

# CABINET

## MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

5 March 2007

The meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m.  
In the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### Present:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond - In the Chair

Councillors: Cath Hill (Deputy Mayor),  
Robbie Payne (Finance Portfolio Holder),  
Peter Jackson (Performance Management Portfolio Holder),  
Victor Tumilty (Culture, Leisure and Transportation Portfolio Holder),  
Ray Waller (Adult and Public Health Services Portfolio Holder).

Also Present: Councillor Steve Wallace, Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum.

Officers: Adrienne Simcock, Director of Children's Services  
Nicola Bailey, Director of Adult and Community Services  
Peter Scott, Director of Regeneration and Planning Services  
Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services  
Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety and Prevention  
Tony Brown, Chief Solicitor  
Joanne Machers, Chief Personnel Officer  
Peter Turner, Principal Strategy Development Officer  
Philip Hepburn, Parking Services Manager  
Steve Hilton, Assistant Public Relations Officer  
Jonathan Wistow, Scrutiny Support Officer  
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

### 191. Apologies for Absence

Councillor Pam Hargreaves, Children's Services Portfolio Holder.

### 192. Declarations of interest by members

None.

**193. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2007.**

Confirmed.

**194. Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy 2007/08** (*Head of Community Safety and Prevention*)

**Type of decision**

Key – Test ii applies

**Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Strategy 2007/08.

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

The Mayor reported that the draft Strategy, which was attached as an Appendix to the report, identified the different types of ASB, the scale of the problems in Hartlepool, what we are currently doing to tackle the problem areas and what more needs to be done. Actions will focus on ASB associated with:

- People using or dealing drugs
- Groups hanging around, causing a nuisance
- Drunk or rowdy behaviour
- Noise/late night disturbances

A key element of the strategy will be to promote tolerance and reassure residents. It was suggested that the reference to groups hanging around should be qualified to exclude those whose behaviour was not anti-social.

The Mayor indicated that he would be seeking through the Safer Hartlepool Partnership to call the document the “Social Behaviour Strategy”. The Mayor wished to give the strategy a more positive angle by setting acceptable behaviour standards that could be promoted rather than identifying negative behaviour where action would be taken.

**Decision**

That the Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy 2007/08 be approved.

## **195. Introduction of “On-Street” Pay and Display and Permit Parking Restrictions** *(Director of Neighbourhood Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-Key

### **Purpose of report**

To report to Cabinet on a proposal to create permit and pay and display parking zones in an area of mainly unregulated highway between Church Street and Huckelhoven Way.

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

The Director of Neighbourhood Services reported that most of the controlled business user and commuter bays are located to the west of Stockton Road and although some parking controls and parking provisions are available, a large area of land to the east of Stockton Road is currently being utilised by commuters, as it is both unregulated and free of charge. The area of predominantly “on-street parking” is popular with commuters as it is close to offices and Hartlepool College of Further Education. The lack of space does however lead to inconsiderate parking, obstruction of junctions and damage to footpaths and grass verges, as motorists seek to utilise the free unrestricted available parking spaces. The imminent closure of the Royal Vaults site (as part of the new interchange site ) and the likely displacement of HBC staff from the Lynne Street Depot (once staff parking charges are introduced) may see an estimated increase of an additional 170 vehicles into the area and controlled parking measures will be required to manage the situation.

It was proposed to establish a business permit controlled zone in Scarborough Street (between Church Street and Exeter Street) accommodating some 20 vehicles. It was also intended to introduce a long stay pay and display zone of some 107 spaces which would be broken down by the following street locations:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Whitby Street (between Church Street and Surtees Street)      | 15 spaces  |
| Scarborough Street (between Exeter Street and Surtees Street) | 16 spaces  |
| Surtees Street (between Tower Street and Whitby Street)       | 25 spaces  |
| Tower Street  | 38 spaces  |
| Brunswick Street  | 13 spaces  |
|   | 107 spaces |

Surveys indicate a limited vehicle turnover within this location and it was therefore unreasonable to expect the current town centre long stay £2 parking charge to apply within the new proposed site. However, a £1 all day charge was not unreasonable to reflect parking in the area. It was proposed that a number of the bays should allow a season ticket for

commuter parking which would be available at a discounted rate. It was proposed that such a permit be offered at a rate of £150 per year. This would apply at the following locations:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Surtees Street (east of Whitby Street)  | 58 bays |
| Lynn Street                             | 23 bays |
| Reed Street                             | 33 bays |
| Hope Street                             | 11 bays |
| Whitby Street (south of Surtees Street) | 12 bays |
| Maritime Experience                     | 50 bays |

In addition it was proposed to create a further pay and display zone on Church Street (17 spaces). Unlike the commuter space parking proposal, this site would need to discourage long term parking which reflects the current limited waiting restrictions. Pay and display would maintain the high turnover of short stay customer parking provision and should enhance the current traffic management, yet prove easier to enforce with better use of existing manpower. Details of the costs of implementing the schemes and the income that would be generated were set out in the report.

Members expressed the need to protect the businesses in the area and questioned whether the business community in that area had been consulted on the proposed charges. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that they had been invited to a consultation event, but turnout was very poor. Cabinet commented that the charges may push pressure out to the nearby residential areas and asked that they be monitored. There was also concern in relation to the parking for residents of the flats in Church Street.

#### **Decision**

1. That the proposal to create a new permit/pay and display zones be approved;
2. That the proposed price structures be approved and
3. That the consultation process be instigated and officers proceed with the necessary advertising of legal orders

## **196. Tees Valley Unlimited: Proposed Governance Arrangements** (*Chief Executive*)

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

#### **Purpose of report**

To obtain Cabinet approval for the proposed governance arrangements for the Tees Valley partnership “Tees Valley Unlimited” required to manage the Tees Valley City Region as set out in the Business Case submitted to the Secretary of State, and to obtain approval for the implementation timetable.

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

The Mayor reported that a business case for the development of Tees Valley Unlimited has been prepared and considered by Tees Valley Leaders and Chief Executives and submitted to central government for consideration. The next stage of the development of this important initiative is the establishment of governance arrangements to support this. These were set out in detail within the report, which is also been considered formerly by the other Tees Valley authorities.

The aim of establishing sub-regional governance arrangements that suited the needs of the Tees Valley and enabled greater delegation from the regional and national level of powers and resources was outlined, in the context of the wishes of government and regional funding bodies. It was noted that this could also counter recent trends in regionalisation.

Several Cabinet members indicated their serious concerns in relation to the creation of Tees Valley Unlimited and were not minded to support the arrangements at this time. Members concerns centred around the proposed unelected representatives, including the Chairperson of the proposed Leadership Board who would have a casting vote, and the potential for the body to become focussed on the central part of the Tees Valley. Members also had particular concerns as to what powers would be delegated to Tees Valley Unlimited.

The Mayor suggested that a further report be submitted to Cabinet including setting out what the development of Tees Valley Unlimited meant for Hartlepool, the membership and chairing of the key proposed Boards within the organisation, how voting would be conducted and what powers would be delegated.

### **Decision**

That a further report be submitted to Cabinet.

## **197. Cleveland Safety Camera Partnership - Update** *(Director of Neighbourhood Services)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-Key.

### **Purpose of report**

To update Cabinet in respect of proposed changes in the way that the Safety Camera Partnership will be funded together with how it will operate in the future.

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

The cost recovery system for safety and red light camera enforcement (hypothecation) scheme was launched on 1st April 2000 as a Partnership between Cleveland Police, Cleveland Magistrates' Courts Service and the

four Unitary Authorities within the former Cleveland area. In addition, the partnership was supported by the Highways Agency. The Unitary Authorities undertook to install camera sites and nominate suitable roads for enforcement based on speed and casualty data and to monitor vehicle speeds and traffic volumes. The national criteria for these was set by the Department for Transport.

In the first year of operation, 33 roads were nominated (8 in Hartlepool). In this 7th year of operations, a total of 54 roads are camera monitored (13 in Hartlepool), together with 23 complaint sites (7 of these are in Hartlepool). All costs involved in operating the partnership were met by income from fine revenue, enabling partnership activity to be maintained as 'cost neutral' to all partners; the balance of any remaining monies at the financial year end was returned to the Treasury.

Headline casualty reduction figures at camera sites for this area were a drop in the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured of 14% and a drop of 45% in the number of Personal Injury Collisions. The Director highlighted that this drop showed Cleveland to be the fifth highest performing partnership in the country out of a total of thirty-eight, whilst remaining one of the smallest.

On 15 December 2005, the Department for Transport announced a number of proposed changes to the administrative and funding arrangements for the national safety camera programme. The way safety cameras are funded will change on 1 April 2007. The annual netting off funding of safety cameras from fine revenue will end and all fine income from safety cameras will go to the Treasury's consolidated fund in the same way as other fines. Local authorities will instead receive additional funding for road safety through the Local Transport Plan process.

The Government is encouraging the establishment of wider road safety partnerships, in which the existing close working between local authorities, the police and other local partners on safety cameras is extended across a broader range of road safety measures. It is envisaged that a Cleveland-wide road safety partnership is formed at strategic level, and including representatives from the Health Service and the Fire Service in addition to those partners currently involved.

The partner contributions for the first year of the new look camera safety partnership based upon percentage allocation was £140,544.17 for Hartlepool of the overall costs of £770,105.00.

Members were concerned at the transfer of the funding into the LTP as this money was subject to competitive bidding. Cabinet requested information on how the new arrangements were progressing at the six-month stage. Comparative statistics on road accident reductions between Cleveland and Durham, where speed cameras were not in operation, was also sought by Cabinet.

**Decision**

That the proposals for the future operation of the Safety Camera Partnership be approved.

**198. Eldon Grove Sports Centre - Marketing** (*Director of Neighbourhood Services and Director of Adult and Community Services*)

**Type of decision**

Non-Key.

**Purpose of report**

To seek Cabinet approval to a marketing strategy for Eldon Grove Sports Centre.

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

The Mayor reported that there have been several expressions of interest received with proposals of how the centre could be operated in whole or in part by organisations other than the Council. A marketing strategy was now required.

It is necessary to set some objectives for any marketing proposals and it is suggested that the following will be base requirements:-

- To ensure that site is used for leisure and recreational services for the benefit of the community.
- To ensure that current service users/groups are accommodated in the proposals.
- To give the opportunity to current service users/groups to present a proposal.
- To ensure that there is no cost to the Council in any arrangement.
- To ensure any existing liability and/or responsibility in relation to the site is passed over to the new operator(s).
- Proposals would be subject to relevant consultations.
- Proposals would be subject to local plan and other planning requirements.

There are two options that the Cabinet could consider (or possibly a permutation of the two):

**Option 1**

- The Council markets the site on a wide scale appealing for the best consideration on a commercial basis, but always retaining the base requirements in section 3.2.
- This could take approximately six months to undertake and would cost in the region of £3,000, taking into account preparing briefs, advertising, marketing, consultation and evaluation.

**Option 2**

- The Council markets the site on a local basis (say via the Hartlepool Mail and other local outlets) appealing for local companies and/or community/sports groups to express interest.
- This option would need to retain the base requirements of the marketing proposal in section 3.2.
- This would take approximately four months to undertake at a cost in the region of £1,500.

Whichever option the Council chose, it would need to consider whether:

- To retain the freehold of the site and enter into a lease arrangement.
- To sell the freehold interest of the site.
- The site could be subject of one single proposal or possibly a number. Although there would be difficulties in evaluating setting up and managing a number of operators.
- The Council should seek to gain any financial benefit from the future arrangements, e.g., profit sharing from a commercial arrangement.

Whichever option or permutation is approved it may be that the three months extension of time may need to be further extended depending upon the responses received.

Cabinet Members considered it was essential that the Council retained the freehold in the land in order to control any future use. Cabinet Members were also concerned that there needed to be a finite time limit for bids to come forward as Members did not wish for the issue to drag on. The Mayor indicated that option 2 would be the preferred option as it was a local use that was sought for the facility.

### **Decision**

That a marketing strategy for Eldon Grove Sports Centre be approved based on Option 2, as set out above, with the Council retaining the freehold interest in the land.

## **199. Comprehensive Performance Assessment Results 2006** *(Assistant Chief Executive)*

### **Type of decision**

Non-Key.

### **Purpose of report**

To provide Cabinet with the results of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) reassessment for 2006. The overall assessment does not take into account the results of the Corporate Assessment Inspection, carried out in November and December 2006, results of which will not be known until later this month.

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

The Performance Management Portfolio Holder reported that the report



contained the results of the CPA reassessment where the Council has been rated a four star authority which is “improving well”. The Direction of Travel statement, prepared in advance of the CPA reassessment, has been audited by the Audit Commission. Their judgement is that the Council is “Improving Well”. The Audit Commission have produced a statement of their assessment and this was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

### **Decision**

That the results of the assessment be noted and that all members of staff be thanked for their input into this positive result for the Council.

## **200. Individualised Budgets – Self Directed Support** (*Director of Adult and Community Services*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-Key.

### **Purpose of report**

To update members on plans for the implementation of self directed services which is process of supporting individuals with social care needs to plan and control their own service delivery with the support of their families/friends or appointed social care professional.

The way in which this is to be achieved is by Hartlepool becoming one of a group of Local Authorities nationally who is being supported to implement a new system of support through the In Control programme.

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

The Adult and Community Services Portfolio Holder reported that In 2003 work began in six local authority pilot sites to test Self Directed Support as a viable model of social care; this model was called “In Control”. The pilots focused mainly on people with disabilities; however, the system of self-directed support is designed for everyone who uses social care support.

“In Control” developed its system of Self Directed Support as a way of supporting disabled people to have real power and responsibility – a system based on the principle that disabled people are citizens like other people.

The impact of this was described in the Government’s document Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People. This paper highlighted the disparity between professional aspirations in regard to the citizenship of disabled people and the actual outcomes produced by the present social care system.

The recent report to Cabinet on the strategic Direction of Travel for Adult Social Care in Hartlepool received support for the changes required in

commissioning and care management functions in order to put people at the centre of their care and support decisions. The key outcomes for vulnerable adults being to improve choice and control for people using social care, to maximise peoples potential and life changes and to confirm the role of Local Government in supporting social inclusion and well being for its communities.

The Cabinet report on the strategic direction of travel builds on the work done as part of the In Control Pilot both nationally and in Hartlepool. Hartlepool joined the In Control pilots in September 2006 and has done significant work to identify what is needed to move Hartlepool's current system of social care services to one that is controlled and directed by the people who receive those services. As part of this development process a baseline report was completed by the Policy Director of In Control which confirms Hartlepool's readiness to move forwards towards implementing self directed services for all adult service users and to being put forward to become one of the Local Authorities who are involved in the Total Transformation projects within the In Control system.

#### **Decision**

That the progress to date on delivering Self Directed Support and Individual Budgets be noted, and further update reports be received on the departments' involvement in the national Total Transformation project and progress in the implementation of self-directed services.

### **201. Post Office Network Consultation** *(Chief Executive)*

#### **Type of decision**

Non-Key.

#### **Purpose of report**

To seek Cabinet's view on the DTI consultation document regarding the future of the post office network.

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

The Government is currently undertaking a consultation on the future funding and structure arrangements of the post office network. The consultation document was attached as an Appendix to the report. The consultation will help determine the long-term role post offices play in rural and urban communities throughout the UK. Members of the Local Strategic Partnership have been provided with the opportunity to submit comments.

Cabinet Members were concerned that appropriate recognition was not given to urban post offices being community facilities in the same way as they were in villages. The loss of such facilities was only going to affect those considered the most vulnerable in society. Members commented that should the government reinstate the services it had withdrawn in recent years from Post Offices', it would find that the majority would

become extremely viable.

**Decision**

That a response to the consultation document be submitted in line with Cabinet's comments.

**202. Railway Approaches – Final Report** (*Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum*)

**Type of decision**

Non-Key.

**Purpose of report**

To present the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into Railway Approaches.

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

The Chair of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, Councillor Steve Wallace, presented the report and findings of the forum's investigation into Railway Approaches.

The Mayor welcomed the report and thanked the forum for an excellent piece of work. There was concern expressed that whatever work to the approaches was carried out, the infrastructure of the station itself was in a very poor condition and needed considerable work.

**Decision**

That the recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum, as set out below, be endorsed and that a action plan for the implementation of the recommendations be prepared and reported to Cabinet.

- (a) That in relation to Network Rail:
  - (i) The Authority seeks to develop a proactive approach with Network Rail around combating graffiti, and in particular through making connections to Network Rail's graffiti budget;
  - (ii) That Network Rail's 24 hour helpline number (08457 11 41 41) is publicised through the dissemination of the Forum's final report, associated press releases and through the Authority's Heartbeat magazine; and
  - (iii) That the Authority invites Network Rail to bring the 'No Messin' scheme to schools in Hartlepool in the interests of reducing trespassing, graffiti and vandalism around the railway lines.
- (b) That the Authority reports incidences of graffiti and litter along the Railway Approaches and liaises with Network Rail about these where appropriate;
- (c) That the Authority invites Northern Rail's police and schools liaison officer to attend Hartlepool schools;
- (d) That the Authority uses its Planning and Development Control powers

- proactively to enhance the Railway Approaches into the town;
- (e) That the Authority seeks to maximise the regeneration benefits of the 2010 Tall Ships event, the development of 'Hartlepool Quays', and the direct rail link to London by linking, where appropriate, prospective improvements to Hartlepool's Railway Approaches into the regional, sub-regional and local strategies described in the main body of this report;
  - (f) That the 'key problem spots' sites identified in the Railway Approaches Scrutiny Investigation, are incorporated, wherever possible, into the Green Infrastructure Strategy and its associated site specific schedules;
  - (g) That the area of unused land identified in paragraph 11.6 of this report is developed as a 'Community Forest' or 'Woodland Area' and as a diversionary route away from traffic;
  - (h) That the Authority supports the development of the North Hartlepool Linear Park strategy;
  - (i) That discussions between representatives of the Regeneration and Planning Services Department and Tees Forest (North East Community Forests) around the development of a broad programme of planting to create 'green fingers' of woodland extending into the urban area along the railway corridor is supported;
  - (j) That the Authority develops an 'allotments policy' and consults allotment users in the development and implementation of this policy;
  - (k) That the 'key problem spots' identified during the Scrutiny Investigation are incorporated, where appropriate, into the list of Untidy/ Derelict Land and Buildings;
  - (l) That the Authority develops a strategy geared towards screening the 'key problem spots' identified during the Scrutiny Investigation based on the approaches outlined in paragraph 11.5;
  - (m) That in relation to Stations in Hartlepool:
    - (i) The Authority pursues enhanced adoption of Hartlepool Station to a 'Partners Scheme' in conjunction with Northern Rail and that involvement from the CVS, 'Coastliners' and Pride in Hartlepool is sought in this;
    - (ii) That the Authority pursues the development of a station adoption scheme at Seaton Carew Station in conjunction with Northern Rail and that involvement from the CVS, 'Coastliners' and Pride in Hartlepool is sought in this;
    - (iii) The Authority maximises the opportunity that the Tall Ships event provides to lobby the Department for Transport, Network Rail and Northern Rail to make structural improvements to Hartlepool and Seaton Stations, prior to improving the cosmetic appearance of these;
    - (iv) That the Authority continues to lobby the Department for Transport, Network Rail and Northern Rail for a station halt to reopen at Hart Station; and
    - (v) That pedestrian and vehicle signage (including further development of brown signage) around Hartlepool Station is improved, especially in relation to the town centre.
  - (n) That 'Coastliners' have a continuing involvement in implementing the

outcomes of this investigation. In particular in improvements to Hartlepool and Seaton Carew Stations and in the development of a 'Railway Approaches Forum';

- (o) That the CVS has a number of specific contributions it can make to improvements to Railway Approaches, as outlined in Appendix C, and that the Authority considers how best the adoption of these options can be supported;
- (p) That the Authority helps to establish a 'Railway Approaches Forum' in partnership with the CVS to ensure that the momentum for this issue is maintained around improvements to both the railway corridors and stations. In addition to the Authority and the CVS, the rail operators, rail user groups and the disabled access group should be involved in this forum; and
- (q) That the recommendations from this report are reflected, where appropriate, in actions contained in Departmental / Service Plans.

## **203 Local Government Access to Information**

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

Minute 204. – Para 1 (Information relating to any individual)

## **204. Chief Officer Grading Appeal** (*Chief Executive*)

### **Type of decision**

Non-Key.

### **Purpose of report**

The purpose of the report is set out in the exempt section of the minutes.

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

The issues considered by Cabinet are set out in the exempt section of the minutes.

### **Decision**

The decision is set out in the exempt section of the minutes.

**J A BROWN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 9<sup>th</sup> March 2007**