

Cabinet

A meeting of the Cabinet was held on Thursday, 9th March 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 Allport, D Kitching (DNS), P. Sellar (CESC), J Danks, G. Canning (R), M Waggott, M Henderson (LD).

Also in attendance: Councillor Frankland, Luton and Mrs Rigg

1069 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Leonard declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in respect of the item 5, entitled 'Schools Organisation Plan 2006/09' as he was a school governor for a school in the Borough.

Councillor Gibson declared a personal/prejudicial interest in respect of item 6, entitled 'Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08', as he served on the Newtown Resource Centre's Management Board, which was referred to in the report.

Councillor Coleman declared a personal/prejudicial interest in respect of item 6, entitled 'Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08', as he served on the International Family Centre's Management Board, which was referred to in the report.

Councillor Nelson declared a personal/prejudicial interest in respect of item 6, entitled 'Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08', as he had served on The Forge Community Resource Centre's Board.

Councillor Leonard declared a personal/prejudicial interest in respect of item 6 entitled 'Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08' as he served on Hardwick in Partnership

Councillor Kirton declared a personal/none prejudicial interest in respect of item 6, entitled 'Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08' as he was a trustee of the Corner House Community Resource Centre.

Councillor Mrs. Cains declared a personal/none prejudicial interest in respect of item 6, entitled 'Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08', as her husband was a volunteer for Stockton District Information and Advice Service.

Councillor Mrs. Cains, Leonard, Johnson, Coleman and Mrs. O'Donnell declared a personal/non prejudicial interest in item 7, entitled, 'Concessionary Fares Scheme', as they or a relative, or friend either received, or were /would be entitled to receive (under the proposed scheme) concessionary travel benefits

Councillor Nelson declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of item 9 entitled 'Housing Capital Programme 2006/2007' as a result of his role as Council representative on the Tristar Management Board. Councillor Leonard also similarly declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest for the same reason; and also as a result of being a resident on the Hardwick Estate which was referred to within the proposed Housing Capital Programme.

Councillor Coleman declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of item 10 entitled 'Parkfield/Mill Lane Housing Regeneration Phase 2' as a result of his membership of the Parkfield/Mill Lane Neighbourhood Management Partnership. Councillors Nelson and Leonard each declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of this item as a result of their role as Council representatives on the Tristar Management Board.

Councillors Nelson and Leonard each declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of item 11 entitled 'Local Area Agreement' as a result of their role as Council representatives on the Tristar Management Board.

All Councillors present at the meeting were deemed to have a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of item 19 entitled 'Members Allowances-Review' as a result of their entitlement to receive such allowance.

1070 Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 9th and 23rd February were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

1071 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:-

Ash Trees Schooll -	Mr. J. Rowan
Blakeston School	Mr. J. Beall Mr G Pickup
Fairfield Primary School	Mrs L. Emmerson
The Glebe Primary School	Cllr R. Cains Mrs. V. Fletcher
Whinstone Primary School	Mr. G. Prest
William Cassidi CE primary School	Mrs V. Fletcher
Wolviston Primary School	Mr Harrison Mullen

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1072 Schools Organisation Plan 2006/09

Cabinet considered a report relating to the Council's School Organisation Plan (SOP) 2006 – 09. It was explained that the Children's Act 2004 repealed the statutory requirement for a SOP, but the need to plan the provision of school places remained. The Authority was under a duty to ensure a sufficient supply of early years and school places, and the level of surplus school places was monitored by the Department for Education and Schools and as part of Comprehensive Performance Assessment and Joint Area Review (JAR) processes. Much of the data previously published in the SOP would therefore continue to be gathered and analysed, and there seemed no good reason to withhold this information from publication.

The SOP set out, for the information of schools, parents and the general public:

- the Council's policies in relation to the provision of early years and school places;
- data including the number of places in schools maintained by the Authority, the number of pupils in them, and projections for future pupil numbers;
- general conclusions on any need to add or remove school places.

The preparation of a new SOP for 2006 afforded an opportunity to review Council policy on school provision, which had remained essentially unchanged since 1999. There was a need to review policy in the light of national developments such as integrated services for children and young people, extended school opening, developments in the curriculum, reform of the school workforce, and increasing autonomy for schools. The Committee were provided with a copy of the draft SOP that had been circulated for consultation among schools and colleges. It included a new statement of policies and principles which reflected the changing national context.

It was proposed that the School Organisation Plan would be part of a network of service plans that would support the Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP). The SOP therefore adopted the same approach as the CYPP by looking over a three-year timescale at demand for school places in the five geographical integrated service areas: Billingham, Stockton north, Stockton central, Eaglescliffe and Yarm,

and Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby. Like the CYPP, the SOP would be updated annually for publication in April.

RESOLVED that the draft School Organisation Plan 2006 to 2009 be adopted and published on the Borough Council website on 1st April 2006

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1073 Voluntary Sector Support Fund Allocations 2006/08

Councillors Gibson, Coleman, Leonard and Nelson left the meeting room during consideration of this item.

Councillor Cook in the Chair

Cabinet considered a report that provided an interim review outlining changes to the sector, including new governance arrangements, since Cabinet at its meeting held on 11th November 2004 had agreed indicative allocations from the Council's Voluntary Sector Support Fund (VSSF) to the voluntary sector for core funding purposes.

Members were provided with background information about the fund and noted the importance of providing resource support to the sector.

The Council supported 13 organisations when the VSSF underwent a review in November 2004. In order to enable organisations to undertake suitable financial planning, Core Funding Agreements (CFA's) was provided annually. The CFA's prescribed all the obligations of the organisation in return for the funding, such as legal and financial requirements and the provision:

- Annual Reports
- Business Plans
- Audited accounts

The performance of the voluntary organisations benefiting from this support was monitored by the Council. The Core Funding Agreement required organisations to set yearly milestones and report progress. The milestones for 2005/6 and progress against them were provided for Members.

To address the national and local (raised in our Audit Commission Assessment) moves towards greater focus on governance arrangements a 'Code of Practice – Governance' had been developed with the core funded voluntary sector organisations. Compliance with the code was a pre-requisite for those receiving grants or support from the Council from April 2006.

The end of the Single Regeneration Budget funding and the Single Community Programme funding streams had contributed to financial difficulties for the two umbrella groups in the Borough, Stockton Voluntary Development Agency and Stockton Residents and Community Groups Association. An organisation review and development of a future strategy encompassing the rationale of both organisations was currently taking place to determine how they could work to best service the Voluntary and Community Sector in Stockton-on-Tees.

Members noted that following the liquidation of the Forge Community Resource Centre – the centre was temporarily being ran by Stockton Borough Council, however a longer term solution was required. The Forge Community Resource Centre was one of the recipients of the core funding. Similarly, following the liquidation of the Richard Hind Centre, the core funding allocation was provided to Stockton International Family Centre (SIFC) to maintain a community resource in the area. However the Richard Hind Centre had now been taken under the umbrella of Sure Start and the payment that SIFC would have received, had they retained the centre had been reviewed, and a one off payment of £25k allocated, pending a wider review of the funding later this year.

Discussions had been held with Newtown Community Resource Centre around undertaking management responsibility for the Forge Community Resource Centre. This would provide economies of scale through shared management across both centres and would be used to support the kick starting of activity, core-running costs and to continue a dedicated resource for the community. Therefore it was proposed

that an allocation of £50,000 p.a. be made to support Newtown Community Resource Centre and the Forge using the underspend from the VSSF. This would result in an overall saving to the Council budget of £10,000 on the anticipated spend this year on the Core Funding.

The Hardwick allocation would also need to be transferred to an appropriate delivery organisation in the area. This would be agreed through the Hardwick Community Partnership to ensure that an appropriate delivery agent was commissioned to address the key priorities in the area.

New milestones were being negotiated with the recipients of the VSSF to develop milestones to be contained within the CFA's which:

- (i) supported the delivery of borough wide strategies and outcomes
- (ii) made a contribution to the development of initiatives and
- (iii) improved the quality and life chances of the communities, which they served.

It was also proposed that Stockton Voluntary Development Agency (SVDA)/Stockton Residents and Community Groups Association (SRCGA), as one of the milestones within their Core Funding Agreement, provide a copy of their membership database annually to the Council to support the work around governance.

Whilst indicative allocations had been identified for 2007/08 in light of the emerging independent review of the SVDA and SRCGA it was proposed that a comprehensive review of the Voluntary Sector Core Fund takes place later this year when a clearer way forward had been identified by the Voluntary Community Sector for the core support functions of any umbrella organisation/s and how it would be delivered. It was proposed to present a paper back to Cabinet in September 2006 detailing changes in the sector. Furthermore in view of the enhanced governance arrangements being adopted by the Council it was hoped to develop a system whereby funding was allocated on a performance-based system.

RESOLVED that

1. funding from the Voluntary Sector Support Fund be approved for allocation to the Voluntary Sector for the financial year 2006/7 as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report and Core Funding Agreements (CFA) be extended for that period.
2. the allocations for 2006/7 as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report be approved subject compliance by recipients in meeting the 'Code of Practice – Governance'
3. the proposal from Newtown Community Resources Centre to manage both the Newtown Community Resource Centre and the Forge Community Resource Centre be supported and that an allocation of £50,000 from within the fund be approved.
4. approval for any changes within recommended allocations, plus or minus 10% of that detailed in Appendix 1, be delegated to the Corporate Director for Development and Neighbourhood Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport.
5. a comprehensive review of the Voluntary Sector Support Fund arrangements be undertaken and a report be brought back to Cabinet in September 2006 in light of the independent review of the Stockton Voluntary Development Agency (SVDA) and Stockton Residents and Community Groups Association (SRCGA) umbrella which is underway, governance issues and changes within the sector.
6. a condition of receipt of any Voluntary Sector Support Fund allocations, at least two elected Members or SBC Officers are provided with a place on the Board of recipient organisations.
7. a one off payment of £25k be allocated to Stockton International Family Centre pending a wider review of the voluntary sector support funding later this year.

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1074 Concessionary Fares Scheme

Councillor Gibson in the Chair

Cabinet considered a report that detailed an officer decision taken in accordance with the Council's Special Urgency rule. It was explained that the decision had agreed the reimbursement scheme for concessionary bus travel within Stockton and the Tees Valley for 2006/07.

The reasons why the decision had been a matter of urgency was that it had to be made, and a notice published regarding a proposed concessionary fares scheme for 2006/07, on or before 3 March 2006.

In March 2005 the government announced its intention to improve the statutory minimum scheme that must apply throughout England from 1st April 2006. The improved scheme would provide for free travel within the concession authority area (Stockton-on-Tees) between 9.30am and 11.00pm on weekdays and all day on weekends and Bank Holidays. Concession authorities were allowed to have enhancements in addition to the statutory scheme, but could not provide any concessionary scheme offering reduced entitlements. In November 2005, Cabinet approved negotiations with partner authorities with a view to seeking an enhanced concessionary travel scheme for the Tees Valley and instructed that a further report be submitted.

The consensus of the Tees Valley authorities was that a Tees Valley wide scheme should be adopted if possible because this would enable pass holders to make cross boundary journeys for no charge or at reduced rates. A Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Travel scheme had been negotiated with bus operators that individual Tees Valley local authorities could subscribe to. Each participating authority had still had to agree payments with operators for providing the enhanced scheme in its area. This retained transparency and the cost of participation to each authority could be identified. The agreement reached with local operators was provided to Members

Of the Tees Valley authorities, Hartlepool and Middlesbrough had, in principle, joined the scheme subject to approval. The position of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council was still to be determined. Darlington Borough Council had negotiated an entirely separate agreement with operators. For this reason, the agreement did not extend to providing free travel within or to/from Darlington. However, entitlement to travel to/from or within Redcar & Cleveland had been retained in the agreement in order to maintain entitlements secured under the present Goldcard scheme.

Guidance issued by the Department for Transport stated that concessionary travel authorities needed to determine final reimbursement arrangements before 3 March 2006. Because all major operators had signed up to the Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Travel scheme and agreed payments for participation, it had not been necessary to issue formal participation notices to any operator legally requiring it to participate. However it was recommended that details of the agreement were made available on the Council's website and that notices were placed in all major public buildings. It was also recommended that a leaflet be provided containing details of the scheme and how to obtain the concession.

An agreement had been secured with operators so that present Silver and Goldcard pass holders could use their passes to obtain free travel from 1st April. Silver and Goldcard passes would then be replaced at the usual time. However, it was noted that, at that time, a number of residents entitled to free concessionary travel, but who held neither a Silver or Goldcard pass may have been attracted by the enhanced scheme and would have wished to apply for a pass for 1st April. It was recommended that these residents were issued with a Goldcard pending the normal pass renewal. Under the Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Fare scheme, no charge would be levied for passes in 2006/07.

It was explained that the financial implications for the council of adopting the recommended Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Travel scheme were that it would place a substantial additional financial burden on the council in 2006/07, which had been offset by an additional allocation by the government to provide for free concessionary travel within the boundaries of Stockton-on-Tees after 9.30am on weekdays and all day on weekends and Bank Holidays. The total cost of providing the Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Travel scheme would be approximately

£2,321,000 not including administration and distribution costs for permits. This compared with payments to operators of £1,075,200 agreed for 2006/07, meaning additional operator payments of approximately £1,245,800 in 2006/07. Approximately £93,000 revenue previously obtained through the issue of Goldcard passes would also be lost to the council. The agreement fell within the range predicted in the November report to Cabinet of between £2.3 and £2.5 million per annum including administrative costs. It was still possible that additional costs would be incurred through new operators joining the scheme or through an operator increasing its concessionary patronage by in excess of 50%, but the financial risk to the authority was substantially less than an approach based on the number of trips made each month.

Because of the uncertainties attached to introducing free concessionary travel, bus operators had been unwilling to agree a scheme for payments beyond 2006/07. It was therefore recommended that a further report be presented to Cabinet detailing the operation of the Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Travel scheme during its first year and recommending its extension or the adoption of a replacement scheme from 1st April 2007.

RESOLVED that the following decisions, numbered 1 to 4, taken by the Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services, under the Special Urgency rule, be noted and endorsed:-

1. Approval is given to participation in the Tees Valley Enhanced Concessionary Travel scheme offering free travel within and between the areas covered by Stockton-on-Tees, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough and Redcar & Cleveland Borough Councils.
2. That the enhanced scheme operates for a one-year period commencing on 1st April 2006.
3. The agreement for the operation of the enhanced scheme attached as **Appendix 1** to this report is approved.
4. The approved scheme is published on the Council website and in all major public buildings with a leaflet and press release detailing the scheme and how to obtain the concession.
5. A further report be provided to Cabinet later this year recommending the scheme to be adopted after March 31st 2007.

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies in respect of decision 5

1075 Stockton Borough Open Space Audit

Cabinet considered a report invites Cabinet to note the Borough-wide Open Space Audit prior to its publication for public consultation. The Open Space Audit findings would inform future documents, local planning policy and strategies including *inter alia* the creation of minimum open space standards for use in Planning.

Members noted that Planning Policy Guidance 17 "Sport and Recreation" had set out Government policy on the subject of open spaces. In promoting sport and recreation in the widest sense, it required an audit of existing open space provision to be undertaken, having regard for its value as playing space as well as a wider visual and recreation amenity. A companion guide to guidance set out the framework for undertaking the Audit.

Following a pilot audit in Billingham in 2003, a comprehensive survey had been undertaken of all open spaces identified in a desk-top study and subsequent site visits.

The survey work has been completed and the findings analysed to produce an interim summary of findings for public consultation. It was explained that the resulting document was substantial and, to limit publication costs, a copy had been made available in the Members Library for some time and would be placed in each of Stockton, Billingham and Thornaby town centre libraries following this meeting.

Public consultation should help determine the needs and aspirations of local communities with regard to open space requirements and highlight whether existing open spaces provision, in terms of size, location and typology were appropriately fulfilling their needs. This knowledge could then be used to develop local space standards from which local policy could be informed.

Once the local space standards were developed they would be used as baseline data (which would be monitored regularly) to inform the Council of open space requirements and the needs of local communities when developing open space strategies and assessing planning applications.

RESOLVED that Cabinet note the report and approve the Open Space Audit prior to public consultation.

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1076 Housing Capital Programme 2006/07

Cabinet considered a report detailing the proposed Housing Capital Programme for the financial year 2006/07.

The decent standard works programme was being carried out over a 10-year period with an overall value of £163,215,000 and the Council was embarking on the 6th year of this programme and had made excellent progress in improving the council housing stock. By March 2006 £92,858,838 would have been invested in council homes bringing 62.49% of properties up to the decent standard.

Funding for the Council's decent standard works programme was met in part from the £63 million awarded as part of our ALMO bid. In addition funding for our Capital Programme was made up of capital receipts, major repairs allowance, and housing Single Housing Investment Programme allocations awarded by the Regional Housing Board. An exercise had been undertaken to determine investment priorities for our Council Housing Stock between 2006 and 2010/11. Clearly decent standard works continued to be the Council's main focus but additionally recent stock condition surveys had highlighted the need to invest in other urgent works such as lift replacement and structural repairs. Those additional works amounted to in excess of £7 million. On an annual basis the content of the programme varies dependent on the number of properties sold and on the individual property condition surveys. All the up to date information the Council had has been modeled into the forward programme and was reflected in the overall cost of the capital programme over the period up to 2010/11. Likewise the Council had remodeled the resources available, based on the latest right to buy figures, actual Regional Housing Board allocations and so forth. The capital requirements and funding over the period to 2010/11 were provided to Members.

It was pointed out that in order to ensure that the Council's investment priorities could be met, work had been undertaken with Tristar to re examine the content of the decent standard works. There were works such as internal door replacement which were not necessary to reach the ODPM's decent standard criteria but which had historically been undertaken. Agreement had been reached that this work would be omitted from the future programme to ensure savings.

Additionally the Council was mindful that tenants aspired to have replacement windows as part of improvement works, but again it was noted that window replacement was not automatically part of decent standard works as the judgement was about condition. To date, windows to 3,276 properties had already been replaced (some 28.20% of the overall stock) but the programme up to 2010/11 could not sustain a full window replacement programme. However, Tristar were to undertake a review of the current procurement process for decent standard and repair works as part of the development of a new procurement strategy and would be looking to determine efficiencies from this process which could be channeled back into the investment programme. The aim was to develop a full window replacement programme as part of the investment works post 2010/11 and advise members further on this at a later date.

Members noted that consideration had been given to making a revenue contribution to capital funding. Effectively this meant taking any surpluses above the agreed 3% balance and using it to pay for capital works. Housing Revenue Account balances

were affected by a number of facts including the number of properties sold under right to buy and available rental income. Tristar's performance of turning around vacant properties was increasing and through service improvement plan actions in this area Tristar were anticipating quicker turnaround times. This improvement had been modeled through the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan assumptions and this leaves the Council with some anticipated surpluses in each year. On this basis the Council had included in available resources a revenue contribution to capital of £1 million per year. Clearly there was some risk associated with this and the void performance would be closely monitored. Any changes to anticipated funding would be reported to Cabinet as part of the capital monitoring processes. Tristar Board had considered the draft programme and recommend that Cabinet approve the programme for 2006/07 at a value of £19,297,000. Programme content was detailed in the following table:

Work Content	Value of Work £
Decent Standard Works	13,486,100
DS works slipped forward	342,800
Heating Replacement	1,847,100
Stock Rationalisation	1,698,400
Other works	1,900,100
Major Structural Defects	460,000
Minus an adjustment for properties currently scheduled which will be sold in year and wont require decent standard works	-437,500
Total	£19,297,000

The Retained Housing Service also manage an element of the Capital programme, namely Private Sector Grant Work, Disabled Facilities Grants (private sector housing) And Housing Regeneration. On an annual basis the authority had to provide funding to ensure work could be undertaken to meet the growing needs within the following areas.

- *Disabled Facilities Grants (DGF)'s*
- *Private Sector Housing Renewal (PSHR)*
- *Housing Regeneration*

The Capital Programme required for the retained housing service was £11,928,500. Capital Programme for 2006/7 was as follows:

	Cost
Delegated to Tristar Homes Ltd.	
Decent Standard - Works to Council houses	£13,048,600
- Heating	£1,847,100
Void Refurbishment	£460,000
Stock Rationalisation / demolition	£1,375,900
Melsonby Court	£693,800
Prior Court	£548,900
Kennedy Lifts	£657,400
Slippage 2005/2006 – Decent Standard	£342,800
- Stock Rationalisation	£322,500
	£19,297,000
Retained HRA	
Adaptations (council housing)	£900,000
HECA	£56,500
	£956,500
Housing General Fund	
Private Sector Renewal Grants	£935,000
Disabled Facilities Grants (private sector housing)	£1,126,000

Mandale regeneration (includes repurchased council houses)	£2,090,000
Hardwick regeneration (includes repurchased council houses)	£1,725,000
Market restructuring - Parkfield 1	£2,847,000
- Parkfield 2	£2,249,000
	£10,972,000
TOTAL	£31,225,500

Funded from: -

Regional Housing Board SCE (R) HRA	£1,210,000
Regional Housing Board Grants - HMRF	£1,375,000
- SHIP 2	£2,882,000
ODPM Grants – DFG	£458,500
Major Repairs Allowance	£14,070,600
Usable Capital Receipts – RTB	£4,414,400
- Regeneration	£5,815,000
Revenue Contribution	£1,000,000
Total	£31,225,500

RESOLVED that

1. Members note the agreed Housing Capital Programme 2006/07 for works to council housing stock (delegated to Tristar Homes Board in the Management Agreement) and agree to the release of the required funding to Tristar of £19,297,000.
2. Members agree the remaining Housing Capital Programme for 2006/07 to the value of £11,928,500
3. Members agree the Stock Rationalisation Programme for 2006/07.
4. The Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services be authorised to approve the schemes and financial appraisals in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing.

The ‘call-in’ period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1077 Parkfield / Mill Lane Housing Regeneration Phase Two

Councillor Coleman left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Cabinet considered a report advising Members of the mechanism required for bring about the redevelopment of the Parkfield / Mill Lane Phase 2 regeneration area.

The Masterplan for the Parkfield / Mill Lane Regeneration Phase Two areas was previously endorsed by Cabinet on 3rd November 2005 and details of the redevelopment had been presented to Cabinet. In summary the scheme seeks to demolish approximately 193 properties and 7 commercial properties in order to regenerate and redevelop the area with a private developer partner and Registered Social Landlord (RSL). Since the last report to Cabinet, funding had been secured to commence the implementation of the scheme, and a phased programme of delivery had been developed.

During consultation with residents throughout the masterplan process officers had developed and tested potential relocation initiatives. The purpose of the relocation initiatives were to enable residents to relocate to alternative accommodation and ensure that any financial gap between the value of the two properties could be bridged.

“Parkfield Regeneration – Homes for All” was a bespoke package of relocation initiatives which built on the good practice already developed in the Parkfield Phase One area and the Mandale and Hardwick Regeneration Schemes. “Homes for All” offers residents (subject to eligibility) access to one of the following initiatives:

- Home Owners Relocation Scheme
- Purchase & Repair Scheme
- Shared Ownership Scheme
- Equity Share Scheme
- Early buy-back scheme
- Open Market Home Buy
- Housing Association property for rent
- Provision of financial advice.

Further detail outlining each initiative was provided to Members.

Members were asked to agree that delegated authority be given to the Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services and the Cabinet Member for Housing to develop any further relocation initiatives as required, as the scheme develops.

1. new-build Housing Association properties within the Phase Two area.
A formal financial appraisal of the scheme had been undertaken and funding had been secured from the Regional Housing Board to commence the acquisition of properties and commercial premises within the phase two area. However this funding was not sufficient to deliver all of the programme and there would be a gap in funding. To help bridge the gap Members were asked to agree that the Capital Receipts raised from the sale of the land could be ring-fenced to the regeneration scheme. A further report outlining the finances of the scheme would be presented to Cabinet following the appointment of the private developer partner.

In order to ensure that a sustainable community could be created, the housing re-provision within the new development would contain approximately 20% Housing Association properties (subject to successful bids for funding to the Housing Corporation).

Tees Valley Housing Group were the Councils selected Registered Social Landlord partner for the regeneration of Parkfield / Mill Lane.

To assist with the decantment of residents from existing properties, Members were asked to provide delegated authority to the Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Housing to develop a local lettings policy for the allocation of properties.

RESOLVED that

1. Members approve the relocation initiatives for the Parkfield Phase Two Regeneration scheme and delegate responsibility to the Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing to develop any further relocation initiatives as required.
2. Members approve the ring-fencing of Capital Receipts from the sale of land to ensure the scheme is self-financing.
3. Members delegate responsibility to the Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing to develop a local lettings policy for the allocation of new build Housing Association properties within the Phase Two area.

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1078 Local Area Agreement: 2006 Update

Cabinet considered a report that provided a summary of proposals for refreshing Stockton's Local Area Agreement for 2006.

Members were reminded that the pilot Local Area Agreement (LAA) for the Borough had been signed by Ministers in March 2005 and would run until March 2008 with an annual update built in.

There were two specific elements to LAAs:

- They focus on a range of agreed outcomes that are shared by all the delivery partners nationally and locally and which they all agree to work towards achieving.
- They simplify the number of funding streams from central Government going into the area, helping to join public services more effectively and allow greater flexibility for local solutions for particular local circumstances.

The Council's LAA had been operating for a year as one of the national pilots. During that time the Council had worked closely with Government Office for the North East in developing implementation plans. During the first year of the agreement, the Council's understanding of the aims and objectives of LAAs had developed. Rather than being merely a technical exercise in pooling of funds, LAAs aimed to more fundamentally challenge the nature of the relationship between Central and Local Government. Therefore the aims and objectives of the 2006 update focused on the core objective of improving local services by devolving power and control from central government to localities. The simplification of funding streams was a core element of devolution. In addition the Council had requested, as part of its updated agreement, a core set of freedoms and flexibilities from centrally imposed red tape.

The Council had reviewed the current agreement through joint work with members of thematic partnerships, with the aim of building on the three year . The proposed updates would keep pushing for devolution and simplification of both the funding and performance regimes by which local services were constrained. The LAA were an ongoing process of dialogue between central and local government rather than an agreement which was set in stone, and was becoming a key element of the Secretary of State's proposals for local government reform. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister was planning to roll out the approach to all local authorities in 2007.

The Council's LAA was organised around three funding and performance blocks:

- Children and Young People,
- Healthier Communities & Older People and
- Safer & Stronger Communities.

The core change proposed in the 2006 update was the adoption of a fourth block to the Council's LAA focusing on 'Economic Regeneration and Transport'. This reflected the importance of Regeneration to the Council's Local Strategic Partnership. Neighbourhood Renewal Funding, Neighbourhood Element and Cleaner, Safer, Greener funding would be paid through this fourth block.

In addition, it proposed a number of specific enhancements to the implementation of the three existing LAA blocks which flowed from consultation with thematic partnerships and built upon the existing agreement:

- Pooling of Sure Start funding as part of the Children and Young People's LAA block, in support of the work of the new Children's Trust.
- Pooling of Youth Justice Board funding in a mini-LAA style approach as part of the Safer and Stronger Communities Block, freeing us up from a prescriptive monitoring framework.
- Pooling of drugs treatment money (as requested the previous year), including National Treatment Agency funding.
- Delivery of pooling of funding already requested in the Healthier Communities and Older People block, with additional inclusion of 'Supporting People' funding.
- Full integration of neighbourhood renewal and neighbourhood management performance management requirements within the LAA performance management framework .

Members were provided with a draft 2006 update document for consideration. The key areas which had been updated were highlighted in red. There was still a few areas of missing data in the new Economic Regeneration and Transport block where information was still being gathered.

Subject to any comments, it was recommended that Cabinet recommend that Council approve the draft update document for submission to Government Office. Final negotiations of the updates requested would then take place, and it was recommended that the Leader and Vice Chair of Renaissance be given delegated responsibility to approve any changes at that stage. This should then lead to sign off by Central Government in late March, with new pooled payments and freedoms being implemented from April 2006.

RECOMMENDED to Council that

- 1. the changes to Stockton's Local Area Agreement outlined be agreed, subject to final negotiations with Government Office North East.***
- 2. any final amendments be approved via delegated responsibility to the Leader, Chief Executive and Vice Chair of Renaissance.***
- 3. during 2007 the Council continues to push for further freedoms and flexibilities through the LAA process.***

1079 Performance – Key Corporate Measures

Cabinet considered a report that provided details of the council's performance against a range of "corporate health" measures included in the corporate basket of PIs.

The Council's basket of key performance indicators contained 85 measures broken down into 6 themes:

- Corporate health
- Children and Young people
- Healthier Communities and adults
- Livability
- Community safety
- Economic regeneration and transport

Information provided related on Council performance at the end of the third quarter of 2005/06 against the measures, which indicated its "corporate health". These included:

- Percentage of non-domestic rates due for the financial year which were received by the authority
- Average number of working days / shifts lost to sickness absence per employee
- The number of types of interactions with the public that are enabled for electronic service delivery as a percentage of the types of interactions that are legally permissible for electronic service delivery
- The level of the Commission for Racial Equality's "Equality standard for local government" to which the authority conforms
- Percentage of invoices for commercial goods and services that were paid by the authority within 30 days of such invoices being received
- Percentage of council tax collected
- Percentage of expenditure inside contracts where contracts exist

Our performance against each measure was provided in graphs and tables appended to the report.

Particular focus was given to sickness absence and it was noted that performance had dropped in 2005/06.

It was explained that Absence management had been completely reviewed during 2003/04 with new procedures, guidance and support for managers put into place. The collection of data had also been improved and this drop in performance may reflect more accurate data collection. However, this may not be the case and action

was being taken to further tighten the council's approach to managing sickness absence. Those actions included:

- Implementing the recommendations of the scrutiny review into sickness absence that reported in late 2005, including reviewing training for managers and supervisors
- Providing further information to managers on managing sickness absence
- Improving management information on frequent absences, providing managers with alerts when employees have had three absences in a rolling 12 month period
- Completing a detailed analysis of patterns in sickness, by service area, manager etc. to enable "hot spots" to be addressed
- Developing realistic but challenging targets for the reduction of sickness absence across the council, culminating in a half day reduction per full time equivalent, per year for 3 years.

RESOLVED that report be noted.

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1080 Minutes of Various Bodies

Cabinet considered the minutes of the following meetings:-

Northern Area (Billingham) Partnership	9 th January 2006
Renaissance Board	17 th January 2006
The Eastern Area Partnership Board	31 st January 2006

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the above meetings be approved/received, as appropriate.

Northern Area (Billingham) Partnership Board Minutes – 9th January 2006

<p>Members: Manager: Kevin Pitt (KP) Chair: John Tough (JT) Kevin Bowler (KB), Jim Sculley (JS), Michele Smith (MS), Miriam Stanton (MS), Cath Coldbeck (CC), Sue Cash (SC), Cllr Keith Dewison (KD), Colin Straton (CS), Ray McCall (RM), Cllr Barry Woodhouse (BW), Ken Ellis (KE), Joe Maloney (JM), Geoff Harrison (GH) and Ged McGuire (GM)</p>
<p>Advisors/Observers Nigel Laws (NL)-SBC John Angus (JA)– SBC Kelly Brown (KB)- SRCGA</p>
<p>Apologies Roger Black , Liz Smith, Mark Leck, Carolynne Withers and Paul Harrison</p>

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.Introductions and Apologies for Absence Apologies for absence were noted		Noted	SR			Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>2. Approval of Minutes for Meeting on 12th December 2005. Minutes agreed as a true and accurate record</p>		Agreed	SR			Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
<p>3. Safer Cleaner Greener Expressions of interest for the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and CSGE funding were submitted to the Neighbourhood Renewal team on 2nd December and full applications are to be completed for the beginning of January. Within the package of project ideas several suggestions of locations to carry out environmental improvements have been taken from Local Action Plans these are still to be confirmed and approved by the appropriate Area Partnership Board. The proposed projects have been grouped together in similar areas. Community Safety, Parks, Open Green Spaces and Street Scene.</p> <p>The population of the Neighbourhood Renewal Super Output areas for Billingham area is 9% living with the Neighbourhood Renewal area within Low Grange and Cowpen and Clarences</p> <p>The following issues were raised: The supporters of John Whitehead Park have been sent an expression of interest proposal from NIR</p>		Noted				John Angus SBC 01642 526499

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>sent an expression of interest proposal from NR. Confusion over who would run this project was raised. Concerns about groups being overridden by the Thematics.</p> <p>The Big Lottery Fund is looking at Borough Wide not just NR areas.</p> <p>Kevin Pitt to be liaison between SBC Regeneration and TBP for suggestions for other environmental improvement projects for open green spaces. Not just for the NR areas, as JA indicated other funding is being sourced for the rest of TBP areas</p>		<p>One application form will be submitted for each thematic package. Decision on how expressions of interest will be put together will be discussed by thematic leads</p> <p>TBP to think about</p> <p>Agreed</p>	TBP			<p>John Angus SBC 01642 526499</p> <p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p>
<p>4. Matters Arising</p> <p>a. Town Centre Development</p> <p>It was reported at the last TBP meeting on 12.12.05 that officers were assessing the implications of initial outline regeneration proposals submitted by Halladale, which were based upon the results of public consultation to date. Further public consultation would not be undertaken until a satisfactory appraisal of the proposals had been achieved. SBC are hopeful that Halladale will give the issues raised careful consideration and continue to work in partnership with</p>		Noted				<p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>SBC to deliver viable options that will lead to the successful redevelopment of Billingham Town Centre. SBC have in accordance with the lockout agreement, given Halladale one month's notice to address the issues (which relate to sensitive legal, commercial and property issues) and prepare further options which can then form the basis of further consultation. If the Lock-out Agreement were terminated, then the vast majority of information and surveys could still be used in the future and would not be wasted</p> <p>b. Bulgarth NL has looked at definitive conservation area plans which would appear to indicate that the Bulgarth site for car parking is actually outside the Billingham Green Conservation Area boundary, thereby conflicting with the boundary shown on the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan. NL to clarify at next meeting</p> <p>c. Billingham House The planning application by Brossely Homes has been formally submitted, and a number of supportive responses have already been received. The crux of the issue will be the formal response of HSE. If this is not supportive (as expected), then SBC will convene and meet with Brossely and HSE in an attempt to find a mutually acceptable proposal</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p>
<p>5. Thematic Group Update A thematic group list was circulated. KP suggested that every 6 weeks the Thematic representatives</p>		<p>Agreed</p>	<p>KP</p>			<p>Kevin Pitt TBP</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>should meet to discuss issues which effect TBP. KP to arrange. KP circulated a green folder which includes the following information: Local Area Agreement – which discusses targets within thematic areas List of Funding Streams. KP encouraged all of TBP to look at the Community Strategy, which have already been circulated at a previous meeting.</p> <p>Economic Regeneration and Transport GH has been invited to judge proposals from entrepreneurs on their bids for starting a new business.</p>						01642 360150
<p>6. Information Updates</p> <p>a. Community Sector GH attended the Single Programme Steering Committee who are trying to get the Community Empowerment Network £60,000. Black and Ethnic Minority has 38 groups with 5 staff. Community Network has 138 groups with 2 staff. The BEM workers have never reported to the steering group. What are these 38 groups and what are the workers doing?</p> <p>Supporters of John Whitehead Park now have a bank account. Maps have been sent to Police for recommendations. Eddie Lincoln the contact for the Police may be attending the next meeting.</p> <p>b. Voluntary Sector JM attended an Arts meeting which was mainly for the Riverside Festival so it was not very relevant but</p>		<p>TBP are in full support of GH chasing this matter further</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				Geoff Harrison TBP

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>leaflets and other promotions for the Billingham Folklore Festival were left</p> <p>c. Business Sector There was no meeting held in December. KP has contacted the Chamber of Commerce to inform them that there is a seat on TBP</p> <p>d. Public Sector BW informed TBP that Cllr Bob Gibson has received an OBE. It would be a nice idea for the board to congratulate him on this achievement</p> <p>MS stated she attended a presentation at the last Billingham Network meeting which encouraged youngsters to ask questions about what they want in Billingham. From this the youngsters stated they would like a youth club like the one similar in Thornaby and now in Hartlepool. MS asked if they could come to the Board. It is vital that TBP keep in close contact with the Youth.</p> <p>There is a conference about how to involve and engage young people. KP suggested this would be an excellent course and TBP have the funds to send a member of TBP to attend.</p> <p>On Wednesday there will be an event at Billingham Campus about Youth Facilities and the youth bus will be coming down</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed. KP to write a letter congratulating Cllr Bob Gibson</p> <p>SR to look at the forward plan and arrange.</p> <p>If any members of TBP are interested please contact KP</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Joe Maloney TBP</p> <p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p> <p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p> <p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p> <p>Kevin Pitt SBC</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>7. Visioning</p> <p>KP and JT are trying to arrange a visioning away day for the board.</p> <p>KP is still waiting for the top three priorities from the visioning</p>		<p>Can all TBP members send their availability to KP a.s.a.p</p> <p>Any member who has not yet done so, need to send their top 3 priorities from the visioning to KP a.s.a.p</p>	<p>TBP</p> <p>TBP</p>			<p>01642 360150</p> <p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p> <p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p>
<p>8. Chairs Report</p> <p>JT has arranged a meeting with Derek Lincoln from European Funding at SBC to try and bring some funding into TBP from other streams of funding. DL was quite confident that some funding will be able to be brought down</p> <p>JT is having a meeting on 12.01.06 regarding TBP Managers Post</p> <p>JT has been asked to sit on the interview panel for SBC's Billingham Regeneration Manager. TBP were not aware that this post had been created. A letter should be sent on behalf of the TBP</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>John Tough TBP 07963481941</p> <p>John Tough TBP 07963481941</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>10. Any Other Business</p> <p>Two representatives are needed one from Voluntary sector and one from the Community sector to sit on Children's Trust Board, which replaces the Children and Young People thematic group. The group meet 4 times a year.</p> <p>Michele Smith and Ged McGuire were nominated</p> <p>SVDA have asked if TBP would like to appoint someone on the SVDA board. GH did attend last time but SVDA would not allow him to take the minutes to TBP. GH was nominated</p> <p>SRCGA are also looking for a Community Sector Representative. RM nominated</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Board Agreed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Board Agreed</p> <p>Board Agreed</p>	<p>SR to write confirmation letter to Childrens Trust Board</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
Peter Sellers would like to incorporate any issues that TBP think need to be considered in the Children and Young People. Peter Sellers will be attending the next meeting of the TBP		Noted				
11. Date and Time of Next Meeting 13 TH February 2006 at the New Life Resource Centre, Billingham at 5.45 p.m.						

Renaissance Board Minutes – 17th January 2006

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement ?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
Welcome & Apologies.			No	No	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Coordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438
Minutes of the 4th October 2005, 8th November 2005 and 6th December 2005		It was agreed that the minutes were a true and accurate record.	No	Yes	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Coordinator Contact 526498/527568
<p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Clarification was given with regards to NRF allocated to the Community & Voluntary Sector compared to that of the Statutory agencies. The Voluntary and Community Sector receive approximately 30% of the overall Neighbourhood Renewal Funding. A request was made for the breakdown of Neighbourhood Renewal funding for the Voluntary and Community Sector.</p> <p>At the meeting on the 8th November it was agreed that the representative from the LSP for the Raising Aspirations Steering Group would be Jim Beall. Unfortunately JB is unable to attend future meetings due to other commitments.</p> <p>A discussion was held around the NRF process. It was highlighted that this process is different to that of the SRB process, the NRF process is that of a commissioning process and NOT a delivery process.</p>		<p>It was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A break down in NRF allocation to the Voluntary and Community Sector would be given. • Alternative representation to be sought. 	LD to provide the information to the Community and Voluntary Sector. Clarify membership to the Raising Aspirations Steering Group	No	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Coordinator Contact 526498 or 527568

<p>AREA TRANSPORT STRATEGY - UPDATE Progress was given toward the development of the four Area Transport Strategies within the borough. Priorities within the four areas have been identified and subject to approval, will be included in the second Local Transport plan to be presented to Cabinet on 9th February and Full Council on 8th March. The Transport department had recently gained 'excellent status' and is in the top 11 authorities nationally. The board agreed the priorities identified in the report for the four area strategies.</p>		<p>It was agreed that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The four Area strategies be approved. 	No	No	No	<p>David Lynch Transport Manager Contact 526728</p>
<p>CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE'S PLAN 2006 - 2009 As a requirement of the Children Act 2004, all Local Authorities have to produce a Children and Young People's Plan for all children's services. The Plan is intended to be a strategic plan and needs to be in place by 1 April 2006. The draft Children and Young People's Plan was presented to the Partnership and comment were noted as part of the consultation process. Further comments on the Plan can be received up until 10 February 2006. Area Partnerships and the CEN are included in the consultation process. This is a 3yr rolling plan and is very much a strategic document highlighting strategic priorities, however the document will be reviewed in 12 months Reference was made to having a robust action plan, underpinning the strategic priorities, which would allow feedback to Stockton Renaissance linking progress to targets and outcomes.</p>		<p>The board:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepted the draft Children's Plan and acknowledged the consultation process • Ensure that a robust action plan, underpinning the strategic priorities is in place to enable feedback to be presented to Renaissance 	No	No	No	<p>Peter Sellar Head of Strategy Contact 527043</p>

<p align="center">PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD</p> <p>The board were requested to approve the draft terms of reference for the Public Service Board, which acts as a key support group to the main Stockton Renaissance Board/LSP. This board strengthens partnership approach through cross cutting themes and has a cross agency focus.</p> <p>With reference to the terms of reference it states, 'steering public involvement in the LSP...' it was felt that this should state 'steering public service involvement in the LSP'.</p> <p>GONE acknowledge the workings of PSB and agreed that this was the way forward and helped to shape performance management. Support to the board was offered by GONE and this was acknowledged and noted. It was clarified that the Public Service Board was a defined body and was not replicating the LSP structure.</p> <p>It was noted that reference to 'avoiding duplication' need to be incorporated into the TOR.</p>		<p>The board approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Public Service Board TOR subject to the changes noted. 	<p>Amendments to be incorporated into the Terms of Reference</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Jenny Haworth Assistant Chief Executive Contact 527004</p>
<p>RENAISSANCE COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT NETWORK WORKING GROUP</p> <p>An update was provided to the board regarding the work of the group set up by Renaissance in October to look at support to the Community Empowerment Network following the national reduction in Community Empowerment Funding, which in Stockton meant a reduction from £270k in 2005/06 to £106k in 2006/07. The group looked and considered models of affordable support with the Community Empowerment Fund allocation, supplementary/alternative finance sources, identified outcomes for inclusion within the Local Area Agreement and agreed and developed a robust Performance Management Framework.</p> <p>The following recommendations were presented to Renaissance for consideration and approval:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider and agrees the indicative allocation of £60k from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund 2006/07, enhancing the core-funding element of £106K of the Community Empowerment Fund, 	<p>SB DC</p>	<p>The board agreed that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The indicative allocation of £60k from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund 2006/07, enhancing the core-funding element of £106K of the Community Empowerment Fund, Progress made on the delivery of the agreed outcomes and key indicators be evaluated in October/ November 2006 Renaissance has a representative from 	<p>Additional outcome regarding the BME worker to report to the CEN steering group to be included in the NRF application.</p> <p>A representative to be sought to sit on the CEN Steering Group</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Lesley Dale Area Partnership Co-ordinator Contact 526498/527568</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renaissance agrees that progress made on the delivery of the agreed outcomes and key indicators be evaluated in October/November 2006. • Renaissance has a representative from the LSP on the Community Empowerment Network Steering group. <p>Regarding the recommendation for a LSP representative to be on the CEN Steering Group, SRCGA representative present sought guidance from GONE. It was highlighted that this would improve and strengthen communication links and help with Data Information Sharing. GONE supported the recommendation and a representative will be sought.</p> <p>An additional outcome and recommendation was put to the board. It was agreed to enhance links between the BME Network and the CEN, the BME officer is to attend and feedback to the CEN Steering Group on a monthly basis.</p>		<p>the LSP on the Community Empowerment Network Steering Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BME Network worker to attend and feedback to CEN steering Group on a monthly basis 				
---	--	---	--	--	--	--

<p>NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL FUND</p> <p>The purpose of the report is to present some of the first of the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) Round Four interventions for consideration. It is proposed to commission the attached interventions to tackle the floor targets and the key Neighbourhood Renewal issues for Stockton on Tees. A further report will be brought to the February meeting setting out the services to be commissioned using NRF under the thematic packages.</p> <p>It was requested that the Board approves the following NRF sums in principle subject to technical appraisal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Empowerment Network £60,000 2006/7, and indicative allocation of £60,000 2007/8 subject to evaluation of delivery in 2006/7. • Community and Voluntary Sector Support Fund £120,000 2006/7, £120,000 2007/8 • Information Manager £40,202 2006/7, £41,408 2007/8 <p>The Information Manager's post would continue the work that is currently being carried out regarding the collation of effective statistical information in particular the collation of geographical information. It has been recognised nationally that there are barriers and the LSP, Government Office North East (GONE) and Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) are working together to help address this problem.</p> <p>One of the advantages of this coordinated approach to data collation at Borough, ward and neighbourhood level would be to support the area partnerships to focus on their priorities and work in a more structured way with the Thematic Partnerships to assess the impact of the Community Strategy and Neighbourhood objectives in their areas.</p>		<p>The board approved the NRF sums in principle subject to technical appraisal for the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Empowerment Network (£60K for 2006/7 & indicative allocation of £60K for 2007/8 subject to evaluation of delivery in 2006/7)) • The Community and Voluntary Sector Support Fund £120K for 2006/7 and £120K for 2007/8 • Information Manager (£40,202 for 2006/07 & £41,408 for 2007/08) • Baseline data to be collated for Area Partnerships • Work programmes of Area Partnerships and Thematic Partnerships to be aligned to ensure regular Thematic Partnerships reporting on the impact of the Community Strategy & Neighbourhood objectives on key priorities in the Partnership areas. 	<p>Base line data around the Community Strategy themes will be collated and supplied to Area Partnerships by the end of April 2006 to support them in determining their key priorities for the coming year.</p> <p>Work programmes of Area Partnerships and Thematic Partnerships to be aligned to ensure regular Thematic Partnerships reporting on the impact of the Community Strategy & Neighbourhood objectives on key priorities in areas to the Area Partnerships.</p>	No	No	<p>Dawn Welsh Neighbourhood Renewal Manager Contact 526011</p>
<p>MINUTES OF MEETINGS</p> <p>Minutes from the Regeneration Sub Group meeting on 1st November 2005 & 6th December 2005</p>		Noted				<p>Sarah Upex Contact 527566</p>
<p>Minutes of the Renaissance Central Area Partnership held on 26th September.</p>		Noted				<p>Lesley Dale Contact 527568 or 526498</p>

Minutes of the Western Area Partnership meeting held on 28 th November 2005		Noted				Sophie Richardson Contact 526026
Minutes of the Eastern Area Partnership meeting held on 25 th October, 22 nd November & 20 th December 2005		Noted				Sophie Richardson Contact 526026
Minutes of The Billingham Partnership meeting held on 14 th November & 12 th December 2005		Noted				Sophie Richardson Contact 526026

Eastern Area Partnership Board Minutes – 31st January 2006

<p>Chair: Graeme Oram (VS) Members: Josephine Robinson (CS), Carol Adams (CS), Dave Hill (Stockton Police), Dianne Patterson , Cllr Derrick Brown (SBC), Cllr John Lynch (SBC), Cllr Beryl Robinson (SBC), Linda Russel – Bond (PUB)</p>
<p>Advisors Mike Bowron (SBC), Jamie McCann (SBC), Richard Bradley (SBC) and Sophie Richardson (SBC)</p>
<p>Apologies Irene Machin, Ian Garret (Stockton Police)</p>

CS =	Community Sector	YA =	Youth Assembly
PCT/PUB =	Primary Care Trust/Public Sector	RC =	Rural Community Sector
PS =	Private Sector	BS =	Business Sector
Stockton Police/PUB =	Stockton Police/Public Sector	PC =	Parish Council
SBC/PUB =	Stockton Borough Council/Public Sector		
VS =	Voluntary Sector		
JS+/PUB =	Job Centre Plus		
CPF =	Community Partnership Forum		

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>1. Welcome and Introductions Members and Advisors were welcomed and introduced to the Board</p>		Noted				Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
<p>2. Apologies Apologies were noted</p>		Noted				Sophie Richardson

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
						SBC 01642 526026
<p>3. Minutes of Last Meeting</p> <p>Minutes of the last meeting were amended and agreed subject to the following:</p> <p>Linda Russell-Bond sent apologies for 20.12.06.</p>		Noted	SR			Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
<p>4. Matters Arising Thornaby Post Office</p> <p>A response from the Post Office was received stating their results from the consultation. Full details are in the letter which will be circulated to all board members</p>		SR to send out letter from the Post Office	SR			Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026
<p>5. Waste Management</p> <p>Jamie McCann and Richard Bradley attended:</p> <p>Stockton Borough Council are struggling to reach Government recycling Targets. Stockton need to reach 30% by 2010 and at present Stockton are not reaching 18%.</p>		Noted Noted				<p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>SBC are looking at ideas and feedback on how they can improve the recycling percentage. Specific research is taking place to look at any recycling patterns within wards and also social economic factors which may effect recycling. 60-70% of rubbish in wheelie bins can be recycled.</p> <p>Comments from the Board: Can more recycling be made available for plastics and cardboard?</p> <p>How do the Waste Management team encourage youngsters to recycle?</p> <p>What about teenagers? LRB would love to see the Waste Management Team do some work at Thornaby Community School</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Recycling sites have increased from 30-60. Looking at refurbishing and advertising the recycling points</p> <p>Schools are visited throughout the area, with the mascot Freda the Frog. A message in a bottle scheme is also in place</p> <p>An Interreg swap with children from Norway has taken place to look at different ways to recycle. Also a scheme was ran at Thornaby Town Centre on a lunch time, with children swapping binning their rubbish for bowling vouchers.</p> <p>This would require a Merth</p>	<p>JM to contact LRB to arrange</p>			<p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>What about using split bins like in Australia?</p> <p>Could stickers be issued for the blue boxes to state when the collections for recycling are</p> <p>The Eastern Area Partnership Board are more than happy to assist in raising awareness</p>		<p>Calendars should be sent out shortly with all collection dates for 2006</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p>
<p>6. Safer Cleaner Greener</p> <p>Mike Bowron from SBC attended</p> <p>Total funding over 2 years is £2 million to be spread over the Super Output Areas across the whole of the</p>		<p>Noted</p>				<p>Mike Bowron SBC</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Borough. The areas which affect the Eastern Area Partnership Board are Mandale and Victoria and Holmes and Middlefield.</p> <p>Need to ensure when spending the money that it meets NRF Floor Targets working around the Local Action Plan. Works which are carried out are the communities priorities.</p> <p>SBC are starting to put an application together and are liaising with residents and Councillors. Expecting to receive funding in the Summer</p> <p>MB is in touch with Councillors and is starting to create a wish list.</p> <p>Comments from the Board: Holme and Middlefield. This area needs the run between the houses reducing.</p> <p>Shrubs have been neglected and full of rubbish on Topcliffe Road</p> <p>Eastern Area Partnership Board will start to think of projects which could use the Safer Cleaner Greener funding</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>JM to look into the removal of rubbish</p> <p>EAPB</p>			<p>01642 526028</p> <p>Mike Bowron SBC 01642 526028</p> <p>Mike Bowron SBC 01642 526028</p> <p>Mike Bowron SBC 01642 526028</p> <p>Jamie McCann SBC 01642 527071</p> <p>Mike Bowron SBC 01642 527071</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>7. Thornaby Town Hall Update</p> <p>Derek Lincoln from SBC attended</p> <p>A bid went into the Heritage Lottery fund in September, the total project cost £2 million. A response from the Heritage Lottery fund stated that it did not have enough funds for this. It seemed that the information received from Heritage Lottery Fund to SBC had been misleading. The Heritage Lottery Fund although could not fund the full amount requested, they did think it was a very good project and they could fund £250, 000. A new application was submitted for £500,000 and it was stated that the £250,000 would not be enough but as it was a very good project would the Heritage Lottery Fund consider the new amount requested of £500, 000.</p> <p>It was also later discovered that The Heritage Lottery Fund could only fund one project at a time from SBC.</p> <p>At present SBC has two priorities. Thornaby Town Hall and Winter Gardens at Preston Park. After consideration it is proposed that the Winter Gardens is more likely to get the funding. This is because there is not just the Town Hall to consider but also the attached buildings. Planning permission and listed building consent is all in place. Need to start looking for new funding. SBC are limited to who they can get funding from.</p> <p>The Eastern Area and DL need to re- group and look at</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Derek Lincoln SBC 01642 527564</p> <p>Derek Lincoln SBC 01642 527564</p> <p>Derek Lincoln SBC 01642 527564</p> <p>Derek Lincoln SBC 01642 527564</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
what funding is available. Looking at the steering group to become more of a management board.		Noted	EAPB to start to think about funding			Derek Lincoln SBC 01642 527564
8. Thematic Group Update Community and Voluntary Representatives There are 4 places for Community and Voluntary Sector Representatives on the Eastern Area Partnership Board. The Chair proposes that the Board has 2 from Ingleby Barwick and 2 from Thornaby on top of the representatives already from Thornaby Town Council and Ingleby Barwick Parish Council		Board Agreed	GO to liaise with SRCGA			Graeme Oram Five Lamps 01642 608316
9. Any Other Business Neighbourhood Renewal Fund £40, 000 has been allocated to EAPB. GO is to have a meeting with Ian Thompson from SBC to discuss the process. A letter will be sent out to EAPB to finalise the identified priorities and consider possibilities. This money is only available for Thornaby projects. Meeting Rooms for EAPB Thornaby Community School could provide a room for		Noted	EAPB to start thinking of projects SR			Graeme Oram Five Lamps 01642 608316

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>the EAPB meetings over the half term.</p> <p>Ingleby Barwick Community Hall has been given £20,000 from Persimmon to extend the Hall, this could be a possibility for meetings in the future</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>
<p>10. Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>21st February 2006 at 9.30 a.m. at Bannatynes , Ingleby Barwick</p>						

1081 The Gambling Act 2005 – Implementing the Transfer of New Functions to the Local Authority

Cabinet considered a report informing it of the progress of the Gambling Act 2005 and outline actions required for the authority to be able to undertake its new functions.

Members were provided with background information about the Act. It was noted that amongst other things the Act will introduce a unified regulator for Gambling in Great Britain, the Gambling Commission, and a new licensing regime for commercial gambling. The Act removes from licensing justices all responsibility for granting gaming and betting permissions. Instead responsibility will pass to the Commission and local authorities.

Members noted that the Act contained three licensing objectives, which underpinned the functions that the Commission and licensing authorities will perform:-

- Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime and disorder, or being used to support crime;
- Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way; and
- Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling

The Government's primary objective are to implement swiftly and effectively the system of regulation set out in the Gambling Act 2005, and through that deliver the licensing objectives of the new Act:.

Members were provided with key implementation dates culminating in September 2007 when existing legislation would be repealed and the 2005 would be implemented

Cabinet noted the main functions of the Council under the Act:

- license premises for gambling activities;
- consider notices given for the temporary use of premises for gambling;
- grant permits for gaming and gaming machines in clubs and miners' welfare institutes;
- regulate gaming and gaming machines in alcohol licensed premises;
- grant permits to family entertainment centres for the use of certain lower stake gaming machines;
- grant permits for prize gaming;
- consider occasional use notices for betting at tracks; and
- register small societies' lotteries.

Licensing authorities have an obligation to provide information to the Gambling Commission, including details of licences, permits and registrations issued.

In addition, licensing authorities were required to prepare, every three years, a statement of the principles which they proposed to apply when exercising their functions. In preparing the statement, licensing authorities must follow the procedure set out in the Act, including whom they should consult

Members noted that it was proposed that a draft Gambling Policy Statement be prepared upon release of the Guidance by the Secretary of State (likely to be April 2006). After consideration of that draft by the Licensing Committee it would then be published for formal consultation with the finalised version being agreed by Council in December 2006 following further reports to the Licensing Committee and Cabinet.

The Licensing Committee would have particular functions under this Act and would broadly have similar functions and powers as under the Licensing Act 2003. However, there were some differences and a summary was provided.

The Council's Scheme of Delegations would need to be adapted for the purposes of the Gambling Act and proposed delegations were provided.

Members noted that future reports would consider financial implications at the same time as the financial review of the Licensing Act 2003.

RESOLVED that

1. That Cabinet note the report and implications.
2. An all Member Seminar(s) be arranged
3. That further reports be submitted to Cabinet in due course concerning:
 - (i) financial implications and consultation costs (at the same time as the financial review of the Licensing Act 2003)
 - (ii) firm proposals on necessary changes to the Scheme of Delegation
 - (iii) approval of the Gambling Policy Statement

The 'call-in' period ending at Midnight on Friday 17th March 2006 applies.

1082 Statement of Community Involvement – Local Development Framework

This item deals with the report of the Inspector following the independent examination of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), the changes required to the SCI and Member approval to adopt the SCI.

Members were informed that following Council endorsement of the draft, the SCI had been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination at the end of August 2005. A six-week period of consultation, when formal representations could be made, coincided with submission. Details of the consultation undertaken was provided. Any representations made were considered by the Inspectorate as part of the examination into the "soundness" of the SCI. The date for adoption of the SCI, as set out in the Local Development Scheme, was March 2006. This date was a key milestone, and would have to be met in order to meet both the Council's BVPI targets and qualify the Service for Planning Delivery Grant.

Members were provided with the Inspectors report and noted the required amendments.

RECOMMENDED to Council that

1. ***the Inspector's report be noted and the required amendments to the Statement of Community Involvement be made.***
2. ***that the amended Statement of Community Involvement be approved and adopted.***

1083 Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Cabinet were asked to consider the draft Core Strategy Issues and Options paper and recommend its approval to Council.

The Council's Local Development Framework identified the Core Strategy as the first development plan document to be produced.

The Core Strategy was a strategic document which set out the vision and spatial strategy for meeting the known and anticipated development requirements to 2021. It would include a key diagram which would show broad locations (not specific sites) to meet specific requirements and would also include a suite of generic criteria based development control policies.

Members were provided with a draft Issues and Options Paper for the Core Strategy. This gave a brief overview of Stockton Borough, identified drivers for change, suggested a vision and strategic objectives for the area, identified key issues for the Borough and put forward options for consideration.

The Issues and Options Paper asked a series of questions for key stakeholders and the public to consider. The consultation exercise would invite all those who had an interest in the Borough to let the Council know their views on the best way(s) to meet the development needs of the Borough and to raise any other issues and options which they thought should be considered at this stage in the process.

It was anticipated that the consultation exercise would be carried out over six weeks in May and June 2006.

Following this initial round of consultation, the preparation process could be divided into 3 further stages:

- **Production** – preparation of Preferred Options (formal consultation/participation would take place on these) (April to July 2007) followed by the preparation and submission of the Core Strategy development plan document in the light of representations on the Preferred Options (March 2008)
- **Examination** – the independent examination into the soundness of the Core Strategy (October 2008)
- **Adoption** – the binding Inspector's report and adoption (June 2009).

.RECOMMENDED to Council that it

- 1. endorse the draft Core Strategy Issues and Options paper for wider consultation purposes.***
- 2. note that feedback from the consultation exercise would be reported back to Cabinet as part of the preparation of the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy.***

1084 Children and Young People's Plan

Cabinet considered a report relating to the Children and Young People's Plan 2006-09.

Members noted that the Children Act 2004 placed a statutory requirement on local authorities to produce a Children and Young People's Plan. The Plan had to be developed in partnership with all partner organisations and agencies, the business community and wider community in general and in consultation with children, young people and their carers. The Children and Young People's Plan was to be a strategic plan encompassing all services for children and young people across the Borough and had to be in place by 1 April 2006. It would be a three year plan, reviewed on an annual basis.

This Plan had been produced as a result of extensive consultations. The key objectives and strategic priorities were agreed through the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership based on the outcomes of needs assessment, performance information and a wide range of consultation

events with partner organisations, community and voluntary sectors, children, young people and their carers.

The Plan gave details of the key objectives and strategic priorities for addressing the improvement of outcomes for all children and young people across the Borough. It provides information on the key actions that would take place to meet the objectives.

Performance measures and targets were being set, based on nationally prescribed indicators and locally developed ones. They would encompass all the indicators that would be used in the Annual Performance Assessment of Children's Services by OFSTED and the set being identified for the Joint Area Review which is due to take place in late 2007, early 2008. This would be available as an appendix to the Plan and would be used by the Children's Trust Board to support the performance management of children's services.

Consultation had involved presentation at a wide variety of partnership meetings and events which were detailed in the Plan, plus individual responses to the draft Plan. Although the individual responses were fairly limited, along with the discussions and dialogue through partnership meetings, etc. they had provided clarification on some issues, identification of areas for further development and the need to continue the process of consultation and involvement through the year.

Some of the issues raised in consultation include:

- general consensus that the key objectives were the right ones;
- a need to ensure that there was continual engagement with all partners and parties;
- a need to get the balance right between universal services and specialised services;
- identification of key groups such as parents, fathers, grand-parents, young carers in terms of support and involvement;
- a need to address issues for specific areas of the Borough;
- a need to develop a young person's version of the Plan and ensure it had meaning;
- a need for a positive title;
- identification of "hard to reach" groups e.g. children who were bereaved;
- a recognition that resources were not enough to meet all the needs.

Where possible the issues raised above had been incorporated into the Plan. Where this had not been possible they would be used in the ongoing dialogue and involvement in reviewing and developing the Plan during the next year.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the Children and Young People's Plan, as detailed in the report, be approved.

1085 Planning Performance Improvement Plan

Cabinet considered a comprehensive performance improvement plan for the Planning Service for consideration and approval to improve the speed and efficiency of the planning system to enable the service to move forward and meet performance targets.

Members were reminded of Government targets for Local Authorities processing planning applications. It was noted that Local Planning Authority's were rewarded for their progress towards meeting these targets and could receive funding through Planning Delivery Grant (PDG). It was a requirement that all Planning Authorities reached the standards by March 2007.

It was noted that Stockton would only secure in the region of £100,000 in terms of PDG in 2006/2007, compared to over £530,000 in the current year, due to poor performance in determining applications in the period September 2004-June 2005. This would leave a funding shortfall.

In addition to setting national targets, the government also introduced minimum standards of performance. All local authorities were required to deliver services which met those standards. Those authorities who demonstrated performance consistently below the minimum level were designated 'standards authorities' and had to improve their levels of performance or face sanctions. In the worst case, it was suggested that the service might need to be provided outside of the LPA directly on behalf of the ODPM, however to date no LPA has experienced intervention. Authorities who were designated as standards authorities had to put in place immediate improvement strategies and had regular contact with ODPM over the performance improvements over the course of the year. In 2004, Stockton was designated as a standards authority, having demonstrated consistently low levels of performance in 2002 and part of 2003. Performance did improve for a period, resulting in Stockton being taken out of special measures and made an amber authority, kept under review by the ODPM.

In response to the issues of poor performance, a number of direct and immediate responses were made to the delivery of the planning service. These responses covered administrative, political and resource areas of the service.

During 2004/05 consultancy firm Addison & Associates (A&A) undertook an evaluation of the 2004/05 planning standards authorities on behalf of the ODPM, and Stockton Borough Council (SBC) was amongst the Authorities assessed and suggested improvements were made.

Performance from December 2004 fell again, due to a high number of staff vacancies that arose from people departing the authority, problems recruiting into those posts, staff illness and maternity leave, the inexperience of staff and the sheer volume of planning applications, enquiries and complaints still being received.

Set against this background, the Environment and Regeneration Select Committee had carried out a scrutiny review of the service in summer 2005, highlighting the need for Planning to develop a new performance improvement plan, to put a range of options in place to overcome the problems with performance and staffing. An ISO 9001 inspection also took place, along with an internal Systems Audit. A Performance Improvement Plan. (PIP) had been developed and was placed before Members for consideration.

The PIP was structured around seven main objectives: -

1. Supporting and Improving Efficient Processing of Applications
2. Providing a Quality Service
3. Develop Resources and Involve Staff
4. IT Development
5. Improve Appeals Process
6. Enhance Enforcement Process
7. Improving Performance by Monitoring and Review

A series of actions to support the objectives was proposed, with measures and management information data to ensure that targets were being met and potential blockages or problems highlighted at an early stage. This would allow priorities to be re-assessed and resources adjusted accordingly. Each action has been risk assessed, with mitigation measures highlighted, and resource implications estimated.

It was noted that these resources could not be met out of the existing managed budget and required additional funding. Should this funding not be forthcoming, then the main actions to achieve the objectives would not be met, and the service would fail to improve and meet the targets. This would affect BVPI scores, potentially reduce the score of the Environment block within CPA and reduce the effectiveness in attaining PDG grant. Recruitment and retention issues would remain as at present.

If the actions within the PIP were achieved, then performance would improve, staffing problems would be addressed, and the workload of individual officers brought into line with the recommended levels. This would raise morale and help prevent the high turnover of staff. Public satisfaction levels would correspondingly increase, and the service would be able to offer a first class service to the citizens of the area and all stakeholders.

.RECOMMENDED to Council that

- 1. the performance improvement plan be approved and the actions and measurements authorised.***
- 2. Members note the financial implications arising from the performance improvement plan, particularly over the uncertainty of future PDG, and that this be considered within the 2006/07 budget medium term financial plan review.***
- 3. a further report be presented to Cabinet when the emerging funding regime relating to PDG becomes clear.***

1086 Members' Allowances

Cabinet considered a report of The Independent Remuneration Panel with a view to recommendations being submitted to Council (at the Special Council meeting on 22 March 2006) regarding the existing Members' Allowances Scheme for 2005/06 and a Scheme for 2006/07.

Cabinet and Council had previously agreed to a review of Members' Allowances by the Authority's Independent Remuneration Panel during 2005/06 (minutes 760 refers).

The Panel was tasked to review Members' Allowances in the light of the May 2005 elections, the review of Cabinet Member Portfolios and the revised Scrutiny arrangements.

The Panel had undertaken a review and produced its report. A copy of that report was provided to Members.

An analysis of the additional costs to the Council, should the Panel's recommendations be accepted was also provided together with a comparison of Officer and Member travel and subsistence allowances.

Cabinet were asked to consider whether to recommend to Council that Members' travel and subsistence allowances be aligned with Officers allowances.

One other matter raised in the Panel's report related to any potential inflationary index rate which the Council may wish to apply to increase allowances (Basic, SRAs and Co-optees Allowances) in 2007/08 and beyond (up to a maximum of 4 years). The Council used a figure of 2.5% for the purposes of its corporate/Members' budgets.

During discussions reference was made to Child Care and Dependent Carers' Allowance, which the Panel had suggested should follow the level set under the Local Government Association's Scheme and stood at £4.81 per hour for 05/06. It was suggested that this rate was unrealistically low and did not adequately reflect the cost involved in providing such care. It was therefore agreed that a more appropriate rate of payment be identified.

.RECOMMENDED to Council that

1. ***The report be received and the Panel be thanked formally for their work;***
2. ***The Panel's proposals for a revised Allowances Scheme for 2005/06 be approved;***
3. ***The Panel's proposals for a new Allowances Scheme for the period from 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2007 be approved subject to the proposed hourly allowance identified for Child Care and Dependent Carers' being increased to a more appropriate level.***
4. ***From 1 April 2006 Members' travel and subsistence allowances be aligned with those paid to Officers.***
5. ***Subject to the decisions regarding the above recommendations, the additional resources required to implement the proposed new Schemes be provided in 2005/06 and for 2006/07.***

1087 Standards of Conduct in English Local Government: The Future

Cabinet considered a report providing details of the Government's Discussion Paper entitled Standards of Conduct in English Local Government: The Future.

Members considered a report relating to Standards of Conduct in English Local Government (a discussion paper).

Cabinet was reminded of consultation papers issued by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Standards Board relating to Codes of Conduct for Members and Employees and a review of Political Restrictions on employees. The Council had submitted responses, to the consultations, incorporating comments by the Standards Committee.

It was explained that the Government had published a Discussion Paper – "Standards of Conduct in English Local Government: The Future, which set out its vision for a future comprehensive conduct regime for local authority members and employees.

Members were provided with details of the proposed principal changes to current arrangements. Specific reference was made to the following proposals:-

Conduct Regime for Local Councillors

- Initial assessment of all misconduct allegations to be undertaken by Standards Committees, rather than the Standards Board
- National rules would determine under what circumstances Standards Committees had to refer cases to the Standards Board for investigation
- Standards Committees to be given power to impose increased levels of sanction from the current maximum three month's suspension.
- The "whistleblowing" obligations to report breaches of the Code would be abolished

Conduct Regime for Local Employees

- Retain the current principle that senior and sensitive posts should be politically restricted, but ensure that only the most senior and sensitive posts were covered.

It was noted that a copy of the discussion paper had been provided to each political group and a copy placed in the Members Library.

Members were asked to provide any comments to the Director of Law and Democracy.

.RECOMMENDED to Council that

- 1. The report be considered, together with any comments made by the Council's Standards Committee.***
- 2. The Director of Law and Democracy, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, be authorised to submit to the ODPM any views on the Discussion Paper which the Authority wished to make.***

1088 Council Plan 2006 - 2008

Consideration was given to the draft Council Plan for 2006-2009.

It was explained that the Council Plan set out how the Council would contribute to community objectives. The plan was based on the objectives and outcomes already set in the Community Strategy and Service Plans, but provided focus on the key objectives the Council needed to achieve authority wide, and which needed to be monitored by Corporate Management Team and the Cabinet.

The principle underlying the development of the Council Plan was that it should be a business plan for the organisation, focusing on key corporate priorities for change, rather than summarising all activities that the Council undertook. This approach was vital to ensure a clear focus on improvement, but meant that some significant service areas did not feature in the key objectives and outcomes. The focus of the plan shifted each year as key improvement priorities altered over time; it was a three year rolling plan which was updated on an annual basis.

The Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) of the Authority during Winter 2005 rated the council as 4 star and improving well. It endorsed the Council's overall direction of travel. This year's plan was therefore based around the same set of core objectives as were used in 2005. Within the plan the improvements, which linked specifically to the CPA inspection, were highlighted.

The Council Plan had been developed as the negotiations for the second year of the borough's pilot Local Area Agreement (LAA) had been ongoing; links to the LAA had been highlighted within the Plan.

The Plan had been developed in partnership with all Services and in consultation with elected members. The development process included:

- a. Consultation with elected Members through the MTFP and Council Plan seminar and drop in clinics in February;
- b. Consultation with Corporate Directors, Heads of Service and Policy Officers throughout the drafting process;
- c. Consideration of the results of the 2005 Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Stockton
- d. Consultation with the Viewpoint Panel on priorities

As an 'Excellent' Council Stockton had the freedom to use its Council Plan to meet the statutory requirement to prepare a (Best Value) Performance Plan. The Council Plan therefore formed the Council's Performance Plan for 2006/7. It would be supplemented by an annex of best value performance indicator information and targets to be published at the end of June.

In its guidance on performance plans, the ODPM specified the intended audiences of those documents:

- a. The primary audience should be the authority itself including elected members and officers
- b. The Government was a secondary audience, because the plans contained essential information enabling it to monitor performance
- c. Although Performance Plans had to be available to the public, the public were not intended to be the primary audience.

This was in line with Stockton's approach and full copies of the plan would be provided to members, managers and key partners and the Government. A summary version of the Council Plan would also be prepared for all staff. The Council Plan would also be made available in public places and copies would be provided to the public when requested: full and summary versions would also be available over the

RECOMMENDED to Council that the draft Council Plan for 2006 – 2009, as appended to the report, be approved.

1089 Service Improvement Plans 2006-2009

Consideration was given to the draft Service Improvement Plans for 2006-2009.

Members were reminded that the service planning framework was reviewed in 2005 and a revised framework put into place to focus on changes and improvements and to bring service and resource (finance, human resources, ICT, procurement) planning closer together. Service Improvement Plans (SIPs) had been developed to cover the responsibilities of each head of service, though not necessarily on a one head of service one service plan basis. SIPs include the key changes, improvements and priorities which would require significant attention from heads of service to deliver. Core business in each service would be covered in business unit plans which sat beneath the SIPs.

The service improvement plans supported the Council Plan and Community Strategy. Plans were structured to include

- a. introduction outlining the strategic direction of the service and key achievements from the previous year;
- b. action plans linked to the five themes of the Community Strategy and a theme of organisational development. The action plans included links to other plans, identify actions and milestones, responsible officers, success measures and targets, and risks. In addition where actions would have resource implications those were identified.
- c. The medium term financial plan for the service
- d. A performance indicator table including both measures and targets.

Plans had been developed to cover all service areas. In some areas it had been sensible to develop combined SIPs covering more than one head of service's remit e.g. finance and children. The planning service had developed a performance improvement plan rather than a SIP, reflecting the improvement priority of that area.

Performance against SIPs would be monitored and reported to Members twice a year, alongside Council Plan monitoring.

Appended to the report were abridged versions of the draft SIPs, focusing on key elements of the action plans. Full draft SIPs had been placed on the Intranet to enable Members to consider them in detail. Once agreed, plans would be published on cd-rom and on the intranet with a set of hard copy plans lodged in the members' library.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the draft Service Improvement Plans be approved.