

Cabinet

A meeting of Cabinet was held on Thursday, 9th February 2006.

Present: Councillor Gibson (Chairman); Councillors Mrs Cains, Coleman, Cook, Cunningham, Johnson, Kirton, Leonard, Nelson and Mrs O'Donnell.

Officers: G Garlick (CE), J Haworth (ACE), M Robinson, I Thompson, Carol Straughan, J Elliott, R McGuckin (DNS), A Baxter (CESC), J Danks, M Skipsey (R), H Dean (PPC), M Waggott, S Connolly, M Henderson (LD).

Also in attendance: Councillors Frankland, Lupton and Mrs Rigg.

Representatives from Audit Commission: G Gittins, S Nicklin and L Watson.

1020 Review of Sickness Absence

Cabinet were presented with a report detailing the outcomes of a review of sickness absence throughout the authority. The review had been undertaken by the Council's Corporate Policy Review Select Committee.

The objectives of the review had been to:

- overview how the Authority managed sickness absence and measures taken to improve levels of absence
- explore how the authority could improve future performance on the current sickness absence rates
- report findings from the review to Cabinet with any resultant recommendations.

RESOLVED that the work undertaken by the Select Committee be noted, and the following recommendations be implemented:-

1. Quarterly reports to Cabinet, to be part of the quarterly performance reporting regime, outlining the following:
 - a. Days lost per full time employee (FTE)
 - b. Overall sickness absence shown as a percentage
 - c. A profile of the causes of sickness

Where BVPI figures highlight areas of concern, an exception report should be generated and made available to appropriate manager and Cabinet Member

2. Managers to improve coding of absence returns with the support of Human Resources
3. Managers to improve the rate of absence returns with the assistance of Human Resources
4. Results of the HSE Stress Survey pilot to be reported back to the Corporate Policy Review Select Committee via the Executive Scrutiny Committee
5. To create a database containing the details of all staff with managerial/supervisory responsibilities.
6. To make it compulsory for all staff with managerial/supervisory responsibilities to undertake training in managing sickness. This should commence with a series of seminars to which all Managers/Supervisors are invited as appropriate
7. Training issues relating to sickness absence management should be addressed and evaluated at annual appraisal sessions
8. A regular article to go in KYIT to outline full sickness absence procedures
9. Information on flexible working practices and flexi time schemes to be included in management training programmes

10. The Council should ensure that Unions are consulted appropriately and informed on issues relating to changes in sickness absence policies, and should be invited to attend absence management courses provided by Stockton Borough Council
11. Homes visits during long term absence normally undertaken by Line Managers supported by HR. HR Officers will undertake visits under exceptional circumstances on behalf of Line Managers.
12. Executive Scrutiny Committee to incorporate monitoring procedure into the 2006/07 work programme for the Corporate Policy Select Committee.

1021 Local Authority Representatives on School Governing Bodies

Cabinet was requested to consider the appointment of school governors in accordance with the procedure for the appointment of school governors, approved at Minute 84 of the Cabinet (11th May 2000).

RESOLVED that the appointments to the following School Governing Bodies be approved in line with agreed procedures subject to successful List 99 check and Personal Disclosure:-

Bewley Infant School -	Mrs M. McLean
Proposed New CE VA School, Fairfield	Mrs. K. Ward
Preston Primary School	Cllr. M. Cherrett

1022 The Scheme and Formula for the Funding of Schools

Cabinet considered a report seeking Members approval to changes to the scheme and formula for funding schools for the 2006/07 and 2007/08 financial years.

During the latter half of the Autumn Term, formal consultation had taken place with Governing Bodies regarding the proposed changes to the Scheme for Financing Schools, changes to the formula, new delegation, devolution of high incidence / low level special education needs funding to primary schools and formula factor weightings.

In September 2005 the Schools Forum, comprising mainly of Headteachers and Governors, was consulted on these changes in its statutory capacity as an advisory body to the Council prior to the papers submission to all Governing Bodies.

Although the Schools Forum had been an advisory body to the Council it was also to have new powers vested in it by the Secretary of State for Education and Skills. These new powers included agreement:-

- a. to make variations to the minimum funding guarantee for schools which would otherwise provide anomalous results,
- b. to increase the central expenditure limit within the Schools' Budget relating to the local authority managed budgets and,
- c. of the amount to be retained by the Council for certain areas of central expenditure.

The proposed methodology for distributing teachers pay grants reflected closely the current grant distribution which would provide stability in school budgets. Since the Fair Funding Consultation document was sent out the DfES had decided to route teachers pay grants relating to schools' sixth forms via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC). The LSC required that the post 16 element of the teachers pay grant was transparently distributed to schools and was separately identifiable. It was requested that the proposals set out in the Fair Funding Consultation document be approved and that minor amendments relating to the post 16 element of the teachers pay grants be consulted upon and agreed with the Schools Forum.

The Governments intention to prioritise funding for personalisation and practical learning options became known in the latter part of last term after the Fair Funding Consultation had been sent out to Governing Bodies. The full picture did not emerge

until after the announcements on the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocations in December 2005. Therefore it had not been possible to consult schools on the distribution of the resources identified by the DfES within the DSG. It was proposed that the arrangements connected with this area be consulted upon and agreed with the Schools Forum.

At the same time as the announcement of the Dedicated Schools Grant, the DfES with HM Treasury also published a review of the way local authorities funded schools for the extra burdens imposed by social deprivation. Although the statement was mainly directed towards change from 2008, the DfES believed that Authorities should have some headroom to be able to start to respond to the outcome of the review. It was recommended that this be considered subject to headroom being available, in conjunction with the Schools Forum at its meeting on 1st February 2006.

A copy of the Fair Funding consultation paper was provided for Members together with a summary of responses with comments regarding necessary action.

RESOLVED that

1. That the Scheme for Financing Schools be amended to introduce controls on excessive surplus balances as detailed in Section 2 of the consultation document.
2. That Multi Lingual funding within the Schools Budget Share Formula be distributed based on the number of children (above a threshold of 30 in each school) whose First Language is not english.
3. That members note the new powers of the Schools Forum to agree local modifications to the minimum funding guarantee and to agree spending by the Authority in excess of the statutory central expenditure limits within the Schools Budget.
4. That funding for teachers pay grants be delegated to schools as set out in the Fair Funding Consultation document and that minor amendments be consulted upon and agreed with the Schools Forum for the post 16 element of the teachers pay grants.
5. That funding for low incidence / high level special education needs be delegated to secondary schools.
6. That funding for physiotherapy support to two special schools is not delegated at this time
7. That the trial of devolving high incidence / low level special education needs funding to primary schools be extended by twelve months so that it ends at 31st March 2007.
8. That non pupil related funding data (excluding rates and salary safeguarding) remain unchanged during the course of a multi year funding period.
9. That headroom within the Individual Schools Budget be distributed taking into account the following:-
 - a. The opening of a new primary school at Ingleby Barwick in September 2007
 - b. Primary AWPU increase being 0.7% more than that for secondary schools reflecting the full year effect of the final stage of the introduction of workforce reform agreement
 - c. New delegation for personalisation, including access to extended services at Primary and Key Stage 3 and for practical learning options at Secondary Schools, the methodology for which will be consulted upon and agreed with the Schools Forum
 - d. Once the areas above have been covered from headroom within the Individual Schools Budget that consideration, in conjunction with the

Schools Forum, be given to allocating remaining headroom funding for deprivation costs to schools.

1023 Arrangements for an Area Tourism Partnership for the Tees Valley.

Cabinet considered a report that explained new proposals for the formation of an Area Tourism Partnership (ATP) for the Tees Valley as part of the new delivery mechanism for tourism activity within the region. The report also sought members endorsement of the new structure.

It was explained that One NorthEast had taken on strategic responsibility for tourism in April 2003 and had developed a revised structure for tourism support and promotion, to promote effectiveness and reduce duplication. Significantly increased resources were to be channelled into tourism by One NorthEast in order to achieve a step-change in performance of the North East visitor economy.

This revised structure, was intended to be operational by April 2006, and would be known as Tourism Network NorthEast, comprising five core organisations: the Regional Tourism Team and four independent ATP's.

While the ATP's primary associations and funding relationships were with One NorthEast, the Regional Network and Tees Valley Partnership, it was important that the activities of the ATP responded to the perceptions of customers who were largely uninterested in administrative boundaries. The ATP would therefore broker co-operation across boundaries including working with other North East ATP's. Joint planning and working with the Yorkshire Tourist Board and the emerging North Yorkshire Moors and Coast ATP was particularly important and included involvement in the Captain Cook Country promotion.

The Regional Tourism Team within One NorthEast would be responsible for the overall strategic direction, delivery of regional marketing campaigns and other region-wide initiatives. The ATPs in each of the 4 sub-regions would work on behalf of tourism businesses and public agencies to promote the area and to ensure that visitors enjoyed the best possible experience. The activities of the Tees Valley ATP had been detailed in an Interim Business Plan, which was supported by an Area Tourism Management Plan and Marketing Plan. Consultation with public and private sector organisations had been held to identify the activities and priorities of the ATP. This information had then been used to produce the aforementioned plans. The ATP would consult annually on its Business Plan through the Management Board and the Joint Strategy Committee.

Public sector support for tourism within Tees Valley already operated in a spirit of partnership. Following local government re-organisation in 1996/7, the five Tees Valley authorities and Tees Valley Tourism Bureau had adopted a joint approach to tourism marketing for the whole sub region. Over the last five years this approach had been consolidated and strengthened to ensure structured and co-ordinated activity, which had minimised any duplication of effort. It was now proposed that the ATP would build on this excellent co-operation achieved through working in partnership with the Tees Valley Tourism Bureau. The proposed arrangements for the new ATP were based on the continuation of current levels of local authority support - both in terms of financial commitment and officer time. Details of this were provided to Cabinet

The finalisation of the staffing structure of the ATP would be dealt with through the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit.

The key principles for the governance of the ATP had been established by ONE. They were summarised for Members as follows:-

- The ATP would be a voluntary partnership with its own Management Board with private sector, voluntary sector and local authority representation
- The Management Board would appoint, manage and monitor the performance of the senior executive staff of the ATP
- The Chair to be a senior private sector person with profile and strong connections in the sub-region

- The ATP Management Board to report to the Tees Valley Partnership Board, and the precise structure of the ATP Board to be resolved as the revised structure of the TVP Board was agreed.
- Advise on public investment in the tourism product, such as attractions, activities and events.
- Stockton BC would continue as the accountable body and employer of staff of the ATP
- In terms of the contribution of £230,000 from the Tees Valley local authorities, a service level agreement with One NorthEast and the ATP was agreed to how local authority resources are utilised.

As the LAs were a key contributor to the Area Tourism Partnership budget it was considered that they should be represented on the board. ONE had not guaranteed this through the proposed structure and therefore discussions were ongoing to find a way forward. It was recommended that a council representative from SBC should be on the board, and that the decision on how best to proceed should be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport and the Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services.

RESOLVED that

1. The principle of the formation of an Area Tourism Partnership for the Tees Valley be endorsed.
2. Cabinet agree that SBC require member/officer representation on the board, to be determined by the lead cabinet member for Regeneration and Transport in consultation with the Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services.

1024 Parkfield/Mill Lane Housing Regeneration Phase One Compulsory Purchase Order

Cabinet considered a report that sought approval for the procedure which would enable the Council to confirm the Compulsory Purchase Order associated with Parkfield Regeneration Phase .

Cabinet were reminded that the Parkfield Regeneration Scheme was the Council's flagship private sector Housing Market renewal Scheme. Since August 2004 the Council had actively been purchasing property in the phase one area (otherwise known as Alliance St, Hind St, Templar St and part of Spring St). The scheme had progressed well, a private developer partner had been appointed, subject to agreeing the terms of the development agreement, and there were a small number of properties awaiting to be purchased.

Cabinet had previously provided approval for officers to progress the use of Compulsory Purchase powers. The programme of property acquisition had proceeded well and every effort had been made to purchase by agreement. Negotiations continued to proceed in relation to the acquisition of these interests, however, in order to ensure that the scheme could proceed within its requisite timescale officers sought to progress a Compulsory Purchase Order

The Compulsory Purchase Order had been made on 12th December 2005, and the closing date for lodging objections had been 13th January 2006. Confirmation has been received from Government Office that no objections to the Compulsory Purchase Order have been received.

The Council was awaiting confirmation from the Secretary of State to advise whether the Council could now proceed and confirm the Order itself, or whether some variations were required to the order. In the event of variations being required, the Secretary of State would then look to confirm the Order. Details of the legal process involved was provided to Members.

RESOLVED that Members agree the procedure required to enable the Council to confirm the Parkfield Regeneration Phase One Compulsory Purchase order.

1025 Procurement Update

Consideration was given to an update on the progress made improving the Council's approach to procurement and to seek approval of an updated Procurement Strategy.

Members were reminded that following the launch of the National Procurement Strategy the Council had published its own Procurement Strategy in 2004. The strategy detailed the principles of good procurement and formed a basis from which to develop an action plan for improvement.

The introduction of Gershon efficiency targets had further increased the pressure to improve procurement in order to achieve some of the targeted savings.

As a consequence of the Gershon efficiency targets the Procurement Strategy required updating, to identify more explicitly how procurement could assist achievement of the Community Strategy objectives and in addition, some further expansion of the procurement principles was required in specific expenditure areas in order to clarify Stockton's approach. These included:

- ICT Procurement
- Construction Procurement
- Schools Procurement
- Care Commissioning

A copy of the updated Procurement Strategy 2006 –2009 was provided to Members.

Cabinet was informed that the implementation of the Agresso Financial Management System had now made it possible to analyse, at quite a detailed level, where the Council spent money,. It was pointed out however, that the analysis didn't include expenditure from the old Uniclass System and therefore did not include a large proportion of Direct Services spend in Development and Neighbourhood Services. Consequently, the Procurement Working Group, with help from the North East Centre of Excellence had undertaken a detailed procurement spend analysis using data from the third and fourth quarters of 2004/05 and the first and second quarters of 2005/06. The analysis removed the majority of non-influencible spend; such as grant funding, payments to Members and employees etc and concentrated on procurement spend. The objective of the analysis was to look at WHO we spend money with, i.e. our suppliers, WHERE we spend money, i.e. how much money was spent in the region and WHAT we spend money on i.e. the type of procurement. The analysis also included an assessment of the level of contracted against non-contracted spend, based upon information held on contract registers supplied from Council officers to the working group.

Cabinet was provided with details of the results of the spend analysis and agreed that it should be viewed as a first step in an ongoing process and further work was required. The results indicated that the Council had a core group of big suppliers, a group of medium sized suppliers and a great number of smaller suppliers who we spent lots of small amounts with. This suggested that there was scope to work with the big suppliers to see what added benefits the Council could secure, including community benefits, the development of local supply chains etc. In addition, there was considerable scope to work with medium sized suppliers to maximise the use of contracts to generate savings and finally there was scope to reduce the number of the many low value transactions with the smaller suppliers, thereby creating transactional efficiencies. Clearly more work was needed to identify the level of contracted and non-contracted spend and to assess the level of savings that could be generated by increasing the use of contracts. All savings could count towards Gershon efficiency savings targets. The Procurement Working Group had re-established the Procurement Champions Group to carry out further investigations into the level of non-contracted spend, the risk to the Council and the 'quality' of existing contracts (i.e. do they include performance and innovation incentives etc). A Procurement Champions' Draft Action Plan was provided to Members.

A lack of procurement skills and capacity was clearly identified in the Byatt Report as a significant barrier to good procurement. Consequently, the National Procurement Strategy for local government 2003 placed a greater emphasis on capacity building. The Procurement Working Group and North East Centre of Excellence had undertaken a skills audit across both Stockton on Tees Borough Council and the rest of the region. In Stockton, over 400 self-assessments were received from services.

The analysis suggests that only a small proportion of officers had a comprehensive understanding of procurement and that the vast majority identified procurement as a key part of their job, but stated that they did not have the skills needed to undertake it effectively. Where some officers perceived that they were fully competent, the results of the spend analysis in their particular area suggested that they perhaps were not. Procurement and contract law in particular, was a complex area and it was vital that officers received comprehensive training to assist them in using procurement effectively to improve performance, reduce costs and to reduce the risk of legal action against the Council.

Consequently, a series of training programmes were being designed to increase procurement capacity of officers. They would target three different groups. Firstly, the regular procurers who organised contracts on a regular basis. The training would cover the full procurement cycle, including issues such as achievement of community benefits etc. Secondly, the occasional procurers who only arranged contracts every year or so. This training would focus on signposting help and guidance when they need it. Thirdly, those who regularly placed orders for lower value goods and services. This training would focus on signposting existing supply contracts and the need for formal quotations where contracts did not exist.

Cabinet were informed that work continued at both the sub regional and regional levels via the Tees Valley Joint Procurement Group and the North East Centre of Excellence.

At the sub-regional level, contract opportunities had been identified and a number had been arranged or were in progress. These included stair lift installation and maintenance, cleaning materials, civil engineering materials, hired plant and potentially fleet procurement.

At the regional level, work continued to develop an approach to assessing the economic impact of procurement on the region, developing a joint approach to e-Procurement (in particular Purchase Cards, e-Tendering and e-Marketplaces) a number of training opportunities had been arranged, spend analysis support and financial support to a series of exemplar projects.

Cabinet noted that Procurement savings had been generated from a number of areas. The enforcement of preferred suppliers/ contracts for stationery, furniture, mobile phones and toner/ ink cartridges was projected to generate £220,000 this financial year and was built into service groups' medium term financial plans. The use of collaboratively bought energy was projected to save approximately £856,000 this year compared to the price the Council would likely pay if it bought it itself although this was offset by ongoing price increases. Other saving were being generated by the use of purchase and corporate credit cards, consolidated invoicing, e-mailing orders, paying by BACS rather than by cheque etc. Savings would also be generated from the reduction in the requirement for performance bonds in contracts. A summary of Procurement savings for 2005/06 was provided.

It was explained that Council's procurement decisions could have a significant impact upon the environment. Consequently, environmental considerations should be built into all procurement decisions as a matter of course. For example, 75% of the Council and schools' electricity was from 'green' sources and the majority of paper used by the Council was from sustainable forests or recycled. In addition, only flat screen monitors were bought with computers as they use considerably less energy, use less parts, take up less space in transport, last longer than traditional monitors and are less harmful to the environment when disposed. Although the initial cost was slightly higher than traditional monitors, the pay back in reduced electricity consumption only took 2/3 years.

The Procurement Strategy included a commitment to procure from verified sustainable sources where available as first choice, unless a business case existed that could justify other products.

In support of Stockton becoming a 'Fairtrade Town', the contract for the provision of food included a number of fairtrade products and the Procurement Unit had made arrangements for the supply of fairtrade tea and coffee for use with drinks machines in the various conference rooms. It was suggested that the procurement strategy be amended to reflect the work undertaken in this area.

Cabinet highlighted the excellent work undertaken by officers in preparing the procurement strategy and recognised its importance in making savings.

Cabinet also discussed the need to continue the development of contract opportunities to the local business sector.

RESOLVED that

1. The updated Procurement Strategy is noted, subject to reference being made to the Council's use of fairtrade products, where possible.
2. The results of the Spend Analysis and the ongoing approach to generating savings is noted.
3. The approach to building procurement capacity is endorsed.
4. The work at both sub-regional and regional level is noted
5. The level of procurement savings is noted

1026 Audit Commission – Annual Audit and Inspection Letter 04/05

Cabinet considered a report that presented Members with the Audit Commission Annual Audit & Inspection Letter for 2004/2005 (formerly the Management Letter).

Representatives from the Audit Commission were in attendance to present the Inspection letter to Cabinet and answer any questions from Members.

Members were reminded that the Audit Commission was responsible for arranging for the audit of the accounts of the Council (either by private firms or through their own auditors). They were also responsible for undertaking an annual Comprehensive Performance Assessment and other service inspections.

A formal stage in this process was the production of the "Annual Audit & Inspection Letter", formerly, the Management Letter. The Annual Audit & Inspection Letter for 2004/2005 had been received and was provided to Members.

The Annual Audit Letter provided a comprehensive and independent assessment of the "health" of the Council

It was noted that the letter demonstrated that the Council continued to maintain sound financial systems and that the Council's budgetary control and resource management ensured that the financial position for the General Fund remained healthy.

The letter also demonstrated that the Council was meeting the Government's Modernising Local Government agenda, and was performing strongly against the new comprehensive performance assessment framework.

Cabinet thanked the Audit Commission for their presentation and expressed the hope that the excellent working relationship that existed between the Council and the Audit Commission would continue.

Members noted that under the new CPA arrangements Councils now received star ratings (from zero to four stars, with four being the highest). Stockton had received a four star rating, replacing its previous rating of excellent, which had been received under the former arrangements. Audit Commission representatives indicated that, given the new assessment framework, which was a harder test, they considered that the Council had actually improved on its previous 'excellent' rating.

Members agreed that this was testimony to the hard work undertaken by all Members and staff. It proved that every part of the Council was committed to improvement and was contributing to the Council's success.

It was suggested that the Council's performance should be highlighted in an appropriate manner.

RESOLVED that Members note the contents of the letter.

1027 Comprehensive Performance Assessment 2005-2008

Cabinet were informed that, in December 2005, the Audit Commission had rated the Council as “a four star council that was improving well” in its Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA). Members were provide with a report that detailed the Council’s performance in the different areas that made up the assessment.

RESOLVED that Members note the report.

1028 Outside Bodies- Proposed Change of Membership to Tristar

Cabinet was informed that Cllr Dewison had resigned from his position as a Council representative on the Tristar Management Board. As a consequence of this a vacancy for a Council representative existed

A nomination for Councillor Roberts, to serve on the board, had been received.

RESOLVED that Councillor Roberts be appointed to the Tristar Management Board in place of Councillor Dewison; and that the Acting Managing Director of the Board be informed accordingly.

RESOLVED that Members note the report.

1029 Minutes of Various Bodies

Cabinet considered the minutes of the following meetings:-

Joint Strategy Committee	16 th December 2005
Western Area Partnership Board	28 th November 2005
Northern Area (Billingham) Partnership Board	12 th December 2005
The Eastern Area Partnership Board	20 th December 2005

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Area Partnership Boards and the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee, be approved/received, as appropriate.

Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee – 16th December 2005**Present:-** Councillor Budd (Chairman)

Representing Darlington Borough Council:- Councillors Lyonette and Ruck.

Representing Hartlepool Borough Council:- Councillors Coward, Preece and Waller.

Representing Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council:- Councillors Dunning, Empson and Smith.

Representing Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council: Councillors Cherrett, Cook and Dixon.

Officers:- J Lowther, D Peace, S Turner (Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit); N Hart (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council); B Thompson (Hartlepool Borough Council).

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Payne, Richmond and Mrs Scott.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Cook declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in respect of the item entitled “DICIDA Activities” on the grounds of his employment within the chemical industry.

Councillor Dunning also declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in respect of the same item as a result of his son’s employment within the chemical industry.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29th September 2005 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Regional Transport Board

Consideration was given to the summary of the progress made by the Regional Transport Board (RTB) in developing a ten year transport programme for the North East of England to be funded from a regional funding allocation for transport, commencing at £42 million in 2006 rising to £49 million in £2016.

The Board, upon which the Chairman of this Committee was a member, considered each project submitted against the policy criteria based on the Regional Spatial Strategy and Regional Economic Strategy, which was appraised on :-

- (a) Scheme outcomes
- (b) Consequences of not taking action
- (c) Policy fit
- (d) Value for money
- (e) Deliverability

The following schemes, which had been supported by a full business case, had been included in the appraisal:-

Schemes with Full Business Case £461m	
Scheme	Cost (£m 2005 prices)
A1 Adderstone to Belford Dualling	£14m
A1 Morpeth to Felton Dualling	£80m
A19 Coast Road Junction Improvements	£68m
A19 Seaton Burn Junction Improvement	£29m
A19 Testos Grade Separated Junction	£21m
A19/A189 Moor Farm Junction Improvements	£40m
A66 Cross Lane – Greta Bridge	£19m
A66 Bowes Bypass Dualling	£15m
A69 Haydon Bridge Bypass	£29m
Darlington Eastern Transport corridor	£12m
East Durham Link Road	£10m
Morpeth Northern Bypass	£7m
North Middlesbrough Accessibility Improvements	£15m
Northern Gateway	£14m
Orpheus Bus Corridors (First Corridor)	£5m
Sunderland Central Route	£14m
Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor	£69m

The following schemes were currently under development and had been considered under the appraisal criteria however, it was noted that both the Metro Re-invigoration and Tees Valley Metro Schemes would not be funded through the regional framework allocation and would be delivered by other funding mechanisms:-

Schemes under development £1400m+	
Scheme	Cost (£m 2005 prices)
A1 North of Alnwick to Scottish Border dualling	Circa £400m
A1 West Mains – Bridge Mill	£21m
A66 Darlington Bypass	£52m
Blaydon/Newburn Haugh Foot/Cycle Bridge	£10m
Durham Northern Relief Road	£20m
East Billingham Relief Road	£19m
Metro Re-invigoration	Circa £400m+
New Tees Crossing	£156m
Tees Valley Bus Network Review	£30m
Tees Valley Metro	Circa £228m
Transit 15 QBC's Durham	£15m
Orpheus Bus Corridors (2 nd phase)	£30m
Redheugh Bridge/Scotswood Road Junction	£10m
Wheatley Hill – Bowburn	£10m

The next Board meeting to consider the above schemes would be held on 5th January 2006 with a view to the finalised programme being submitted to the Government by the end of January 2006.

Members expressed particular support for the inclusion of the following schemes:-

- A66 Darlington Bypass – to be brought forward from current position in programme post 2016

- East Billingham Relief Road – arising from safety concerns regarding use by HGV tankers
- A19/A66 – to be considered as part of the major road network, aka A66/A1, due to its significant role in the Tees Valley
- A66/A1 to be considered as part of national road network

RESOLVED that:-

1. The report be noted.
2. The following proposals be put forward from the Tees Valley to the Regional Transport Board for consideration for funding from the Regional Funding Allocation:-

A66 Darlington Bypass – to be brought forward from current position in programme post 2016

East Billingham Relief Road – arising from safety concerns regarding use by HGV tankers

A19/A66 – to be considered as part of the major road network, aka A66/A1, due to its significant role in the Tees Valley

A66/A1 to be considered as part of national road network

Regional Spatial Strategy

The Committee was advised that the Examination in Public for the Regional Spatial Strategy would be held on 7th March 2006 for a period of five weeks. The Joint Strategy Unit had been invited to attend the Examination in Public and had been asked to produce three reports which would need to be considered and approved by this Committee, namely:-

- (a) Sub-regional housing strategy
- (b) A report justifying the housing allocations for the Tees Valley; and
- (c) A report justifying allocations of employment land

It was proposed that a special meeting of the Joint Strategy Committee be held in the last week of January 2006 to consider and approve the above reports.

RESOLVED that a special meeting of the Joint Strategy Committee be held on 30th January 2006 to deal with any matters relating to the Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public.

Post 2006 European Funding

The Tees Valley was linked to County Durham (TVD) in respect of European Programme funding and the eligibility for these funds depended upon a single indicator as calculated by Eurostat. This indicator was based on Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per head, relative to the EU average, and regions that fell below 75% of the EU average would receive Convergence funding. All other regions would be eligible for competitiveness funding.

Consideration was given to the work undertaken by officers from the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit and Durham County Council in lobbying the UK national government, European Commission officials, MPs and MEPs, in order to secure the best deal for the local economy.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and the Committee be kept informed on the progress of meetings with the various parties in the future.

Tees Valley European Legal Support Service

Consideration was given to progress and achievements made by via the European Legal Support Service Project which was currently funded via Objective 2 of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), Single Programme and in-kind match funding from the North East Chamber of Commerce.

The project commenced in July 2002 with an extension approved in August 2004. ERDF funding for the project was to end on 31st December 2005, with an extended end date of 1st March 2006 for Single Programme funding to enable the remaining outputs to be achieved.

Officers were currently working on a proposal to continue the service but refocusing its activity to concentrate on international trade rather than the more domestic topics. It was also intended to deliver the new project regionally and funding for the project was currently being sought from the META 2 bid, which was a regional project funded via ERDF. The possibility of match funding was also currently being explored with One North East.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Priority 4 Activity in the Tees Valley

Consideration was given to an update on the activity and success of the five Tees Valley Priority 4 Partnerships in the North East of England Objective 2 Programme as coordinated sub regionally by the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit.

The Priority 4 measure was aimed at those areas identified as having the highest level of deprivation in the Index of Multiple Deprivation; and the Priority 4 Package Partnerships reflected the unitary authority level partnerships that facilitated the delivery of these measures in the targeted ward areas within the Tees Valley. For the second half of the programme 2004/2008, the Tees Valley were given a sub regional indicative financial allocation amounting to £7.64 million (£3.68 million European Regional Development Fund and £3.72 million European Social Fund). The Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit, as co-ordinators at a sub regional level, were responsible for ensuring a strategic overview was maintained for the list of projects compiled and received from each individual partnership. Once endorsed by the Tees Valley Priority 4 Executive Group, the lists were submitted to the Government Office for information and planning purposes in advance of individual project application submissions. The Tees Valley process had been commended by the European Programme Secretary as being the only sub regional Priority 4 process that currently worked successfully.

The Committee was advised that the value of the ESF element of the North East of England Objective 2 Programme had increased to £9.95 million in January 2005 and for Priority 4 measures, it was decided to allocate additional funds only to those regions where they had demonstrated the ability to commit existing funds. The Tees Valley was the only sub region to utilise the whole of its financial resources and therefore was the only sub region invited to access this money. Projects to the value of just over £466,000 were submitted in September 2005 and a further £2.3 million of projects were currently under development.

Details were also submitted of a number of programme changes agreed by the Programme Management Committee in September 2005 designed to ensure that the programme continued to perform and deliver its intended outcomes. In total, from the commencement of the Priority 4 projects, approximately £37.1 million had been developed that would support activity in the most disadvantaged wards across the Tees Valley.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Monitoring Housing Market Renewal

Consideration was given to the review of the Joint Strategy Unit's work with Tees Valley Living in developing and implementing the system for monitoring the impact of the Tees Valley's housing market renewal initiative. The work fulfilled the ODPM's requirement for effective monitoring, evaluation and review processes as part of the sub region's housing strategy.

As part of the regional low demand plan to be submitted in the near future by the Regional Housing Board, the ODPM required that each sub regional plan should contain clear output and outcome indicators and targets and should address the effectiveness of monitoring, evaluation and review processes. This would require information at the Tees Valley level and for the areas where the initiatives interventions would take place. Behind this need, there was a requirement for a substantial range of relevant information being available regularly at local, neighbourhood level and this would help those working directly on the housing market renewal initiative plus many others in the housing and planning work. A summary was provided of the two types of information for each neighbourhood namely core indicators and general indicators. The information produced, and monitoring undertaken, was summarised as follows:-

- Housing Database – a range of information about each individual house in the Tees Valley
- Neighbourhood Database – relevant information aggregated by neighbourhoods specially designed for HMR purposes and from other data on relevant socio-economic issues;
- Analysis and Monitoring – analysing and comparing the characteristics of individual neighbourhoods, and measuring change over time as the housing market renewal intervention

makes an impact; concentrating on reporting how well the sub-regional plan is meeting its targets;

- Website – a useful additional feature, making the Neighbourhood Database readily available via a website to all those in the Tees Valley involved in planning and renewing the housing market.

Consideration was also given to a summary of the information contained within both the housing and neighbourhood databases, together with a summary of how the Joint Strategy Unit would analyse, monitor and report the characteristics of the housing stock and way in which it was changing.

The Committee was also advised that since its inception, the Joint Strategy Unit had provided an increasing amount of information on its website covering the Tees Valley, boroughs and individual wards. Developments were now planned to improve the website to include:-

- More Information – a wider range of information covering a range of topics from the Census, other Government sources and locally produced data; this covers the range of issues relevant to regeneration, like unemployment, educational achievement, poor health, low income and crime.
- More areas – as well as wards, the information now covers neighbourhoods and towns and villages;
- Better presentation and navigation
- Snapshot – a selection of key indicators for one area; designed for those wanting to gain a range of information about a single locality;
- Map and Compare – information and map on one indicator for all areas in the borough or Tees Valley; designed for those who want to know how areas compare, which are highest and lowest

RESOLVED that the report, describing the Joint Strategy Unit's role in monitoring the impact of the Tees Valley Housing Market Renewal Initiative at neighbourhood level; and the provision of a wide range of information on housing and other issues on websites; be noted.

DICIDA Activities

Consideration was given to an overview of the activities and discussions taken at the recent DICIDA conference on the Tees Valley on 24th and 25th November 2005.

The main topics covered by the conference were competitiveness, economic drivers and energy; each of which was important to continuing the sustainable development of the industry in the Tees Valley. With regard to its future work programme DICIDA now had a place on the government's chemical stakeholder forum and would continue to contribute to the forum's work on REACH. Work would also continue on lobbying on REACH both through the UK DICIDA network and in collaboration with colleagues in the European Chemicals Region network. Work on the impact of emissions trading on the industry would also continue, as would the whole question of energy in consultation with local MPs. DICIDA was only one of two UK organisations who contributed to the debate on Sustainable Technology Platforms and it was anticipated that further work in this area would be carried out in collaboration with European colleagues. Work would also continue on studies being undertaken by the European Chemical Regions Network and the North East was co-ordinating the study on skills; contributions to the innovations study; and on bringing back into use land contaminated with chemicals.

The Committee requested that an action plan be drawn up outlining the next stage of activity that could be undertaken by the Joint Strategy Unit/Joint Strategy Committee in support of the DICIDA initiative.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Consultation on Planning Application: Mixed Use Redevelopment to include residential, commercial, leisure, education, hotel, ancillary retail, landscaping and car parking at Middlehaven Central Industrial Area, on land bounded by Dock Street, Bridge Street, Cleveland/Durham Street and Vulcan Street, Middlesbrough (Application No. M/OUT/1990/05/P)

The views of the Joint Strategy Committee were requested regarding the consent of an outline planning application for the Phase 2 Development of Middlehaven, Middlesbrough which included:-

570 residential units
Commercial/office development
Museum/leisure attraction
Primary school
Retail and leisure uses
Hotel

The proposal broadly conformed with the local strategy of both Regional Planning Guidance for the North East and the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan. Middlehaven also formed a key site within the Stockton-Middlesbrough River Corridor Regeneration project outlined in the Tees Valley Vision.

While all the elements proposed were broadly accepted it was noted that the Borough Council would need to ensure that the housing development complemented the housing regeneration schemes and the retail element did not affect the vitality and viability of Middlesbrough town centre. Officers of the Joint Strategy Unit had also expressed some concerns regarding the projected low level of future background traffic growth on the existing road network given the large scale of the full development scheme and the possible effect on the A19/A66 junction, even taking into account planned highway improvements to the A66 Cargo Fleet and Hartington Interchange junctions and other surrounding roads.

RESOLVED that Middlesbrough Borough Council be informed of the following comments of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee regarding the outline planning application for mixed use development at Middlehaven Phase 2:-

- (i) The Joint Strategy Committee welcomes the proposed mixed use development at Middlehaven and recognises the valuable role the proposal will make to the successful regeneration of both Middlesbrough and the wider Tees Valley sub-region;
- (ii) The proposal broadly conforms with the locational strategy set out in Regional Planning Guidance for the North East and in the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan;
- (iii) The Middlehaven development forms a key element in the regeneration of the Stockton-Middlesbrough river corridor and will complement the revitalisation of Middlesbrough town centre;
- (iv) The Borough Council should ensure that the residential element of the proposal complements other housing regeneration initiatives both underway and planned; and
- (v) The Borough Council should be satisfied that retail development proposed within the Middlehaven scheme complements the vitality and viability of Middlesbrough town centre.

Consultation on Outline Planning Application: Erection of New Buildings for the use as retail warehouses within Use Class A1, together with alterations to existing retail warehouse units and associated infrastructure and landscaping works at Teesbay Retail Park, Brenda Road, Hartlepool (Application No. H/2005/5921)

The Joint Strategy Committee had been consulted on an outline planning application for the expansion and refurbishment of Teesbay Retail Park, Brenda Road, Hartlepool; such a proposal to include:-

- Refurbishment of 10 retail warehouse units (approximately 14,211 square metres)
- Erection of 8 retail warehouse units (6,480 square metres)
- 195 additional car parking spaces

The Committee was advised that the proposal did not conform with the locational strategy of both Regional Planning Guidance for the North East and the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan. The principle of sustainable development reinforced the need to make maximum use of town centres and the Hartlepool Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft therefore focused major shopping development in the primary shopping area and on the edge of centre followed by fringe sites in the overall town centre. Teesbay Retail Park was an out of centre site.

RESOLVED that Hartlepool Borough Council be informed of the following comments of the Joint Strategy Committee on the outline planning application for expanded retail warehouse development and associated car parking at Teesbay Retail Park:-

- (i) The proposal does not conform with the locational strategy set out in Regional Planning Guidance for the North East and in the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan;
- (ii) The Borough Council should be satisfied that the retail development proposed at Teesbay Retail Park complements the vitality and viability of Hartlepool town centre and complements other regeneration initiatives both underway and planned; and
- (iii) The Borough Council should recognise that it may be necessary to re-examine non-car travel mode assumptions on accessibility.

Projected Outturn Report 2005/2006

Consideration was given to the projected outturn position for the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit for 2005/2006.

At the present time there was an estimated underspend of £192,340; approximately £40,000 of which was due to protracted discussions relating to the management restructuring exercise which meant that a number of vacant posts had been frozen for some time. This amounted to around £140,000, but was offset by the provision of an additional £100,000 to cover estimated redundancy costs. The remaining underspend was primarily due to a successful funding claim against expenditure claim within many of the unit's project area.

Both income and expenditure had significantly greater than envisaged at the time the original budget had been approved and the major element of this was the amount carried forward (£980,735) from 2004/05 for the 'Real Time Information' project. It was noted that the costs of the Joint Waste Management Function provided by the Joint Strategy Unit from 1st October 2005 would be reflected in the next outturn figures.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

List of Meetings

Members received a comprehensive list of the meetings that had been attended by officers of the Joint Strategy Unit.

RESOLVED that the list of meetings be noted.

Western Area Partnership Board – 28th November 2005**Partnership Board Members**

Chair: Cllr Maureen Rigg (Egglescliffe Ward) **(MR)**
 Cllr A. G Turner – Egglescliffe Parish Council **(AGT)**
 Cllr J Beaumont – SBC **(JB)**
 Cllr P Addison – Yarm Town Council **(PA)**
 Nasser Hussain – **(NH)**
 Mick Burke – **(MB)**

Advisors/Observers

Sophie Richardson –SBC **(SR)**
 Jamie McCann – SBC **(JM)**
 Ian Tinney-Hunt – SBC **(ITH)**
 Liz Hegarty – NTPCT **(LH)**
 Peter Gill – NTPCT **(PG)**

Apologies

Andrew Robinson
 John Fletcher
 Angela Mackereth
 Carolynne Withers
 June Kneafsey
 Geoff Turner

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
1. Welcome and Introductions Members of the WAP were welcomed to the meeting		Noted	No	No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
2. Apologies Apologies noted		Noted	No	No	No	Sophie Richardson

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
						SBC 01642 526026
3. Minutes of Last Meeting Minutes of the last meeting were amended and agreed		Noted	No	No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
4. Acute Services Review A presentation was made by North Tees Primary Care Trust, the following comments were made: There has been very little consultation in Yarm / Ingleby. Concerns were raised regarding information and communication between sites. The reasons against the single hospital are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not enough money in Health Service at present ▪ Has not been very popular and are people willing to travel? ▪ Timescale – it will not answer today's problems 		A consultation is to be held on 16 th December at All Saints school and there have been several in Thornaby. The board was re-assured that the changes in Prof. Darzi's report should not affect medical staff reading and communication patients notes. Noted				

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
Feedback questionnaires from NTPCT						
<p>5. Waste Management A presentation was given by the Waste Management Team, the following comments were made:</p> <p>It would be nice to get plastic and cardboards collected.</p> <p>Is it going to be environmentally friendly to collect any more?</p> <p>Lichfield Council have a winning formulae in waste management, they collect waste once a fortnight but collect recycling once a week? Could this be something that SBC could look at?</p> <p>Timings of collections to be reviewed as some areas have to put their recycling bo</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				
<p>6. Housing Investments Report The purpose of the report was to advise the Western Area Partnership Board of the investment into social housing in that area of the Borough of Stockton and to highlight the contribution housing is making to regeneration in the Borough.</p> <p>Within the Western Area 56 properties over the last 10 years have been issued with Disabled Facilities Grants. A further 10 properties will receive benefit of these grants during 2005/06.</p> <p>Whitham House (sheltered housing) should have a</p>		Noted.	No	No	No	Ian Tinney – Hunt SBC 01642 526527

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
new land lord by January 2006. There is very minimal work happening within the Western Area compared to the rest of the Borough.						
7. Any Other Business None raised		Noted				
8. Date and Time of Next Meeting 23 rd January 2006 at 6.00 p.m. at the Clareville Hotel, Eaglescliffe.						

Northern Area (Billingham) Partnership Board – 12th December 2005

Members:

Manager: **Kevin Pitt** (KP)

Chair: John Tough (**JT**)

Roger Black (**RB**), Liz Smith (**LS**), Mark Leck (**ML**), Paul Harrison (**PH**), Joe Maloney (**JM**), Ken Ellis (**KE**), Colin Stratton (**CS**), Tim Sculley (**TS**), Michele Smith (**MS**), Ged McGuire (**GM**), Kevin Bowler (**KB**), and Geoff Harrison (**GH**),

Advisors/Observers

Nigel Laws -SBC

Neil Schneider –SBC

Ian Tinney-Hunt – SBC

Richard Bradley – SBC

Chris Hayward – SBC

Apologies

Cath Coldbeck, Cllr Keith Dewison, Sue Cash, Miriam Stanton and Cllr Barry Woodhouse.

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
1.Introductions and Apologies for Absence		Noted		No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
2. Approval of Minutes for Meeting on 14th November 2005. Pg 11, amend KAB to KB Minutes agreed as a true and accurate record.		Minutes amended Noted		No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
3. Area Housing Presentation Ian Tinney-Hunt, - Development and Regeneration Officer attended The purpose of this report is to: - Advise The Billingham Partnership of the investment into social housing in that area of the Borough of Stockton and, to highlight the contribution housing is making to regeneration in the Borough. Decent standard work has to be achieved by 2010 every council house in Billingham will be brought up to standard. . The decent standard is a Government		Noted Noted		No No	No No	Ian Tinney-Hunt SBC 01642 526527 Ian Tinney-Hunt SBC

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>determined standard</p> <p>50 apprenticeships in painting, decorating, joinery and plumbing have been established within the programme.</p> <p>The issue over Billingham's ageing population was raised and officers outlined a range of initiatives to help meet their housing needs</p> <p>TBP raised issues over the Morrisons site and if SBC can influence the type of housing</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>SBC can influence the type of design and range of housing at development sites.</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>01642 526527</p> <p>Ian Tinney-Hunt SBC 01642 526527</p> <p>Ian Tinney-Hunt SBC 01642 526527</p>
<p>4. Waste Management Presentation</p> <p>Richard Bradley – Care For Your Area Service Manager and Chris Hayward – Waste Management Officer attended.</p> <p>Current Issues are: Recycling Targets – struggling to be met Budget Pressures Rising Waste Tonnages</p> <p>What next? How can we recycle more and reduce amount of waste? 50% of what is in your bin can be recycled. Lichfield Council are recycling 45%.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Richard Bradley SBC 01642 527739</p> <p>Richard Bradley SBC 01642 527739</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>At present Care for Your Area are having consultations in order to meet recycling targets, raise awareness and education and reduce waste and improve recycling</p> <p>TBP made the following comments: Blue boxes are not very suitable</p> <p>Uncertainty regarding collections, calendars should be circulated to all residents</p> <p>Are there any education schemes to get children involved.</p> <p>There is too much packaging on products</p> <p>All comments raised at TBP will be emailed to the Care For Your Area team</p>		<p>A second wheel bin would have cost the council £1 million. Lids and additional blue boxes are available free of charge from SBC</p> <p>Calendars were sent out to public, action will be taken to ensure residents receive them for 2006</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Education school programmes is used with the mascot Freda the Frog</p> <p>This is an issue for the Government – councils can exert pressure</p> <p>Noted</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Richard Bradley SBC 01642 527739</p> <p>Richard Bradley SBC 01642 527739</p> <p>Richard Bradley SBC 01642 527739</p> <p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>
5. Neighbourhood Renewal Fund – Allocation and						

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>GH raised the issue regarding the boundary split in Low Grange How can one street be included and another not, even if they are within the same area of deprivation.</p> <p>How much difference is the money actually making?</p>		<p>This because the Government sets the boundaries to narrow the gap. The SOA are based on populations.</p> <p>It is making a long term difference. The whole programme is aimed at narrowing the deprivation gap</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Rebecca Guest SBC 01642 526033</p> <p>Rebecca Guest SBC 01642 526033</p>
<p>7. Matters Arising a. Town Centre Developments</p> <p>Nigel Laws - Town Centres and Major Projects Officer, Neil Schneider –Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services.</p> <p>Council Officers are currently assessing the legal and financial implications of outline proposals submitted by Halladale. Further consultation will therefore not be conducted until a satisfactory detailed appraisal of the proposals has been achieved. Regular meetings are being held with Halladale and La Salle Investments (Mars Agents) to discuss options for taking the proposal forward.</p> <p>TBP requested if they could see current plans by Halladale</p> <p>The Business Association sent a letter to the Evening Gazette which has not yet been published yet. This letter can be found on Billingham Talk</p>		<p>NL will issue a statement regarding the current position and lockout agreement to TBP</p> <p>NL said Once viable plans were available this would be a priority</p> <p>JT to chase the Evening Gazette</p>	<p>NL</p> <p>NL</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <p>John Tough TBP 07963481941</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>c) Billingham House Council Officers are currently exploring different options for facilitating the development of this site after meeting with a former employee of ICI who is knowledgeable of Billingham House and the Health and Safety Executive. Brossley homes have indicated that they are intending to submit a planning application for residential development on the site within the next few days. To date, the HSE has advised against development on this site other than for industrial or business use, or up to 30 dwellings. Should this HSE stance not change and planning permission be not granted, then the Council will serve a Section 79 notice on the owners.</p> <p>At a recent network meeting, the Manager from Brossley Homes attended and was very confident of HSE support for the proposal.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>d) Acute Services Review Update Consultation finishes on 23rd December 2005.</p> <p>A collective response from TBP should be sent in before the consultation deadline</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Can all members please send their comments to Kevin Pitt</p>	All TBP	No	No	Kevin Pitt TBP 07899945307
<p>e) Performance Management Framework This has been circulated to all members and completed questionnaires to be sent to KP</p>		Thanks for all responses		No	No	Kevin Pitt TBP 07899945307

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>8. Thematic Groups KP circulated a thematic group membership form for all of the board to completed and return to KP.</p> <p>Liveability GH is the representative on this group. The liveability group is going to write to Neighbourhood Renewal requiring funding for Supporters of John Whitehead Park group.</p> <p>Economic Regeneration and Transport LEGI was raised. SMI are putting in for £60 million over the next ten years. This is £6 million a year to encourage new start businesses to employ more people</p>		<p>Board agreed that the Executive Group could make a decision on this</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>GH was commended on all his hard work and commitment to the thematic groups he was involved in.</p>	Executive Group	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Kevin Pitt TBP 07899945307</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>9. Information Updates</p> <p>f. Community Sector Billingham North Residents Association were put forward for a PANDA award and won 1st prize for work on Cowbridge Beck</p> <p>g. Voluntary Sector Nothing to report</p> <p>h. Business Sector There is a meeting to discuss the context of the open letter to the Evening Gazette. The letter was endorsed by LS and Bob Cook.</p> <p>Three shop units have been let. One is currently trading while the other is waiting refurbishment.</p>		<p>SR to write a letter of congratulations</p> <p>JT read out the letter to the group. It has not yet been published.</p> <p>Noted</p>	SR	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>
<p>10. Visioning JT will be planning an away day to get the priorities down to 2 per sector and from this create a strategy for next two years, which should consist of 3 main priorities. It is vital that an action plan is created. It is also believed that TBP should have a funding strategy.</p>		Noted		No	No	<p>John Tough TBP 07963481941</p>
<p>11. Chairs Report Renaissance Community Empowerment Network minutes were circulated. Funding from GONE has been reduced to £105 000.</p>		Noted		No	No	<p>John Tough TBP 07963481941</p>
<p>12. Any Other Business Safer Stronger Communities. Information circulated to TBP. John Angus will be</p>		Noted		No	No	

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>attending the January meetings. Once LAP's established then necessary course of action to be taken. Once LAP is agreed TBP need to monitor this.</p> <p>Agenda Too many presentations on the agenda</p> <p>No Managers report on the agenda</p> <p>Why does KP attend the Area Chairs meeting when he is now Manager?</p>		<p>In future only 1 presentation per meeting</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>KP acts in the capacity of a support of Support Officer for TBP along with Lesley Dale from SBC</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>John Angus SBC 01642 526499</p> <p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p> <p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p> <p>Kevin Pitt TBP 07899945307</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Managers Post</p> <p>At present KP is temporary Manager until April. The post needs to be advertised soon in order to have a replacement waiting.</p> <p>At present KP works 16 hours a week with his core day being a Thursday.</p> <p>TBP needed to discuss the details of the Managers post in a closed meeting.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>		<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	
TBP meeting was closed to the Public						
<p>TBP discussed the details of the Managers post. Manager should only deal with strategic issues.</p> <p>The Board agreed the following:</p> <p>Managers role to be retained, this will be on a part time basis working 16 hours a week.</p> <p>A representative from Bede College, SBC and TBP to discuss job descriptions, advertisings and interview panel.</p> <p>New manager to be in place by April</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>SR to arrange representatives to meet and look into costs for advertising.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>SR</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>

Eastern Area Partnership Board – 20th December 2005

Members:

Chair: Graeme Oram **(GO)**Irene Machin **(IM)**, Cllr Kevin Faulks **(KF)**, PC Kevin Stockney **(KS)**, Derrick Brown **(DB)** and John Lynch **(JL)** and Cllr Beryl Robinson **(BR)****Advisors**Stuart Levin **(SL)**Ian Tinney Hunt **(ITH)**Greg Brown **(GB)**Haleem Ghafoor **(HG)**Sophie Richardson – **(SR)****Apologies**

Cllr Andrew Larkin

Cllr Ross Patterson

Julie Pearly

Cllr Kenneth Dixon

Linda Russell – Bond

CS = Community Sector

PCT/PUB = Primary Care Trust/Public Sector

PS = Private Sector

Stockton Police/PUB = Stockton Police/Public Sector

SBC/PUB = Stockton Borough Council/Public Sector

VS = Voluntary Sector

JS+/PUB = Job Centre Plus

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
1. Welcome and Introductions Introductions from those who attended were made.		Noted		No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
						01642 526026
2. Apologies Apologies were noted and recorded.		Noted		No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
3. Minutes of Last Meeting Minutes of the last meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.		Minutes Agreed		No	No	Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
4. Matters Arising Peter Sellar attended the last meeting to discuss the Children and Young Peoples Plan. It was discussed that a draft would go to consultation on 1 st December. A draft has not been seen. Acute Services feedback forms were sent to SR who has forwarded these on the NTPCT		Noted Noted	GO to chase	No No	No No	Graeme Oram 5 Lamps 01642 608316 Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
5. Housing Investments Report Report was circulated to the EAPB the following comments were raised: Apprenticeships for young people have been put in place but are there anything for adults At present there are 3 people within the Stainsby Hill area which are classed as homeless. What help is available? Concerns about the physical appearance of some of the properties were raised.		There is also an adult return to work scheme set up. DB to pass details onto ITH ITH has written to all landlords requesting a programme of works within the next five years.		No No No	No No No	Ian Tinney Hunt SBC 01642 526527 Ian Tinney Hunt SBC 01642 526527 Ian Tinney Hunt SBC

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
covered by the EAPB						01642 526527
<p>6. Transport Strategy: Key Priorities for Action</p> <p>At the last meeting a long list of priorities were given to EAPB. GO met with the Transport team from SBC and agreed that this would go to public consultation in November. The response to these consultations were very low.</p> <p>The top five priorities have been agreed and will be sent out at the next meeting.</p>		<p>The exhibitions for the consultation were not manned and it was thought this was a major factor to the low number of responses.</p> <p>Agreed</p>		No	No	
<p>7. Thornaby Local Action Plan</p> <p>HG gave a brief introduction to the EAPB. All board members had received a copy of the Thornaby Local Action Plan at the last meeting and it has been agreed that any issues / queries would be raised at this meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed at Renaissance that LAP should be completed for Neighbourhood Renewal areas. Consultation has been carried out.</p> <p>The LAP will be updated every 6 months. The six themes are: Community Safety and Well Being Housing Education and Lifelong Learning Environment and Transport</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>		No	No	<p>Haleem Ghafoor SBC 01642 528677</p> <p>Haleem Ghafoor SBC 01642 528677</p> <p>Haleem Ghafoor SBC 01642 528677</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Health and drugs Jobs and Business</p> <p>Next year Neighbourhood Renewal will be issued with more pots of money which will be available to be spent on the top 10% most deprived areas. This will include Holmes and Middlefield and Lower Thornaby.</p> <p>It was stated that no Neighbourhood Renewal Fund was available for Ingleby Barwick. EAPB are to make it a priority to raise the profile of Ingleby Barwick and to find funding to produce an action plan.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>What area is meant by Lower Thornaby?</p> <p>It would be good to create an Action Plan for Ingleby Barwick, using the same headings as the Thornaby LAP</p>	<p>HG to follow up GO to look into</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Haleem Ghafoor SBC 01642 528677 Haleem Ghafoor SBC 01642 528677 Graeme Oram Five Lamps 608316</p>
<p>8. Thematics Update IM has not been to the Liveability meetings as of late, but will be attending in the future.</p>		<p>There needs to be better links between the EAPB and the Thematic Groups</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>9. Eastern Area Board – Members Update Nothing to report</p>				<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>10. Any Other Business The Post Office - Thornaby Branch. Information regarding the changes to this branch were circulated to EAPB. The following queries were raised: Is there a guarantee that staff will be kept on.</p>		<p>SR to write a letter on behalf of the EAPB to say they are grateful for the reassurance and improved service but concerned with the changes to staff</p>	<p>SR</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
Thornaby Town Hall This needs to be on the agenda at each meeting with an update for the EAPB		SR to speak to Derek Lincoln from SBC to attend next meeting	SR			Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
11. Date of Next Meeting 31 st January 2006 at 17.30 – Five Lamps						Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026

1030 2006/07 Local Transport Capital Settlement

Consideration was given to a report that informed Members of the Local Transport Capital Settlement for 2006/07, and outlined its implications for the Council.

Members were reminded that the Borough Council's 2005 Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report (APR) was submitted to the Government Office for the North East (GO-NE) and the Department for Transport (DfT) on 30 June 2005. The APR had detailed progress made against the targets set in the Council's First Local Transport Plan for the five-year period from 2001 to 2006.

Members were reminded that the Council's 'Provisional' Second Local Transport Plan had been submitted to GO-NE and the DfT on 29 July 2005. The Provisional Plan set out the 'blueprint' for the development of the Borough's transport network over the five-year period from April 2006 to March 2011, and had been the subject of Reports to Cabinet on 7 April and 16 June 2005 (Minutes nos. 1090 and 67 refer respectively). The 'final' Local Transport Plan was the subject of a separate Report to this meeting.

The Council's 2006/07 Local Transport Capital settlement had been received in a letter from GO-NE dated 14 December 2005. A copy of this letter was provided to Members.

A summary of the 2006/07 settlement was provided together with a comparison with the settlements for the other Tees Valley authorities. The key points were highlighted:-

- a) The Council's Annual Progress Report 'score', based on an assessment against the criteria contained in guidance issued by Central Government in February 2005, increased from 72% in 2004 to 89% in 2005. As a result of this increase, the Council had moved from the 'Average' to 'Excellent' category for all authorities producing Local Transport Plans. A table showing the authority standing 7th out of 85 nationally was provided.
- b) The overall settlement for 2006/07 was £3.499 million.
- c) The South Stockton Link continued to be supported in full: the allocation for 2006/07 was £0.055 million, whilst an additional £0.509 million had been secured for the current (2005/06) financial year. Approval was sought for the 'ring fencing' of these allocations to allow completion of the scheme.
- d) The Council's allocation for Structural Maintenance (which comprised Highway Maintenance and Bridge Assessment & Strengthening) was £1.310 million.
- e) The allocation for Integrated Transport (which covered all other areas of capital expenditure) was £2.134million. This allocation included an additional £237,000 – or 12.5% - to reflect the Council's excellent performance in 2004/05.

The indicative distribution for integrated transport allocation was provided. As in previous years, the details of the 2006/07 Capital Programme would be determined in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport.

- f) The indicative distribution under structural maintenance allocation was provided. Again, the details of the 2006/07 Capital Programme would be determined in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport.
- g) A guideline figure of £8.454 million had been secured for Integrated Transport over the four financial years from 2007/08 to 2011/11 inclusive.
- h) All 'Provisional' LTPs submitted nationally had been assessed by the DfT and placed within one of three categories: 'Very Promising', 'Promising' and 'Needing Substantial Improvement'.

The Council was one of 59 authorities nationally to achieve 'Promising' status for its Provisional LTP. Only one authority in the North East – Redcar and Cleveland – achieved 'Very Promising' status.

The Council's 'Final' Local Transport Plan, which was due to be submitted to GO-NE and the DfT by March 2006, was the subject of a separate Report to this meeting.

The overall financial position for the Borough Council in this area was as follows:

Category	(£000s)
Major Schemes:	
SCE (R) (Supported Capital Expenditure - Revenue)	55
Block Allocations:	
SCE (R) (Supported Capital Expenditure - Revenue)	3444
Total Capital Funding for Local Transport	3499

The Council's Second Local Transport Plan was based on a series of key objectives, together with targets against which progress towards those objectives could be measured. As future capital funding would be directly influenced by performance against these targets, the proposed distribution of the 2006/07 settlement reflected the overriding need to ensure that they will be met by the end of the Plan period.

RESOLVED that

- Members note that the Council's 2005 Annual Progress Report has been scored at **89%** - up from 72% in 2004 - and is one of only 11 nationally assessed as '**Excellent**';
- Members note that the Council's 'Provisional' Second LTP has been assessed as '**Promising**';
- Members note that a total of **£3.499 million** has been secured for the 2006/07 financial year, comprising **£2.134 million** for Integrated Transport Schemes, **£1.31 million** for Structural Maintenance and **£0.055 million** towards the completion of the South Stockton Link;
- Members note that an additional **£0.509 million** has been secured for the South Stockton Link in 2005/06;
- Members note that a guideline figure of **£8.454 million** has been secured for Integrated Transport Schemes over the four years from 2007/08 to 2010/11;

RECOMMENDED to Council that

- Members note the Council's Local Transport Capital Settlement for 2006/07, and recommend to Council the allocations as shown below:

Category	(£000s)
a) <u>Major Scheme:</u>	
South Stockton Link	55
b) <u>Block Allocations:</u>	
Structural Maintenance	1310
Integrated Transport	2134
TOTAL	3499

- Subject to Council approval of Recommendation (6) above, the Corporate Director for Development and Neighbourhood Services be authorised to approve the 2006/07 Local Transport Capital Programme and associated

financial appraisal in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport

8. That the indicative distribution of the Integrated Transport block, as set out in **Appendix 5**, be approved; and
9. That the indicative distribution of the Structural Maintenance block, as set out in **Appendix 6**, be approved.

1031 LTP2 – The Second Stockton on Tees Local Transport Plan

Consideration was given to a report that sought approval of the draft 'Final' LTP2 document as the basis of the Council's submission to the Department for Transport and the Government Office for the North East on 31 March 2006.

The first Stockton-on-Tees Local Transport Plan (LTP1) was submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) and the Government Office for the North East (GO-NE) in July 2000.

Progress against the Plan was monitored through a series of Annual Progress Reports. The 2005 assessment was based not only on performance, but also on the quality of the 'Provisional' Second Local Transport Plan, which was submitted to the DfT and GO-NE in July 2005. The Council was awarded a rating of 89% and placed in the 'Excellent' category for the 2005 Annual Progress Report and the quality of the Provisional Second Local Transport Plan was assessed as 'Promising'. Both of these ratings had contributed towards the Council's score under the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) framework.

Cabinet was reminded that it had approved the policy content of the draft 'Provisional' Second Local Transport Plan on 7 April 2005 (Minute no. 1090 refers) and the capital element of the submission on 16 June 2005 (Minute no. 67 refers). The final 'Provisional' plan was submitted to the Department for Transport and the Government Office for the North East on 29 July 2005.

In September 2005, Officers from the Council received detailed feedback on the Provisional LTP from GO-NE. The feedback was generally positive, and GO-NE acknowledged that the Council had considered transport in its widest context - specifically, how transport was considered and influenced in the delivery of agendas within other service areas - and that the Plan showed a strong corporate theme. However, GO-NE stated that the plan needed to be strengthened by increasing the evidence base underpinning its development.

Based on this feedback, officers had restructured the Final LTP to ensure that the robust evidence base, which informed the transport agenda, had been included and set out in a clearly defined manner. A summary of how the Final LTP had been restructured was provided for Members.

Work was nearing completion on the full 'Final' LTP and approval was sought for officers to complete the drafting of the Plan and submit it to Government by the 31 March 2006 deadline.

The LTP would be the Council's main means of securing capital funding for transport schemes over the five financial years between April 2006 and March 2011. This funding would generally be allocated under three headings:

- a) Major Schemes (i.e. schemes valued at £5 million and over)

Bids under this heading were assessed on a case-by-case basis, with an annual decision round.

- b) Integrated Transport ('block' allocation)

Funding under this heading was determined by a national formula. The Council's actual Integrated Transport settlement for 2006/07, and its indicative allocations under this heading for the four financial years thereafter, were the subject of a separate report to this meeting. Details of the implementation programme for the period of the Second Local Transport Plan were provided

c) Structural Maintenance ('block' allocation)

Funding under this heading is also determined by a national formula. The Council's actual Structural Maintenance settlement for 2006/07 was also the subject of a separate report to this meeting.

Officers recommended to Members that two Major Schemes be taken forward to the stage of bidding to Government during the period of the Second LTP. These schemes were:

(i) Tees Valley Bus Network Review

The Tees Valley Bus Network Review was commissioned jointly by Stockton-on-Tees, Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, Darlington and Redcar & Cleveland Borough Councils, all of whom were committed to tackling the long-term decline in bus patronage and the increasing instability of the local bus network.

The five Councils had agreed to submit a joint major scheme bid to the DfT. Council Funding of £30,000 in 2006/07 was required to meet the initial preparation costs that would be incurred by the Council in developing the scheme sufficiently to allow a major scheme bid to be submitted to the Department for Transport. At the present time, evaluation of the total preparatory costs was being considered and this was likely to be a maximum of £100,000.00 over 2006/07. Under current DfT guidelines, up to 60% of the preparatory costs - including detailed design and preparation of scheme appraisal - MAY be recoverable provided that the bid was successful.

Cabinet were informed that this scheme had been recognised as an early priority for funding by the Regional Transport Board.

(ii) East Billingham Transport Corridor

The Council was currently evaluating proposals for a new road linking the A1046 west of Haverton Hill through to the A1185 north of Cowpen Bewley. The primary aim of the route was to remove existing through traffic, including HGVs carrying hazardous chemicals, from residential areas of Billingham and The Clarences.

Council Funding of £300,000 was required to meet the preparation costs that would be incurred in developing the scheme sufficiently to allow a major scheme bid to be submitted to the DfT. This preparatory work would include carrying out detailed traffic modelling, route evaluation, public consultation and a full environmental impact assessment of the preferred alignment. Under current DfT guidelines, up to 60% of the preparatory costs - including detailed design and preparation of scheme appraisal - MAY be recoverable provided that the bid was successful.

It was pointed out that this scheme had not been recognised as an early priority for funding by the Regional Transport Board. However, Officers had challenged the Regional Transport Board's appraisal of the scheme benefits and a response was awaited.

Members were informed that an integral part of the development process for the Second LTP had been the Area Transport Strategies. A strategy had been developed for each of the four areas based on the Renaissance Local Area Partnership boundaries.

Cabinet noted that The Second Local Transport Plan was supported by a series of 'Daughter' Strategies, all of which were complementary to the Plan and had been instrumental in its development. The names of those documents were provided as follows those highlighted in bold were a mandatory requirement under the Guidance published by the DfT.

- Long-Term Transport Strategy
- Accessibility Strategy
- Public Transport Strategy

- Road Safety Strategy
- Cycling Strategy
- Walking Strategy
- Powered Two-Wheelers Strategy
- Freight Strategy
- Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan
- Transport Asset Management Plan
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

The Action Plans within each of these Strategies formed the basis for the delivery of the objectives set out in the LTP itself.

The consultation process for the development of both the 'Provisional' and 'Final' Local Transport Plan was divided into four distinct elements and details were provided to Members.

It was explained that the objective of EU Directive 2001/42/EC (the 'SEA Directive'), which came into force on 21 July 2004, was:

'To provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans...with a view to promoting sustainable development, by ensuring that, in accordance with this Directive, an environmental assessment is carried out of certain plans...which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.'

A Provisional Environmental Report, prepared following consultation with English Heritage, English Nature, the Countryside Agency and the Environment Agency, was submitted in parallel with the Provisional LTP in July 2005. A Final Environmental Report, assessing the environmental impact of the measures proposed in the Final LTP, was currently in preparation and would be submitted in parallel with the Final LTP in March 2006.

RECOMMENDED to Council that

1. ***The draft 'Final' LTP2 document, summarised in Appendix 1 to this Report, be approved as the basis of the Council's submission to the Department for Transport and the Government Office for the North East on 31 March 2006;***
2. ***Subject to approval of Recommendation (1), the Corporate Director for Development and Neighbourhood Services be authorised to complete and submit the full 'Final' LTP2 document in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport;***

RESOLVED that

3. Members note the current position with regard to potential Major Scheme bids within LTP2, in particular the East Billingham Transport Corridor and the public transport scheme arising from the Tees Valley Bus Network Review;
4. Members note that both Major Schemes will require Council capital funding to take them forward to a stage suitable for bidding to Government, and that internal bids have been submitted on this basis;
5. Members note that the Tees Valley Bus Network major scheme has been recognised as an early priority for funding by the Regional Transport Board, however at the present time the East Billingham Transport Corridor scheme has not been recognised as an early priority for funding and officers have challenged the appraisal results with the Regional Transport Board.
6. Members note both major schemes remain a priority for the Borough Council and, subject to Recommendation (4) above, both schemes will be promoted through the Regional Transport Board;
7. Members note that four Area Transport Strategies have been developed in partnership with the Area Boards of Stockton Renaissance. These Strategies

have been endorsed by the Full Renaissance Board, and form part of the Final LTP2 submission; and

8. Members note the requirement for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of LTP2, and the progress made to date in this regard.

1032 The Stockton on Tees Local Development Framework- The Revised Development Scheme

Consideration was given to a report that sought approval of the Revised Local Development Scheme. The Local Development Scheme was the project plan and timetable for the various documents that would be prepared and collectively comprise the Stockton-on-Tees Local Development Framework.

The Local Development Framework was an umbrella term, which in effect comprised a series of documents or 'Local Development Documents' made up of : -

- Statutory topic / thematic based Development Plan Documents
- Non-statutory Supplementary Planning Documents
- A statutory Statement of Community Involvement identifying those stages when the public and stakeholders can formally engage in the Local Development Framework

In March 2005, the Council had adopted its first LDS and work had commenced on its implementation. However, the LDS was not set in stone and could be amended at any point. Good project management dictated that it should be continuously monitored to take cognisance of slippages within the timetable and to respond to new and emerging priorities. This had been formally undertaken through the Local Development Framework's Annual Monitoring Report (adopted in December 2005).

The Annual Monitoring Report concluded that the following issues should be formally incorporated into the Revised LDS : -

- Amendments to the timescales for the completion of both the Core Strategy Development Plan Documents
- The formal extension of the Yarm Action Area Plan to provide a policy framework for the Eaglescliffe area
- The preparation of a Tees Valley wide Waste and Minerals Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Documents. These were to be co-ordinated by the Joint Strategy Unit on behalf of the Tees Valley Authorities
- The preparation of the following non-statutory Supplementary Planning Documents
 - Parking and Accessibility Standards
 - Conservation Areas
 - Boathouse Lane Planning and Design Brief
 - Planning Obligations

A draft of the Revised Local Development Scheme was provided to Members and set out a synopsis of each document listed above, in addition to those documents the Council has already committed itself to prepare.

The Local Development Scheme was neither the subject of independent testing nor public consultation. However, upon adoption, it would be made publicly available and posted on the Council's website.

Prior to formal adoption of the Revised LDS, Government Office for the North East (GONE) would be formally required to assess and approve it to ensure that it is realistic in all respects. Equally, the Planning Inspectorate (PINs) would need to be assured that the timescales proposed were appropriate and realistic and accorded with their own work programmes. Formal approval had not been sought from either body. However, informal officer discussions had been held with GONE regarding the future documents to be prepared, and to date no concerns had been raised.

To avoid excessive delays in adopting the Revised LDS, authorization was sought for delegated powers to be given to the Head of Planning to liaise directly with both

GONE and PINs to amend the Revised LDS (as directed) and to formally adopt it in consultation with the Chair of Planning and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Transport

RESOLVED that

1. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning (HOP) to secure agreement from both Government Office North East and the Planning Inspectorate and to amended the revised LDS as appropriate in the light of their comments, or as deemed necessary by HOP, in preparation of the LDS for submission to the Secretary of State.

RECOMMENDED to Council that

2. The content of the Revised Local Development Scheme, including any necessary changes coming from the exercise of the delegation detailed in (1) above, be endorsed and formally approved.
3. It endorses the delegation to HOP (in consultation with Chair of Planning and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Transport), by Cabinet and Council, of the authority to make a resolution to adopt and bring into effect the revised LDS, on a date to be determined by HOP, upon the conclusion or expiry of the Secretary of State's consideration of the revised LDS, including the variation of the Scheme to give effect to any directions of the Secretary of State and all other decisions necessary to bring the revised LDS into effect.
4. Delegated authority be given to the HOP to amend, modify, vary, or revoke the revised LDS or parts thereof, to give effect to the requirements of the Secretary of State, or as otherwise deemed necessary, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee.

1033 Stockton on Tees Local Plan: Alteration No.1 Summary of Representation to the Proposed Modification and the Intention to Adopt.

Consideration was given to a report that summarised the responses received to the statutory Proposed Modifications of Alteration Number 1 to the Local Plan and sought formal sanction for its adoption.

Members were reminded that in October 2005, it considered and endorsed a series of statutory Proposed Modifications to Alteration Number 1 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan. Those Modifications had been prepared having regard to the Inspector's recommendations into objections received to the Deposit Draft (September 2003), the Revised Deposit Draft (June 2004) and two proposed pre-inquiry changes documents.

Following the formal consultation period 6 (six) responses had been received from 6 individuals / organisations, but no formal objections have been received.

It therefore remained that as the final step in the adoption of Alteration Number 1, Members needed to consider the following issues : -

- a) the need to hold a further inquiry against any new issues raised by the Proposed Modifications or to the fact that the Council chose not to accept any of the Inspector's recommendations ~ since no objections have been received, there was no such need
- b) whether there were any further amendments required to the Proposed Modifications prior to its formal adoption ~ during the course of the consultation, it became apparent that the reasoned justification (ie supporting text to Policies S4 and S5) were not accurate. It was therefore proposed to amend paragraphs 21 and 25 as follows :-

"21. Office uses (falling within use class A2) and food and drink outlets (use class A3, A4 and A5) contribute to the range of facilities available in the PSF, playing a key role in maintaining a diverse and commercially prosperous centre. However, retail floor space is at a premium within the PSF and national banks; offices and food and drink outlets are already well represented in this frontage. As at July 2003, non-retailing uses accounted

for some 10% of the total length of the Primary Shopping Frontage. As at August 2005, non-retailing uses accounted for some 10.8% of the total length of the Primary Shopping Frontage, therefore indicating that there is no capacity for further changes of use from A1 to non-A1 uses.”

“25. The Council recognise that a diversity of uses have their place within the Centre, complementing the functions of the retail sector and can make the Town Centre more attractive to residents, shoppers and tourists. As at July 2003, non-retailing uses accounted for some 40% of the total length of the Secondary Shopping Frontage. As at August 2005, non-retailing uses accounted for some 50.6% of the total length of the Secondary Shopping Frontage, therefore indicating that there is no capacity for further changes of use from A1 to non-A1 use.”

It was pointed out that the additional alterations would **not** in any way materially affect the integrity of the Policies themselves. Policies S4 and S5 remained unchanged. To that end, it was **not** considered that the minor changes required any further consultation.

Should Council adopt Alteration Number 1, it would immediately form part of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan, replacing and supplementing the 1997 adopted policies. Simultaneously, the Authority would be required to :-

- publish a notice in the London Gazette and local press for two successive weeks giving notice both of the Alteration's adoption and that any person 'aggrieved' by the plan could challenge it through the High Courts within six weeks of the notice first being published
- make copies of the notice, copies of the adopted plan and associated reports available for inspection
- send copies of the notice to anyone who asked to be notified of the Alteration's adoption (*all previous respondents would be formally notified*)

RECOMMENDED to Council that

1. It notes the responses received to the Proposed Modifications to Alteration Number 1 of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan.
2. It approves the formal adoption of Alteration Number 1, together with the replacement text inserted as set out above.

1034 Stockton On Line

Cabinet were reminded that it had agreed in October to a review of Stockton Online to help formulate a way forward for community ICT provision in the Borough. Cabinet considered a report that outlined the current situation with regard to Stockton Online, feedback from the consultation review and presented options for the future.

A process of consultation in November with ward councillors, centre committees/organisations, staff and users generated over 80 responses, the majority of which were positive and indicated that the access and support was valued but it had also shown that membership figures at centres had fallen. The key messages were around:-

- the need for some open access
- learning opportunities and flexibility around joint initiatives
- integration into any development plans at the centres

Where some frustration was expressed was by the larger centres around the need for more flexibility around opening hours and the need for the centres to 'own' and have local determination of how the rooms were developed and ran.

Stockton Online had well developed links with the Borough Council's Library service as there was perceived to be mutual benefit in the provision of the Learn direct contract. However whilst there may have been a possibility of libraries hosting the Learn Direct contract there was no capacity for them to take on the running of SOL. Over time where there were library and Sol facilities in close proximity there was the

potential for some rationalisation of the facilities in the future. An example of this could be the Causeway facility, which was across the road from the library ICT provision.

Extended schools worked on the cluster core offers was underway and whilst discussion had taken place it was too early to say what facilities, including any ICT provision, would finally be negotiated with individual schools within the clusters. However mapping had been done of the key community ICT provision in the Borough and any extended school provision would be complementary to the existing service.

Cabinet considered 3 options for the future:

- Option 1 - Closure of the Service
- Option 2 - A reduced service
- Option 3 - Reconfiguration of the service

RESOLVED that

1. Cabinet, in principle, approve option 3, as detailed in the report.
2. Agreement of the detailed arrangements be delegated to the Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport.
3. Cabinet seeks the support of Renaissance for an NRF application to implement the new approach to the community ICT network.