	£1,310
Workroute ILM	£137,000	£100
Hartlepool Worksmart - Improving the employment offer	£44,000	£952
Enhancing Employability	£28,000	£0
Progression to Work - assisting local people into work	£97,000	£314
Volunteering Into Employment	£76,334	£4,633
Incubation Systems and Business Skills Training	£175,000	£42,940
Business & Tourism Marketing	£24,456	£0
OFCa Social Enterprise Support - Community Employment Outreach	£150,000	£25,000
Homelessness Project	£70,000	£7,642
Carers into Training & Education	£10,000	£23,991
Owton Manor West NWRA	£35,000	£8,750
West View Project	£30,000	£15,000
RESPECT	£6,892	£3,446
Grange Road Methodist Church	£30,000	£15,000
HVDA Business Development Project	£15,000	£0
BEC Carry over / BEC additional budget	£120,000	£343,352

	<b>£1,214,884</b>	<b>£492,486</b>
<b>Lifelong Learning</b>	<b>£215,000</b>	
Active Skills - West View Project	£25,000	£12,500
Hartlepool Deaf Centre	£30,000	£10,000
Career Coaching - HVDA	£32,000	£10,667
Level 3 Progression - HCFE	£79,000	£0
Hartlepool "On Track" Project	£45,000	£0
Administration of LLP	£4,000	£3,404
	<b>£215,000</b>	<b>£36,571</b>
<b>Management &amp; Consultancy</b>	<b>£145,231</b>	
Management & Consultancy	£ 66,364	£638
Neighbourhood Renewal Officer	£ 36,867	£18,589
Skills & Knowledge	£ 2,000	£40
NAP Development	£ 40,000	£0
	<b>£ 145,231</b>	<b>£19,267</b>
<b>Health</b>	<b>£925,000</b>	
Occupational Care for Kids - Dyke House	£40,000	£8,175
Owton Rossmere Health Development Worker	£40,000	£9,201
Mental Health Development Project	£62,906	£31,453
Mobile Maintenance Worker*	£20,022	£5,000
Belle Vue Sports Project	£39,000	£19,500
Smoking Issues	£72,500	£15,267
Early Implementation of Integrated Care Teams	£25,000	£0
Cardiac Rehabilitation through Exercise	£25,000	£0
Connected Care/Health Trainers	£117,250	£0
Anchor Trust Community Development	£31,154	£15,577
Alzheimers Day Service	£61,920	£30,960
Hartlepool Carers	£20,600	£10,300
Reducing Childhood Obesity...	£109,700	£0
MIND Manager & NDC Support Network	£47,000	£23,500
Mental Health Carers Support	£20,782	£10,391
TNEY/MIND Common Mental Health Needs	£41,000	£21,474
Discharge Planning Post	£30,000	£0
VCS Core Costs	£121,166	£96,933
	<b>£925,000</b>	<b>£297,731</b>
<b>Housing</b>	<b>£128,000</b>	
Housing Market Renewal Support for Scheme Delivery	£128,000	£0.0

	<b>£128,000</b>	<b>£0.0</b>
<b>Environment</b>	<b>£120,000</b>	
Environment Team	£100,000	£31,143
Environmental Education	£23,731	£0
	<b>£123,731</b>	<b>£31,143</b>
<b>NAP Priorities</b>	<b>£363,947</b>	
North Hartlepool NAP	£153,000	£0
Dyke House NAP	£65,339	£0
Burbank NAP	£23,000	£11,111
Rift House/Burn Valley NAP	£50,883	£4,970
Owton NAP	£51,176	£18,672
Rossmere NAP	£20,549	£20,766
	<b>£363,947</b>	<b>£55,519</b>

\* FAST Project showing an overspend - currently being reviewed



## **REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY & HOUSING PORTFOLIO**

Report To Portfolio Holder  
20<sup>th</sup> October 2006



**Report of:** Head of Community Strategy

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD ELEMENT FUND 2006-10

---

### **SUMMARY**

#### **1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to inform the Portfolio Holder of progress made in developing the Neighbourhood Element programme in Hartlepool during 2006/07.

#### **2.0 SUMMARY OF CONTENTS**

The report sets out the current financial spend at the mid-point of 2006/07 and the progress against the priorities for Neighbourhood Element chosen by each qualifying neighbourhood.

#### **3.0 RELEVANCE TO PORTFOLIO MEMBER**

Neighbourhood Renewal is within the remit of the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio.

#### **4.0 TYPE OF DECISION**

Item for Information Only

#### **5.0 DECISION MAKING ROUTE**

Portfolio Holder

## **6.0 DECISION(S) REQUIRED**

The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the progress made in developing the Neighbourhood Element programme in Hartlepool during 2006/07.

**Report of:** Head of Community Strategy

**Subject:** NEIGHBOURHOOD ELEMENT FUND 2006-10

---

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Portfolio Holder of progress made in developing the Neighbourhood Element programme in Hartlepool during 2006/07.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 In summer 2005 it was announced that Hartlepool was eligible for the new Neighbourhood Element Fund. The Neighbourhood Element provides new funding to help action in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods to improve outcomes for people living in these areas. In particular this funding will be targeted at the following LAA outcome: “to improve the quality of life for people living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods and to ensure that service providers are more responsive to neighbourhood needs and improve their delivery”.
- 2.2 In total Hartlepool will receive £1,599,600 over 4 years. Years 3 and 4 (2008-10) are subject to confirmation in the 2007 Spending Review.
- 2.3 The Portfolio Holder has previously agreed that the funding be focussed on the four qualifying NAP neighbourhoods of North Hartlepool (Brus, St Hilda Wards), Dyke House/Stranton/Grange, Burbank and Owton.

**3. NEIGHBOURHOOD ELEMENT PRIORITIES**

- 3.1 The Burbank Forum have taken the decision to focus their Neighbourhood Element funding on tackling health issues in Burbank. After discussions with the PCT it has been agreed that funding will be used to provide a nurse led drop in clinic two afternoons per week. The drop in clinic will be staffed by members of the Central Integrated Team who will provide services including wound care, prescribing, advice on health needs, health promotion and signposting to other services and agencies. Initially the focus of the service will be on the elderly population in the area.

- 3.2 The Dyke House/Stranton/Grange Consultative Group have decided that improving Community Safety is their priority. A shortlist of priorities has been developed, linked in with the new NAP in that neighbourhood.
- 3.3 The Owton Forum agreed that Strengthening Communities be the priority for Neighbourhood Element supporting the Connected Care approach to improving their neighbourhood, and given the work already undertaken through the Connected Care Community Audit this seems potentially an exciting way to use Neighbourhood Element in the Owton neighbourhood.
- 3.4 The Connected Care Model is designed to provide an interlocking, bespoke range of services, which directly reflect and respond to the specific needs of the individuals and communities they serve. Connected Care is about offering universal support on health and care as well as advice on housing, education, employment and benefits. The Owton Forum have agreed that a range of local organisations take responsibility for leading on particular themes and are responsible to the local NAP Forum for reporting back to the local community on a quarterly basis on progress on implementing the NAP.
- 3.5 The North Hartlepool NAP (Brus & St Hilda) was agreed earlier in 2006 and work has been progressing on prioritising Neighbourhood Element and NRF Residents Priorities Fund. At the Hartlepool Partnership meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2006 it was agreed that the three sub-areas (Central Estate, Headland, West View /King Oswy) area be allocated a proportion of the Neighbourhood Element to prioritise on one particular theme. Central Estate and West View /King Oswy have prioritised Community Safety whilst the Headland has prioritised Strengthening Communities.

#### **4. COMMUNITY COORDINATION**

- 4.1 The Hartlepool Partnership agreed to allocate £80,000 per annum of the Neighbourhood Element Funding towards Community Coordination, given the lessons learnt from successful local pilot projects such as the Priority Policing Project and the Community Coordinator post funded through NRF.
- 4.2 This year it is estimated that around £60,000 of the £80,000 available will be spent on Community Coordination, through an extension to NRF Community Coordination Officer Role focussing upon the Community Safety issues particularly in Dyke House/Stranton/Grange. Funding is also being used to pay for SRB Officer time in North Hartlepool (Brus & St Hilda) to develop a cohesive Neighbourhood Element programme in that neighbourhood.

- 4.3 The NAP Review 2006 has highlighted that there is still a need to support capacity building in NAP areas, and there are recommendations made in the NAP Review 2006 to take this forward. It is suggested within the NAP Review 2006 that during 2006/07 £20,000 be used to support the implementation of capacity building recommendations.

## **5. MID-YEAR SPEND**

- 5.1 While only £46,025 of the 2006/07 allocation of £412,800 has been spent It is expected that the majority of Neighbourhood Element expenditure will be incurred in the latter part of the 2006/07 financial year. This is because of the time taken to agree priorities by NAP Forums and subsequent implementation.
- 5.2 It is expected that full spend will be achieved. Monthly monitoring meetings will be held with project officers to track progress. A further update will be provided to the Portfolio Holder later this year on programme spend.

## **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The Neighbourhood Element presents an opportunity to build upon and strengthen the neighbourhood based approach to regeneration of the NAP areas. The funding set aside for Community Coordination takes into account the additional tasks involved by officers in delivering the Neighbourhood Element programme to 2010.

## **7. RECOMMENDATION**

- 7.1 The Portfolio Holder is requested to note the progress made in developing the Neighbourhood Element programme in Hartlepool during 2006/07.