

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Monday 13th November 2006

at 2.00 pm

**in Main Hall, Owton Manor Community Centre,
Wynyard Road, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors R W Cook, S Cook, Gibbon, Laffey, London, A Marshall, J Marshall,
Richardson, Wallace, D Waller and Wright.

Resident Representatives:

Ted Jackson, John Lynch and Iris Ryder

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**
- 4. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No items.

No items.

PLEASE NOTE VENUE

5. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

- 5.1 Regeneration and Planning Services Department: Budget and Policy Framework Initial Consultation Proposals 2007/08 – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

No items.

7. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

FOR INFORMATION

Date of Next Meeting – Thursday 7th December 2006 commencing at 10.00am in Training Room 3, Municipal Buildings, Church Square.

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

13 November 2006



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES
DEPARTMENT: BUDGET AND POLICY
FRAMEWORK INITIAL CONSULTATION
PROPOSALS 2007/08

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide the opportunity for the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum to consider the Regeneration and Planning Services departmental pressures and priorities, grant terminations and proposed savings as part of the Budget and Policy Framework initial consultation proposals for 2007/08.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 At a meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 27 October 2006, consideration was given to the Executive's Initial Budget and Policy Framework consultation proposals for 2007/08.
- 2.2 At this meeting it was agreed that the initial consultation proposals be considered on a departmental basis by the appropriate Scrutiny Forum. Any comments / observations would then be fed back to the additional meeting of the SCC to be held on 17 November 2006 to enable a formal response to be presented to the Cabinet on 4 December 2006.
- 2.3 As such attached as **Appendices A to D** are the Regeneration and Planning Services departmental pressures and priorities, grant terminations and proposed savings as part of the Budget and Policy Framework initial consultation proposals for 2007/08.
- 2.4 To assist Members of this Scrutiny Forum in the consideration of the Regeneration and Planning Services departmental initial proposals, arrangements have been made for the Director of Regeneration Services to

be in attendance and an invitation to this meeting has also been extended to the relevant Portfolio Holder (attendance subject to availability).

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 It is recommended that the Regeneration Services Scrutiny Forum:-

- (a) considers the Regeneration Services departmental pressures and priorities, grant terminations and proposed savings as part of the Budget and Policy Framework initial consultation proposals for 2007/08; and
- (b) formulates any comments and observations to be presented by the Chair of this Scrutiny Forum to the additional meeting of the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee to be held on 17 November 2006 to enable a formal response to be presented to the Cabinet on 4 December 2006.

Contact Officer:- Jonathan Wistow – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: jonathan.wistow@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE OF GRANT REGIMES TERMINATING DURING 2006/2007

Grant Title	Does Council need to consider mainstreaming the grant? Please state Yes/No and provide brief justification.	Value of Grant in 2006/2007 £'000	Value of 2006/2007 Grant spent of staff costs (include NI and Pension) £'000	Number of staff funded from Grant FTE's	Number of staff on fixed term contract FTE's	Estimated cost of making staff redundant £'000	Funding available to fund redundancy costs £'000
<p>Single Programme Funding (Coastal Arc Co-ordinator).</p> <p><i>Joint post shared with Redcar & Cleveland. HBC is the employing authority.</i></p>	<p>YES – desirable as provides coordination and basis for Coastal Arc – and for sub-regional single programme funding. Subject to 50% contribution from Redcar and Cleveland.</p> <p>100% Single Programme funding is confirmed for 2006/7. In principle support for 2007/8 subject to funding availability. Situation unclear thereafter.</p>	17	34 (plus other revenue expenditure, excluding oncost). 50% relates to HBC.	0.5 (within Hartlepool)	0.5 (within Hartlepool)	Presumably minimal as employment length would be less than 2 years	nil

APPENDIX A

Grant Title	Does Council need to consider mainstreaming the grant? Please state Yes/No and provide brief justification.	Value of Grant in 2006/2007 £'000	Value of 2006/2007 Grant spent of staff costs (include NI and Pension) £'000	Number of staff funded from Grant FTE's	Number of staff on fixed term contract FTE's	Estimated cost of making staff redundant £'000	Funding available to fund redundancy costs £'000
Safer Stronger Communities Fund	Yes –post created is essential to the team. The ASB unit did not function as effectively prior to support officer being appointed. Members complained they were unable to contact staff in the unit.	25	17.4	1	1	Nil to date (only 1 years service)	nil
Total Grant Regimes Terminating		46					

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE OF BUDGET PRESSURES 2007/2008

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Pressure	Risk Impact of Not Funding Pressure	Value Budget Pressure <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Pressure in 2008/2009 (only complete this column if value shown in 2007/2008 column is part year pressure) <u>£'000</u>
Planning Policy & Regeneration: Local Development Framework	Increased costs arising in relation to the statutory Local Development Framework within Planning have so far been funded entirely from a reserve. This reserve is residual balance of an amount set aside for the Local Plan Inquiry. This is expected to be exhausted in 2007/08 and a more permanent funding solution is required.	Red Failure to establish funding would prejudice the council's ability to fulfil its statutory duty. An adverse effect on development and improvement of the town may occur. The ability to properly involve local people in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement would reduce.	50	
Housing Advice (Statutory)	Provide statutory homeless advice to vulnerable people in the community. Team relatively under- resourced and 1.5 posts are required.	Red Essential to ensure that targets for preventing homelessness are maintained.	40	
Special Needs Housing Team	<u>Statutory duty to ensure advice and assistance and provide grants for Disabled.</u> Funding from SP reduces from March 2007. This was funded through SP on stock transfer as insufficient money was	Red Statutory function of administering Disabled Facilities Grants and other functions of special needs housing will be put at risk. Grants will not be processed in reasonable time, waiting lists for disabled	40	

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE OF BUDGET PRESSURES 2007/2008

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Pressure	Risk Impact of Not Funding Pressure	Value Budget Pressure <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Pressure in 2008/2009 (only complete this column if value shown in 2007/2008 column is part year pressure) <u>£'000</u>
	identified for the team. However, following the completion of review of all SP contracts, much of the work relating to the statutory functions, such as processing disabled facilities grants, is now ineligible for SP funding	adaptations will increase, hospital discharge times will increase, underspend of grant funding will result in future grants being reduced, and disabled accommodation will not be adequately allocated		
Strategic Housing Officers	Due to inadequate funding of retained housing services following stock transfer and the loss of a housing specialist at Director level, current workloads cannot be sustained. Since stock transfer, workloads have increased e.g. preparation of bidding and monitoring documents for new housing capital regimes, performance management monitoring of partnership, increased social and private housing enabling role (encouragement for new build due to needs highlighted by SP and reduction in social	Red Further delays in workload completion, including responses to complaints, completion of returns Inadequate contribution to sub regional issues Missed opportunities for further funding These posts are likely to form part of the report on the future of housing services prepared by the Director of Regeneration and Planning	30	

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE OF BUDGET PRESSURES 2007/2008

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Pressure	Risk Impact of Not Funding Pressure	Value Budget Pressure <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Pressure in 2008/2009 (only complete this column if value shown in 2007/2008 column is part year pressure) <u>£'000</u>
	houses numbers), the increasing regional and sub-regional housing agenda (regeneration strategy and sub-regional housing strategy), increased role in regeneration of houses in town centre etc. Current Strategic Housing Manager role is divided between substantial strategic duties as indicated above, and daily management of housing team. This has resulted in substantial slippage.			
Choice Based Lettings (Statutory)	New statutory obligation to provide system of choice for lettings	Red New statutory obligation to have in place and operating. This assumes a sub regional system with shared costs	27	

SCHEDULE OF BUDGET PRESSURES 2007/2008

[illegible]

APPENDIX C

SCHEDULE OF RED BUDGET PRIORITIES 2007/2008
TOP LEVEL PRIORITIES

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Priorities	Risk Impact of Not Funding Priorities	Priorities Value Budget Priorities <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Priorities in 2008/2009 <u>£'000</u>
Anti Social Behaviour Unit: Respect Agenda	Additional resources are required to implement and effectively respond to the Government's new Respect Agenda. In particular, the following will need to be addressed particularly in disadvantaged communities: Increase capacity of Anti Social Behaviour case investigators to 1 per North/South/Central neighbourhood areas and admin support in order to co-ordinate increased workload from Neighbourhood policing referrals etc. and provide feedback to residents. A review of aspects of this service is underway.	RED - Unable to meet demands from residents, Members and MPs to tackle anti social behaviour which are increasing with the introduction of Neighbourhood Policing.	65	

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Priorities	Risk Impact of Not Funding Priorities	Priorities Value Budget Priorities <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Priorities in 2008/2009 <u>£'000</u>
Housing	Tenant referencing scheme, linked to voluntary accreditation scheme and licensing scheme	RED - Risk of continuing to place unsuitable tenants in disadvantaged areas where significant numbers of privately rented accommodation units exist	40	
		Total of Top Priorities	105	

SCHEDULE OF RED BUDGET PRIORITIES 2007/2008
SECOND LEVEL PRIORITIES

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Priorities	Risk Impact of Not Funding Priorities	Priorities Value Budget Priorities <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Priorities in 2008/2009 <u>£'000</u>
Landlord Registration Officer (LRO)	This is a successful scheme currently being funded until March 2007 by VAT Shelter money (HH) (previously funded via NRF and NDC). The Landlord Registration Officer works in partnership with Housing Enforcement Team, Tenancy Relations Officer and Anti-Social Behaviour Team. Seen as 'good practice' and is included in Audit Commissions Key Lines of Enquiry for Excellent Authorities. The success of this post resulted in Hartlepool being selected to run the pilot scheme for low demand private sector housing, which contributed to the Government's approach to Licensing.	Red Increased tenancy problems e.g. anti-social behaviour in private housing section. Reduced housing standards in private rented accommodation. Increased homelessness – potentially homeless people are currently signposted to suitable accredited landlords Seen as backward step by GONE	28	

Budget Heading	Description of Budget Priorities	Risk Impact of Not Funding Priorities	Priorities Value Budget Priorities <u>2007/2008</u> <u>£'000</u>	Value of additional Budget Priorities in 2008/2009 <u>£'000</u>
	Should a licensing scheme for landlords be introduced (which is area specific), the accreditation scheme would compliment the licensing scheme and also be the only town-wide scheme for landlords			
		Total of Second Priorities	28	

PROPOSED SAVING AT 3%, 4% AND 5%

APPENDIX D

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES

Budget Heading	Description of Efficiency/Saving	Risk Assessment of implementing efficiency/saving	Impact of efficiency/saving on staffing levels	Value of efficiency/saving £'000	Description of One off cost efficiency/saving	One off cost of achieving efficiency/saving £'000
Youth Offending Service	E - Reduce operational support budgets for Youth Offending is proposed	GREEN RISK - It is suggested that this could be achieved with little risk and only minimal impact to the service	None	4		
Management and Administration	E - Reduce costs against some departmental management and administrative related budget headings.	GREEN RISK - It is anticipated that this saving could be achieved at low risk by ensuring a number of small expenses - currently absorbed within this heading but which could be legitimately charged to externally funded projects - are passed on. Increased effort would be required to record, calculate and transfer these costs	None	10		
Community Strategy	S - Reduce a variety of budget lines across the Division relating to printing, room hire, staff training and exhibitions	GREEN RISK - A reduction in opportunities to promote the work of the Hartlepool Partnership would occur. Direct impact on quality of services and impact on community engagement and awareness	None	4		
Planning & Economic Development	S - Reduce running cost budgets for Building Control, Development Control, Economic Development and Landscape Planning and Conservation is suggested	GREEN RISK - Various small scale savings in materials, equipment, printing etc would be made which may result in service level reduction	None	8		
Economic Development	E - Seek to increase income from managed workspace (ie Brougham Enterprise Centre Newburn Bridge)	GREEN RISK - Increasing licence fee income as a result of improvements to premises, increasing occupancy and reviewed fees should be achievable	None	20		
Community Safety	S - Reduce several administration and maintenance headings in the Community Safety budget	AMBER/GREEN RISK - Small reductions to Safer Hartlepool Partnership support budgets would lead to less printing (eg leaflets) and less awareness raising campaigns. The assurance to communities would be reduced affecting perceptions and fear of crime. Less budget for maintenance of 8 Church St and local police offices would also occur	None	9		

Planning Policy & Regeneration	S - Reduce a variety of budget lines across the Regeneration, Planning Policy and Housing Market Renewal Teams (approx £2k per team)	AMBER/GREEN RISK - Reducing printing, copying, staff training, administration and other running costs would occur. The amount shown is considered to be the maximum achievable without incurring serious service level reductions	None	6		
Economic Development	S - Reduce the Sub-Regional Tourism promotion budget	AMBER RISK - Reducing the contribution to Tees Valley-wide tourism marketing and promotion may limit the new Area Tourism Partnership's marketing activity	None	5		
Economic Development	S - Reduce the Marketing budget	RED RISK - This move would impact on marketing/promotion aimed at businesses/developers/ other investors, at a time where there is an improving "product" to sell. Adverse impact on economic investment and employment opportunities	None	10		
Community Safety	S - Reduce the Safer Hartlepool Partnership publicity budget	RED RISK - Only two editions of current quarterly newspaper (Hartbeat) could be produced per annum instead of 4 editions. Factual information and advice are important to provide reassurance to communities. Less funding would be available to publicise good news stories. Direct impact on services and fear of crime	None	13		
Development Control	E - Seek to increase fee income from volume of applications processed, with no increase in staff	RED RISK - The proposal would be to revise the planning application fee target based on high end projections from current levels. This is however a budget that could be subject to a fall in income, eg. as a result of unfavourable economic conditions. Given the economic and property cycle, a significant risk would apply to the achievement of this savings target. If there were to be a shortfall it has been agreed that this would be met corporately.	None	18		
3% LEVEL				107		
Development Control	E - Seek to increase fee income from volume of applications processed, with no increase in staff (Continued)	RED RISK - As above - higher risks as higher targets		12		
Economic Development	S - Reduce the Business Grants budget	RED RISK - This reduction would impact on support available to new businesses and inward investment. An element of match funding would also potentially be lost. This would be unpopular with Partners and contrary to DCLG/NRU and Hartlepool Partnership policy priorities and could adversely affect future funding bids, eg LEGI	None	20		
Departmental Staffing - yet to be identified	S - Reduce Staffing budgets	See below		4		

4% LEVEL				143		
Departmental Staffing - yet to be identified	S - Reduce Staffing budgets (Continued)	RED RISK - The removal of up to 2 posts would be required to achieve a 5% saving target. This would involve either redundancy or removing newly vacated post(s) from the establishment. No specific posts are identified as yet. Redundancy Implications.	-2 depending on grade	36	Redundancy or other costs may arise depending on the post(s) identified- which are not quantified or allowed for in the savings	0
5% LEVEL				179		