

Cabinet

A meeting of the Cabinet was held on Thursday 18th May 2006.

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

Officers: J. Danks (R), J. Haworth (ACE), C. Straughan, J. Allport, J. Edmonds (DNS), M. Henderson (LD).

Also in attendance: Councillor Fletcher and Mrs Beaumont

154 Declaration of Interest

Councillors Nelson and Leonard declared a personal/ non prejudicial interest in respect of item 8 –Tristar Homes Ltd – Strengthening Governance as they were both members of the Tristar Homes Management Board.

155 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20th April 2006 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

156 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: -

Billingham Campus	Mrs J Baker Mr R McCall
Bishopsgarth School	Mr J Rayner Mr G. Noble
Crooksbarrow Primary School	Mrs K Robson
Durham Lane Primary School	Mrs V. Nicholson
Egglecliffe School	Mrs K. Ward
Frederick Nattrass Primary School	Cllr Mrs K. Nelson
Harrow Gate Primary School	Mrs M. Speight
Hartburn Primary School	Miss F Hawkins
High Clarence Primary School	Mr R McCall Mrs A McCoy
Ingleby Mill Primary School	Mr P Mallon Mr S Watson
Kirklevington Primary School	Mr I Waller
Norton Primary School	Mr K Barrett

Priors Mill CE Primary School	Mrs M McLean
Stockton Riverside College	Cllr J Beaumont (Con) Cllr C Coombs(Lab)
St. Cuthbert's RC Primary School	Mr S Dowson
St. Patrick's RC Secondary School	Mrs E Barber
St. Therese of Lisieux RC Primary School	Mrs I. Machin
The Norton School	Mr G. O'Neill
Thornaby Community School	Mr J Lowe Mrs N Wilburn Mr. E. Kirkham Cllr. J. Lynch
Tilery Primary School	Ms K Sainsbury
Village Primary School	Mr R Moss Mrs C Siddell
School Organisation Committee	Mr G Jarrett

157 Primary Schools In Billingham

Cabinet was reminded that the Council had encouraged the formation of primary schools rather than separate infant and junior schools, on grounds of improved continuity and consistency of teaching and pastoral care, enhanced career opportunities for staff, and greater flexibility in management. Three pairs of schools in the Borough had been amalgamated in recent years following consultation instigated at the request of the governing bodies of those schools. The Council had not sought to impose amalgamation against the wishes of schools.

It was explained that only two pairs of infant and junior schools remained in the Borough. These were:-

- Roseberry Infant School and Roseberry Junior School and;
- Bewley Infant School and Bewley Junior School

Meetings of the governing bodies of Roseberry Infant School and Roseberry Junior School had produced contradictory outcomes: one governing body agreed to consultation on a possible amalgamation, but the other had not. Parents of children attending those schools, and staff working in them, had not had an opportunity to consider the issues around amalgamation and express their views (apart from the small number who sat on the governing bodies). Consultation would provide that opportunity for all interested parties.

The outcome of consultation would be reported to Cabinet and would, by law, be considered before any firm proposal being made. If the responses were

positive, the Authority might propose to close the separate infant and junior schools and open a new community primary school in the same buildings.

RESOLVED that the information in the report be used as the basis for consultation with interested parties, on the possible amalgamation of Roseberry Infant School with Roseberry Junior School, and of Bewley Infant School with Bewley Junior School.

158 Tees Valley Joint Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – Local Development Framework

Cabinet received a report relating to the joint Tees Valley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and noted that it would form part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework.

Members were informed that consultation draft Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk stated that all local planning authorities should prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, in consultation with the Environment Agency, to determine the variations in flood risk across the Borough as the basis for preparing appropriate policies for flood risk management for those areas. This would also enable the Council to determine the acceptability of flood risk in relation to emergency planning capability. Strategic Flood Risk Assessments had to either form part of the Sustainability Appraisal of Local Development Documents, or be used to inform the sequential approach to flood risk for site allocations and in determining planning applications.

The submission draft of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East (June 2005) also advocated that in developing Local Development Frameworks and considering planning applications a sequential risk-based approach to development and flooding should be adopted. In addition it would be necessary to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Following a meeting with the Environment Agency and the other Tees Valley Authorities in January 2006, the Head of Planning Services was in agreement to pursue a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in conjunction with the other Tees Valley Authorities. Joint working was particularly encouraged and there were numerous examples of such joint working.

The Council's Procurement Team was satisfied that Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council would go out to tender for the Tees Valley Authorities to ensure that best value for money was achieved. The Environment Agency would be invited to submit a competitive tender by linking work carried out on the River Tees Catchment Flood Management Plan

It was estimated that the costs for a local authority to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment singly was between £20,000 and £25,000. It was also estimated that costs between £40,000 and £45,000 jointly for a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Boroughs of Redcar & Cleveland, Stockton and Middlesbrough (a maximum of £15,000 each). Since the estimates were received, Hartlepool Borough Council and Darlington Borough Council had agreed to undertake a joint Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Dependent on the appointed consultant's workload, it was anticipated that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment would take a maximum of six months to

complete and would require a “planning input” into the final Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to ensure that the data had been interpreted correctly and that it was a planning document with a technical input and not a technical report with a planning input.

Members were provided with details of the advantages and disadvantages of pursuing a joint Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as follows:

Advantages

- Economies of scale
- The River Tees catchment area extends beyond the authority boundary
- A development within one Authority boundary may increase the risk of flooding elsewhere if a holistic approach is not adopted
- Frees up Council staff to concentrate on the preparation of other development plan documents
- Avoid any legal challenge as to the soundness of a development plan document

Disadvantages

- Consultants have to be able to fit it into their workload
- Each local planning authority are at different stages of production of their local development documents

RESOLVED that: -

1. The principle of undertaking a Joint Strategic Flood Risk Assessment be endorsed.
2. The appointment of consultants to carry out this work be endorsed.

159 Joint Strategy Committee – Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Joint Strategy Committee held on 16 December 2005 and 30th January 2006 be approved/received, as appropriate.

16th December 2005

A meeting of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee was held on Friday, 16th December 2005.

Present: - Councillor Budd (Chairman)

Representing Darlington Borough Council:- Councillors Lyonette and Ruck.

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

Representing Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council:- Councillors Dunning, Empson and Smith. Representing Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council: Councillors Cherrett, Cook and Dixon.

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

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

Declarations of Interest

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

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

Minutes

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

Regional Transport Board

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

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

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

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

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

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

Schemes under development £1400m+	
Scheme	Cost (£m 2005 prices)
A1 North of Alnwick to Scottish Border dualling	Circa £400m
A1 West Mains – Bridge Mill	£21m
A66 Darlington Bypass	£52m

Blaydon/Newburn Haugh Foot/Cycle Bridge	£10m
Durham Northern Relief Road	£20m
East Billingham Relief Road	£19m
Metro Re-invigoration	Circa £400m+
New Tees Crossing	£156m
Tees Valley Bus Network Review	£30m
Tees Valley Metro	Circa £228m
Transit 15 QBC's Durham	£15m
Orpheus Bus Corridors (2 nd phase)	£30m
Redheugh Bridge/Scotswood Road Junction	£10m
Wheatley Hill – Bowburn	£10m

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

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

- A66 Darlington Bypass – to be brought forward from current position in programme post 2016
- East Billingham Relief Road – arising from safety concerns regarding use by HGV tankers
- A19/A66 – to be considered as part of the major road network, aka A66/A1, due to its significant role in the Tees Valley
- A66/A1 to be considered as part of national road network

RESOLVED that:-

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

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

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

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

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

Regional Spatial Strategy

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

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

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

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

Post 2006 European Funding

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

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

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

Tees Valley European Legal Support Service

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Priority 4 Activity in the Tees Valley

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Monitoring Housing Market Renewal

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

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

- Housing Database – a range of information about each individual house in the Tees Valley
- Neighbourhood Database – relevant information aggregated by neighbourhoods specially designed for HMR purposes and from other data on relevant socio-economic issues;
- Analysis and Monitoring – analysing and comparing the characteristics of individual neighbourhoods, and measuring change over time as the housing market renewal intervention makes an impact; concentrating on reporting how well the sub-regional plan is meeting its targets;
- Website – a useful additional feature, making the Neighbourhood Database readily available via a website to all those in the Tees Valley involved in planning and renewing the housing market.

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

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

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

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

DICIDA Activities

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

The main topics covered by the conference were competitiveness, economic drivers and energy; each of which was important to continuing the sustainable development of the industry in the Tees Valley. With regard to its future work programme DICIDA now had a place on the government's chemical stakeholder forum and would continue to contribute to the forum's work on REACH. Work would also continue on lobbying on REACH both through the UK DICIDA network and in collaboration with colleagues in the European Chemicals Region network. Work on the impact of emissions trading

on the industry would also continue, as would the whole question of energy in consultation with local MPs. DICIDA was only one of two UK organisations who contributed to the debate on Sustainable Technology Platforms and it was anticipated that further work in this area would be carried out in collaboration with European colleagues. Work would also continue on studies being undertaken by the European Chemical Regions Network and the North East was co-ordinating the study on skills; contributions to the innovations study; and on bringing back into use land contaminated with chemicals.

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

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (v) The Borough Council should be satisfied that retail development proposed within the Middlehaven scheme complements the vitality and viability of Middlesbrough town centre.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Projected Outturn Report 2005/2006

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

List of Meetings

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

RESOLVED that the list of meetings be noted.

30th January 2006

Present: Councillor Budd (Chairman).

Representing Darlington Borough Council: Councillors Lyonette, Scott, Wallis and Williams.

Representing Hartlepool Borough Council: Councillors Preece and Waller.

Representing Middlesbrough Borough Council: Councillors Sanderson and Thompson.

Representing Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council: Councillors Mrs Collins, Dunning and Smith.

Representing Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council: Councillor Cherrett.

Officers: J Lowther (Director of Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit), P K Bell (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council).

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Allison, Brady, Cook, Coward, Empson, Lupton, Mawston, Mrs Moody, Payne, Richmond and Teasdale.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Smith declared a personal non prejudicial interest in respect of Agenda Item No. 5 – Tees Valley Draft Sub Regional Housing Strategy as he is a Member of the Management Board of Coast and Country Housing Ltd.

Tees Valley Draft Sub Regional Housing Strategy.

Consideration was given to a report on the Tees Valley Draft Sub Regional Housing Strategy.

Members were aware that the Joint Strategy Unit was coordinating the evidence on behalf of the Tees Valley authorities for justifying the housing policies and strategy in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

A key report was the Draft Sub Regional Housing Strategy which was attached for Members information and was currently subject to further consultation. The draft report provided a useful summary and background evidence of the housing needs of the Tees Valley and the issues which will need to be examined over the next two years. The report sought approval from Members to submit the Draft Sub Regional Housing Strategy to the library of documents for the Examination in Public on the basis that it was work in progress and illustrated how our planning policies related to housing policies.

There were 3 minor amendments proposed by Hartlepool Borough Council. These amendments were agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED that the Director of the Joint Strategy Unit be authorised to submit the Draft Sub Regional Housing Strategy to the North of England Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public as work in progress.

North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision: Examination in Public, March/April 2006 – Employment Land Provision in the Tees Valley.

Consideration was given to a report on the North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision: Examination in Public, March/April 2006 – Employment Land Provision in the Tees Valley.

It was outlined that the Joint Strategy Unit would be a participant at the Examination in Public to be held into the North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision in March and April 2006. The purpose of the report was to seek the Member's endorsement of the

case that should be made for adequate provision of employment land in the Tees Valley.

The North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision (RSS) was submitted by the North East Assembly, as Regional Planning Body, to the Secretary of State in July 2005. An Examination in Public into the RSS would commence on 7th March 2006 and was expected to last about five weeks. The purpose of the Examination in Public would be to provide an opportunity for a structured discussion and testing of the draft RSS before an independent Panel. The Joint Strategy Unit had been asked to participate at the Examination and will represent the Tees Valley local authorities on a number of matters to be discussed.

The report showed the amount of employment land available in the Tees Valley and compared data with that in the submission draft Regional Spatial Strategy.

It was outlined that although there may be some scope for a limited amount of employment land in the Tees Valley to be de-allocated or re-allocated for other uses, the current employment land portfolio should be largely retained. The Tees Valley needed to be able to implement the economic objectives set out in the Northern Way, the City Region Development Programme, and the Tees Valley Vision. It could only do this if it had sufficient land available for development in the correct location.

The Tees Valley City Region Development Programme had set out the region's priorities for raising the economic performance of the Tees Valley. The region's ability to achieve an improved economic performance would partly depend on having sufficient land allocated in the correct locations to achieve the goal.

RESOLVED that the report be approved as the basis for presenting the case for employment land provision in the Tees Valley at the Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public.

North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision: Examination in Public, March/April 2006 – Housing Provision in the Tees Valley.

Consideration was given to a report on the North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision: Examination in Public, March/April 2006 – Housing Provision in the Tees Valley.

It was outlined that the Joint Strategy Unit would be a participant at the Examination in Public to be held into the North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision in March and April 2006. The purpose of the report was to seek Member's endorsement of the case that should be made for an increase in the housing provision for the Tees Valley sub-region.

The North East Regional Spatial Strategy Revision (RSS) was submitted by the North East Assembly, as Regional Planning Body, to the Secretary of State in July 2005. An Examination in Public into the RSS would commence on 7th March 2006 and was expected to last about five weeks. The purpose of the Examination in Public would be to provide an opportunity for a structured discussion and testing of the draft RSS before an independent Panel. The Joint Strategy Unit had been asked to participate at the Examination and would represent the Tees Valley local authorities on a number of matters to be discussed.

The submission draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East (RSS) identified a net housing requirement in the Tees Valley of 29,100 dwellings over the period 2004-2021. The Tees Valley local authorities considered that the net housing requirement in RSS should be increased to 33,100 for the following reasons:

1. Recent net migration trends indicated that there was a strong case for more optimistic assumptions on future migration rates
2. Good prospects for faster economic growth, as reflected in the Northern Way, City Region Development Programme and Tees Valley Vision
3. The locational strategy in RSS which focused future development in the city regions

4. Major regeneration proposals in the pipeline and initiatives to re-structure the sub-regional housing market
5. Providing more choice and variety of housing type and location to encourage more people to live within the Tees Valley and reduce commuting.

RESOLVED that that the report be approved as the basis for presenting the case at the Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public for an increased net dwelling provision figure of 33,100 over the period 2004-2021.

160 Central Area Partnership Board - Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Central Area Partnership Board held on 26th January 2006 be approved/received, as appropriate.

161 Northern Area (Billingham) Partnership Board - Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Northern Area (Billingham) Partnership Board held on 13th March 2006 be approved/received, as appropriate.

162 Renaissance Board - Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Renaissance Board held on 14th March and 11th April 2006 be approved/received, as appropriate.

Central Area Partnership Board – 16th December 2006

<p>Members: Paul Thomas (CS), Sacha Bedding (VS), Cllr D Coleman (PUB/SBC), Robert Bond (VS), E McClurg (VS), Cllr Suzanne Fletcher (PUB/SBC)) Insp Tariq Ali (Police/PUB), Tina Williams (CS), Lesley Makin (VS), Judith Turner (Rural CS), Jim Beall (CPF), Stan Slater (VS), Ken Lupton (PUB/SBC)</p>
<p>Advisors Lesley Dale (SBC/Advisor), Kelly Smith, Kirstine Da, Nigel Laws (SBC/PUBLIC) Julie Derbyshire, Derek Lincoln</p>
<p>Observers: Sue McPartland, Ron Atkinson</p>
<p>Apologies: Margaret Tinkler, Sue Cash, Kelly Brown, Michelle Wray, Vera Walker, Audrey Wray, Roy Parker, Alex Bain</p>

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 Co-ordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438
<p>Minutes held on:- 27th October 2005 24th November 2005 Page 3 should incorporate a reference to Health Statistics provided by PANIC not being used in the LAP's technical report. Page 7 should state 'Children's Fund Board'. 15th December 2005</p>		<p>It was agreed that minutes for 27th October and 15th December 2005 were a true record.</p> <p>Minutes of meeting on 24th November were noted as a true record subject to amendments.</p>	LD to make amendments.	No		Lesley Dale Area Partnership Co-ordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Matters arising A special 'Thank you' was given to Rev. Derek Rosamond and those directly involved for the co-ordination of the 'Celebration of Renaissance' event, which made the event a success.</p>		Noted.	No	No	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Co-ordinator Contact 526498 or 527568
<p>Stockton Town Centre The partnership was updated on the current developments for Stockton Town Centre, which included the Southern Gateway, the Cultural Quarter and the appointment of Sue Burgess, the new Stockton Town Centre Manager.</p> <p>Regular progress reports would be scheduled into the partnerships forward plan for future meetings. It was felt by the partnership that it is imperative that they are consulted in the master planning process and this should be brought to the partnership for future consultation. However duplication was a concern, following previous studies and reports being carried out of a similar nature. Rural involvement should not be forgotten and links should be developed to enhance the consultation around the Stockton Town Centre developments. It was stressed that social & leisure needs for young people are a</p>		<p>It was agreed that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Stockton Town Centre Manager would be invited to a future meeting to present an update. • Regular update reports will be presented to the board. • Update on the footbridge over the river and the mobile skateboard park. 	LD to contact Sue Burgess, Town Centre Manager.	No	No	Nigel Laws Principal Planning Officer Contact number 527565

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>high priority and this needs addressing. The town also serves the rural areas and it is essential that there is involvement from the Parish Councils etc.</p> <p>It was agreed that the newly appointed Stockton Town Centre Manager would be invited to a board meeting to inform the board of her role and also to address issues around:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market • Shop Mobility • Cultural quarter • Town Centre Partnership <p>An update on the footbridge over the river linking to the university and the position of the skateboard mobile park was requested for a future meeting.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the partnership should be involved in the master planning consultation process 				
<p>Single Regeneration Budget – programme update</p> <p>The SRB DVD is currently being copied ready for distribution and will be available for distribution by March.</p> <p>The draft evaluation report is currently being circulated to the Regeneration subgroup for final</p>		The report was noted.	No	No	No	Kirstine Da Funding & Programmes Officer Contact 527567

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>comments. This should be finalised by February and submitted to GONE.</p> <p>An update was given to the partnership on existing SRB projects. The Regeneration Subgroup has approved the reinstating of the original lifetime allocation of Write to Read project. The subgroup has also approved revisions to the forecast output to the Tees Watersports Centre in line with realistic expectation. Clarity was given around which water sports centre this referred to and it as confirmed that it the centre on Dugdale Street.</p>						
<p>Hardwick Redevelopment Update The board will be given quarterly reports at future meetings regarding the progress on the Hardwick Development.</p> <p>It was confirmed that Barratt Homes & Haslam Homes have submitted their planning application. Comments are to be submitted by 26th January 2006.</p> <p>St Gregory's primary school has now been demolished. The planning application for the new primary school will be submitted by the end of January 2006.</p>		Report was noted.	No	No	No	Rachel Swales Regeneration Project Officer Contact number: 528503

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>The partnership suggested that site visits and maps in relation to these developments would be beneficial. The Housing Renewal Team would take on board the suggestions.</p>						
<p>Stronger Safer Communities & Neighbourhood Renewal Fund. The partnership were advised on the proposed package of project ideas that will make up applications to the Neighbourhood Renewal Liveability Theme and the Safer Stronger Communities Funding (Cleaner Safer Greener Element). The Liveability Partnership has been allocated the indicative amount of £590,827 over two years.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Renewal Fund The proposed project groupings for Neighbourhood Renewal Funding is for projects to look at improving recycling within the Super Output Areas (SOA's) and to raise awareness of waste and other environmental issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure to improve the recycling rates within those Neighbourhoods that 		<p>Report noted. It was agreed that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership member to submit suggestions for proposed projects. 	<p>Members to submit suggestions to LD</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Mike Bowron Principal Development Officer Contact 526028</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>participation is poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased litter and dog fouling enforcement within the NRF areas • Continuation of the Hardwick Dean Warden position • Raising awareness of environmental issues with the schools and youth clubs of the NRF areas. <p>Cleaner Safer Greener Proposed projects are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Safety- alley gates, mobile CCTV camera and street lighting improvements • Parks- improvements to the local parks that serve the communities of the SOA's. • Open Green Spaces – improvements to the open green spaces within the areas to improve access and increase usage • Street Scene – improvement to the places where people live <p>Recognition was given to MB for bringing this report to the partnership for consultation. This was a step in the right direction and the partnership hoped that the other Thematic</p>						

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Partnerships would adopt this approach. It is imperative that timescales are taken into consideration regarding the consultation process and it was hoped that the amount of funding will impact on specific areas and not be spread too thinly.</p> <p>Suggestions were given for consideration such as the old allotments at Oxbridge. Any further suggestions/ideas are to be forwarded to LD to collate and submit to the Liveability Lead Officer.</p>						
<p>Thematic Feedback</p> <p>1) Economic Regeneration & Transport Partnership (ERT) No paperwork had been received prior to this meeting and TW was unable to attend.</p> <p>2) Safer Stockton Partnership (SSP) This meeting will be held in the following week. TW will feed back at next meeting.</p> <p>3) Health Improvement Partnership (HIP) SB is currently scheduling a meeting with Toks Sangowawa and Sue Cash (PCT) to discuss how to better inform partnerships on progress made.</p> <p>4) Stockton Renaissance - Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) A brief overview of the agenda was given the board by SB/JP. This included an update of</p>		<p>Update noted.</p> <p>LD to check with ERT Partnership regarding paperwork.</p>	<p>LD to check receipt of appropriate paperwork for the thematic partnerships.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Lesley Dale Area Partnership Co-ordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
the approved NRF allocations for the CEN.						
<p>RCAP Terms of Reference (TOR) Following the RCAP pre agenda, a question was raised around the stated 'quorum' of the partnership in the current TOR It was felt that this part of the TOR needed re-addressing.</p> <p>It was agreed by the partnership that Section 10 Quorum of the TOR would be amended to state ...'there shall be a quorum of 8 members, comprising one member from at least of three of the four different sectors'.</p>		<p>The partnership agreed to amend the Section 10 of the Terms of reference to state.</p> <p>'there shall be a quorum of 8 members, comprising one member from at least of three of the four different sectors.'</p>	Amend Terms of Reference to reflect changes to the Quorum.	No	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Co-ordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438
<p>Any other Business:- Elections CEN are currently undertaken the election process for the Renaissance Central Area Partnership (RCAP). The members that will be standing down as of the 31st March will be:- Community Sector Vera Walker Tina Williams Voluntary Sector</p>		Noted.	No	No	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Co-ordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Sacha Bedding Stan Slater Edna Chapman</p> <p>Relevant paperwork has been disseminated to the community & Voluntary Sector.</p> <p>Workshop:- Induction to the LSP A workshop will be delivered on the 16th February for the community and voluntary sector around the function and role of the LSP and Neighbourhood Renewal. This model had been successfully rolled out to officers of the council and will be delivered by the councils corporate training department. A letter has already been sent to Area Partnerships member, those who would be interested are to respond to Kelly Brown or Lesley Dale.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Renewal Fund Split. Information was handed to the partnership around the NRF funding split between the statutory and community/sector. The concern that had been raised was round the actual size of the allocations given to each organisation and how this may effect future funding for the Community and Voluntary Sector.</p>		<p>It was agreed for members to notify LD/KB of attendance for workshop SF indicated that she would like to attend this workshop</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>SF to be placed on workshop.</p>			

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
Next Meeting: 23rd February 2005 at 10.00 am						Lesley Dale Contact 527568 or 526498

Northern Area (Billingham Partnership Board – 13th March 2006

<p>Members: Manager: Kevin Pitt Deputy Chair: Roger Black Kevin Bowler (CS), Liz Smith(BS), Joe Maloney(VS), Kenneth Ellis (VS), Geoff Harrison(CS), Ged McGuire(CS), Paul Harrison (VS), Michele Smith (CS), Jim Sculley (BS)</p>
<p>Advisors/Observers Sophie Richardson (SBC, Nigel Laws (SBC), Nicola Kelly (SBC), Jane Elliott (SBC), Kelly Brown (CS), Christine Ellis (CS), and Pat Blackett (CS)</p>
<p>Apologies Sue Cash Carolynne Withers Colin Stratton Councillor Barry Woodhouse John Tough Cath Coldbeck Miriam Stanton</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Introductions and apologies stated</p>		Noted	SR			<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>
<p>2. Approval of Minutes from Meeting on 9th January 2006</p> <p>Minutes of the last meeting amended and agreed as being an accurate and true record</p>		Noted	SR			<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p>
<p>3. Planning Issues</p> <p>Jane Elliott, Principal Planning Officer from SBC advised the Board of consultation relating to the emerging Core Strategy, Issues and Options and its role in the new Local development Framework</p> <p>The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a new system of local planning, called the Local Development Framework. Under the new system, the</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Jane Elliott SBC 01642 526053</p> <p>Jane Elliott SBC 01642 526053</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>TBP did request that they would like feedback on why certain issues may not be included in the final plan.</p> <p>Consultation is a flexible process and Planning from SBC are happy to come and speak to TBP again if needed.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Jane Elliott SBC 01642 526053</p> <p>Jane Elliott SBC 01642 526053</p>
<p>4. Appointment of TBP Manager</p> <p>The above agenda item, will be discussed at the end of the meeting behind closed doors. Members of the Public and the current Manager will be asked to leave the meeting</p>		<p>Noted</p>				
<p>5. Matters Arising</p> <p>a. Town Centre Development</p> <p>Following the Council's decision to provide Halladale with one months notice to address concerns with the redevelopment proposals, the Council is now pleased to report that revised proposals together with financial appraisals by Council Officers. A further meeting has been arranged with Halladale</p>		<p>Noted</p>				<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>for the 14th March.</p> <p>Billingham Forum A PFI working group will be set up to discuss the PFI bid for Billingham Forum. NL requested that a member of TBP attend. As TBP's thematic lead for Arts and Culture, Joe Maloney has been nominated to attend, however a declaration of interest will be declared at these meetings as he is an active member of Billingham Folklore Festival.</p> <p>As a member of Save Our Theatre. KB requested that he also attends the PFI bid meetings.</p> <p>Contingency plans are being looked at if the PFI bid fails.</p> <p>Pigeons are still a big issue in the Town Centre and the excrement from Pigeons is</p>		<p>TBP Agreed. JM to be nominated member to represent TBP at PFI bid meetings</p> <p>NL expressed the importance of keeping this PFI group tight and if it is open to one group then it other groups could challenge this</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>NL to look into putting up signs discouraging people</p>	<p>NL</p>			<p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <p>Nigel Laws SBC</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>making the Town Centre very dangerous</p> <p>b. Bulgarth Estimates are at present being revised and SBC are looking at different schemes. NL will look at getting hold of plans and bringing these to the next TBP</p> <p>c. Billingham House The Council has access to the documents logged with Land Registry in respect of the purchase of the property by the current owners. The Office Copy Entry is the principle title document which proves ownership of the land, and title deeds are no longer required. The Office Copy Entries for Billingham House contain no references to any obligations on the current owners to return the land to ICI if the land is not developed.</p> <p>The Council intends to serve a letter before action on Bizzy B Management Limited, the current owners, notifying them of the Council's intention to serve a notice under</p>		<p>from feeding the pigeons</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>01642 527565</p> <p>Nigel Laws SBC 01642 527565</p> <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>the Building Act 1984 if no action is taken within 3 months of service of the letter to satisfy the Council that they intend to develop the site or otherwise take action to remedy the ruinous state of the property or demolish it. The Director of Law and Democracy has confirmed that such a notice can be withdrawn if necessary but this is only likely to occur once the Council is satisfied that the notice is no longer required to ensure the adverse impact of the property is remedied.</p> <p>The situation regarding the asbestos in Billingham House remains unchanged. The most recent survey states that there is no evidence that air borne particles of the asbestos are leaving the building and therefore it only poses a hazard to people that are illegally entering the building. The Council has therefore continued to apply pressure on the owner to maintain the security of the building to prevent illegal access</p> <p>La Ronde and Forum House</p>						

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>5. Thematic Groups Update</p> <p>Economic Regeneration and Transport GH attended meeting at start of March. He did not receive the papers until the day before the meeting. £1.18 million to be distributed over 2 years and to be agreed by the Thematic Group. GH raised the issue of the BME receiving £308,000 as a brand new project. TBP would like to see more involvement from BME but concerns were raised regarding the amount of funds available and the over bid for funds.</p> <p>GH attended a Building Stronger Communities Conference on 2nd February in London. Report was circulated.</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed that TBP does not oppose the funding to any of the projects in principle however the funding should be allocated to meet the needs of existing projects before funding new projects. Existing commitments should be met first. And funding allocation should fit into the budget profile.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>KP</p>			<p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p> <p>KP to prepare recommendations from TBP for GH</p> <p>Geoff Harrison TBP 01642 861992</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Health Improvement Plan First meeting will be on 7th April</p> <p>Safer Stockton Partnership No meeting took place</p> <p>Children Trust Board Michele received no papers. In future public will be able to attend these meetings and also ask any questions. Peter Seller had taken into account issues raised at TBP when he attended. For e.g Fathers involvement into the Children and Young Peoples Plan.</p> <p>Liveability GH was unable to attend as he was ill.</p> <p>Arts and Culture There was a meeting last Thursday regarding Billingham Carnival. The meeting room provided by TBP was very good and ideal for this meeting. It was noted that the Chair of The Billingham Carnival needs to re establish the committee. RB Chair of Billingham Carnival suggests that TBP</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>SR to chase</p> <p>If TBP has any issues they would like raising they can pass these onto MS</p> <p>The Board approved a paper circulated by JM regarding- Funding for the Carnival- seeking parity with other funding by SBC too Carnival events and parity with regards to obtaining of Street Entertainments License for use in Billingham. KP</p>	<p>SR</p> <p>KP</p>			<p>Sophie Richardson SBC 01642 526026</p> <p>Joe Maloney TBP 01642 651060</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Manager attend Executive Groups and help with administration.</p>		<p>to arrange meeting between Carnival Reps, JM and SBC to resolve issues raised</p> <p>TBP suggested that if the Manager did provide support he was also open to provide support to other groups. KB, GM MS, GH and PH volunteered to help. RB is to organise a meeting to brief volunteers</p>				
<p>7. Information Updates a. Community Sector</p> <p>The Folklore Festival received a grant from Community Chest.</p> <p>It was raised at the last network meeting that SRCGA mailing list was out of date</p> <p>Supporters of John Whitehead Park have had good feedback from their NRF application which John Angus from SBC</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>KB</p>			<p>Kelly Brown SRCGA 01642 733900</p> <p>John Angus SBC</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>submitted. Although John Whitehead Park is not within a SOA, it is a civic space for people who live in SOA within Billingham</p> <p>Voluntary Sector Bede College had a few computers which were available. SRCGA have purchased 3. These could not be released from Bede College until it had certain software was put on it. KB has paid for the software on the machines and they are now ready to be released. The computers are to be distributed to RB, KE and SRCGA.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Watch meeting which took place last week received reports of break ins in the Billingham area, which is targeting car keys. It is now recommended that car keys should be hid even when in the home, as burglaries are taking place where only car keys have been stole</p> <p>Business Sector A meeting is due to take place on Wednesday 15th March. Since the Business</p>		<p>KB will be in touch with those expecting a computer regarding collection or delivery.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>01642 526499</p> <p>Kelly Brown SRCGA 01642 733900</p> <p>Paul Harrison TBP 01642 864341</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Sector noted that a representative from SBC had not been attending their meeting, Paul Hutchinson has started attending which has been very pleasing.</p> <p>2 new shops have opened in Billingham Town Centre.</p> <p>Public Sector No members from the Public Sector were present at this meeting</p>		Noted				
<p>8. Chairs Report</p> <p>JT the Chair was not in attendance</p>		Noted				
<p>9. Managers Report</p> <p>Office at the Billingham Forward is now set up and ready to use. Kevin McAuley and Paul McGee from McAuley and McGee Associates have been commissioned by SRCGA and SVDA to review the service they provide to the community. The basic outcome should be a new format established for Voluntary and</p>		Noted				<p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>Community Sector in the Borough with a strategic lead and hands on delivery.</p> <p>A meeting took place with The Chair, Rebecca Guest and Haleem Ghafoor from SBC to discuss Billingham Local Action Plan. TBP will pick out details within the plan, which they feel are inaccurate, and out of date and bring back the Local Action Plan to the board. SBC did state that this is a live document and is not set in stone. TBP does have money to be spent. This will be discussed in the thematic groups.</p> <p>KP received Tees Valley Community Sector Forum paper work requesting any nominations for their steering groups by 20th March</p> <p>KB residents group meeting takes place on March 20th at 7.00 p.m. KB has spoke to Tees Valley who said that a quick phone call followed up by minutes from the meetings will be adequate for nominations. The chance was there for TBP members to nominate themselves and the Executive</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>				<p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
group would authorise this due to the number of apologies at this meeting						
<p>10. Any Other Business a, Gambling on Teesside</p> <p>There is a proposal for a Super Casino at the Middlehaven site. Will TBP be proactive if this goes ahead and are TBP considering the large scale effects. KE from Churches Together would like to express the unsuitability of this development</p> <p>Although the issues is a concern of TBP. TBP has no remit to consider this as it does not directly effect Billingham</p> <p>Acoustics in the Newlife Resource Centre are quite poor and it is proving difficulty for members of the public, advisors and even board members to hear at TBP</p>		<p>Noted</p> <p>KE to raise at HIP Thematic Group</p>	<p>SR to look at costs for a microphone and raise at next meeting</p>			<p>Kenneth Ellis TBP</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
<p>KP attends the DAT (Drugs Action Team) local supply reduction group and would like to know whether TBP would like him to report back on the DAT to TBP.</p>		<p>TBP Agreed</p>				<p>Kevin Pitt TBP 01642 360150</p>
<p>MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC</p> <p>CURRENT MANAGER, KEVIN PITT ALSO LEFT THE ROOM</p>						

Renaissance Board – 14th March 2006

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
1. Welcome & apologies			No	No	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Coordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438
2. Minutes of the meeting held on the 14 th February 2006		It was agreed that the minutes were a true and accurate record.	No	Yes	No	Lesley Dale Area Partnership Coordinator Contact 526498/527568
<p>3. Neighbourhood Renewal Fund 2006/08 – Health & Economic Regeneration & Transport Packages</p> <p>A summary was given to the board regarding the proposed Neighbourhood Renewal Package 2006/08, regarding the Health and Employment package/cross-cutting Worklessness package.</p> <p>Following the outline health package submitted to Renaissance on the 14th February, the package has been further developed in response to the issues raised at the meeting. Community & Voluntary Sector has been included in the</p>		<p>The partnership approved:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Health Package subject to reference made to all NRF areas, subject to a technical appraisal • The Employment package, subject to a technical appraisal. 	Amendment to be made to Health package regarding reference to all NRF area.	No	No	<p>Ian Thompson Head of Regeneration & Economic Development Contact 527024</p> <p>Ruth Hill Head of Adult Strategy Contact 527055</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>process to support the further development of this package.</p> <p>A question was raised regarding the reference to specific NRF areas in the package. It was felt that reference should be made to all NRF areas and a request to change this was made. Page 21 of the application should indicate 80-90% and not 51-99% of the projects beneficiaries that live within Neighbourhood Renewal Super output areas.</p> <p>The Billingham Partnership support the employment package and it wishes the funds to be allocated as requested to existing providers to ensure continuity within this thematic area. The board approved all the packages subject to a technical appraisal.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of the Worklessness package subject to a technical appraisal. 				
<p>Embedding Culture in Stockton Renaissance Views were sought from the board members regarding embedding culture in Stockton Renaissance. It was recognised that this was a huge opportunity to develop ownership and identity through arts and culture. It was agreed that the</p>		<p>Stockton Renaissance supported and agreed that the Arts and Culture Partnership should interact with the other thematic partnerships.</p>	<p>Dates of the forthcoming Arts & Culture partnership meetings to be submitted to LD</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Reuben Kench Head of Arts and Culture Contact 527039</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
way forward would be for the Arts and Culture Partnership to interact with the various thematic partnerships. This will be done through delivering presentations and representation at the various partnership meetings.						
Minutes of meetings: The Billingham Partnership held on 9 th January 2006		Noted	No	No	No	Sophie Richardson 01642 526026
The Western Area Partnership meeting held on 28 th November 2006.		Noted	No	No	No	Sophie Richardson 01642 526025
The Eastern Area Partnership meeting held on 31 st January 2006		Noted	No	No	No	Sophie Richardson 01642 526026

Attendance: Cllr B Gibson, Cllr Maureen Rigg, Ann Baxter, Olive Milner, Tina Williams, Jim Beall, Cllr Robert Cook, Cllr Jennie Beaumont, Paul Thomas, Tony Campbell, Mike Picknett, Angela Wilson, Suzanne Fletcher, David Coleman

Advisors: Dawn Welsh, Ian Thompson, Jenny Haworth, Lesley Dale, Ruth Hill, Peter Seller, Julie Danks (SBC/PUB), Julie Derbyshire (SRCGA), Kelly Brown (SRCGA), Carolynne Withers, Jan Docherty, Paul McGee, Paul Burns, Geoff Lee

Observers: Rev David Whiting,

Apologies: Cllr Dave Coleman, Frank Ramsey, Margaret Waggot, Malcolm Taylor Chris Willis, Jeremy Hayter, John Tough, Steve Davison, Julie Allport, Geraldine Wilcox, Lynn Melvin, Carolyn Withers, Graeme Oram.

Renaissance Board – 11th April 2006

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>1. Presentation meeting - Apologies for absence</p>		/	No	No	No	<p>Lesley Dale Area Partnership Coordinator on (01642) 527568/ 526438</p>
<p>2. Stockton Resident's Survey 2006 The board were informed of the proposed Stockton-on-Tees Residents Survey 2006 and were invited to consider possibility of submitting further questions for inclusion in the survey.</p> <p>Potential new topic areas could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and exercise (smoking, alcohol etc) linking to the LPSA targets • Transport agenda • Children & Young People • Devolution agenda/Lyons Review <p>There is a cost implication if partners wish to utilise this survey, however this would be minimum compared to generation their own survey/questionnaire. It was noted that the PCT are currently liaising with KD to regarding data</p>		<p>The partnership approved the Local Resident's Survey for 2006.</p>	No	Yes	No	<p>Helen Dean Head of Policy & Performance Contact 527003</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
around Health Life Styles.						
<p>Welfare Reform Green Paper A presentation was given on the Welfare Reform- A new deal for welfare: Empowering people to work. A paper supporting the presentation had been submitted to the board containing concerns deriving from a previous presentation with cabinet members. This paper highlights the Governments aspiration of achieving an employment rate equivalent to 80% of the working age population.</p> <p>The key proposals for the green paper are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incapacity Benefit Reform • Housing Benefit Reform • Lone Parents • Older People • Delivering Welfare Reform <p>The board were asked for a response in relation to this green paper.</p> <p>General concerns were raised around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment to Tenants - the proposal to increase personal responsibility by transferring housing benefits payment 		<p>The board overall supported the Welfare Reform Green Paper, however a formal response will be submitted highlighting the boards concerns.</p> <p>The board showed concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payments of Housing Benefit to tenants. • Amount of jobs matching peoples skills • Resources to enable the voluntary & community sector 	Formal response to be coordinated and submitted by RT	No	No	Ian Thompson Head of Regeneration & Economic Development Contact 527024

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/ endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>directly to the individual rather than the private landlord. It was felt that this might allow the payment to be possibly used for alternative purposes, consequently putting the person into arrears.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The achievement of employment rate of 80%, this included 129,000 additional people in to work in the North East. The proposals concentrate on getting the person into work. A question was raised regarding how had this figure been derived and how could this be achieved? Are there enough skilled people for the jobs created? It was highlighted that currently there are more jobs than people in the region and it was a case of matching the skills to the right job. • Reference is made to some delivery of the proposals by the voluntary and community sector but it is unclear where the resources will come from. <p>The board was informed that all PSL and Job centre Plus led action team and ethnic minority</p>		<p>to deliver some of the proposals.</p>				

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>outreach activities will cease at the end of September 2006. The Department for Work & Pensions is working with Jobcentre Plus to develop a future deprived area strategy that aims to ensure that all area-based activities are more effectively targeted at people and places with the greatest needs. This has involved a review of their programmes and service to ensure they provide good value for money and continue to meet their needs. It was highlighted that the future strategy will provide more flexibility to local areas regarding the types of provision and support needed. To enable local workless people to move into employment or close to the labour market</p> <p>A difficult concept was apparent regarding the reference made to the piloting of 'city consortiums' to tackle worklessness in the green paper. This is still to be confirmed and there appears to be little funding to help with this. Despite there being a number of caveats the board did support the proposals of this paper.</p>						
<p>RSPB Saltholme - The International Nature Reserve in the Tees Valley Kevin Bayes presented the board with an</p>		<p>The board fully supported the Saltholme Project</p>	<p>Letter of support to be submitted.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Kevin Bayes Saltholme Project Manager</p>

ITEM/ISSUE	DOI	Comments/DECISION	ACTION	Does it need Council approval/endorsement?	Are any other boards affected?	CONTACT
<p>inspirational presentation on the Saltholme project.</p> <p>Saltholme will be the largest wetland re-creation project in the North of England. The reserve is being developed with community support and will bring out significant quality of life improvements to local communities.</p> <p>The vision of the project is to create the largest wildlife tourism facility in the Tees Valley, bringing over 100,00 visitors to the area and contribution £1.4 million to the local economy.</p> <p>The board fully supported the project and the vision.</p>		and will submit a formal letter.				RSPB 0191 2334300
Next meeting: 6th May 2006						

Attendance: Cllr B Gibson, Cllr Maureen Rigg, Ann Baxter, Jeremy Garside, Olive Milner, Jim Beall, Cllr Robert Cook, Cllr Jennie Beaumont, Paul Thomas, Tony Campbell, Chris Willis, John Tough, Cllr David Coleman, Jeremy Garside

Advisors: Lesley Dale, Kate Dumain, Helen Dean, Linda Stephenson, Mark Rowell, Roland Todd (SBC/PUB), Julie Derbyshire (SRCGA), Paul McGee, Lynne Melvin, Steve Davison, Kevin Bayes (RSPB), Geoff Lee, Toks Sangowawa

Observers: Rev David Whiting

Apologies: Frank Cook, Jenny Haworth, Graeme Oram, Cllr Dave Coleman, Frank Ramsey, Margaret Waggot, George Garlick, Dawn Welsh, Ian Thompson, Rev Derek Rosamond, Jan Mccoll.

163 Tristar Homes Limited – Strengthening Governance

Cabinet was asked to consider and approve a scheme of remuneration and appraisal for the Tristar Homes Board.

Members were provided with copies of reports (prepared by the Director of Stockton Borough Council's Development & Neighbourhood Services in conjunction with Tristar Homes Limited's Company Secretary), which had been considered by the Tristar Homes Limited Board. They considered a range of issues relating to improving the capacity and effectiveness of both the governance and performance of Tristar Homes Limited.

It was noted that this reflected one of five critical areas of the comprehensive service improvement plan (SIP), developed as a result of the Audit Commission's housing inspection report in 2005 in which it had stated "It is not clear that the Board provides the proactive leadership necessary to drive forward change". The SIP was in effect a route map to a 3 star excellent service.

Specifically there were comprehensive training and development programmes, dedicated support, peer monitoring and revised governance structures. A detailed scheme of appraisal for the Board, and in particular, for those key positions on the Board which had special responsibilities had been agreed in principle and a detailed scheme due for consideration and approval.

One element of the package of measures (which of course all fed into the comprehensive service improvement plan), which required specific approval from Stockton Borough Council, was the scheme of remuneration. This had been considered and debated in detail at several Board meetings (details were provided to Cabinet in Appendix 2 and 3).

Tristar Homes Limited had approved the scheme of remuneration and appraisal as at Appendix 1a of the report, but this was subject to Stockton Borough Council endorsement. In effect the scheme of remuneration would apply to five specific roles, each with special responsibility. The costs would be met from existing Tristar Homes Limited budgets.

It would be appropriate for the Council's independent allowances panel to be asked to review and administer the scheme and the costs of such to be recharged to Tristar Homes Limited.

RECOMMENDED to Council that: -

- 1. The proposed scheme of remuneration and appraisal, as outlined in appendix 1a of the report, be endorsed.***
- 2. The Council's independent allowances panel be requested to review and administer the scheme thereafter.***

164 Improving Sheltered Housing – Selection of Registered Social Landlord for preferred partner status.

Members were reminded that, at its meeting held on 10th March 2005 Cabinet had supported Small Scale Voluntary Transfer (SSVT) as the most viable

means of securing the investment required to deliver quality older persons accommodation.

Since that time, the detailed SSVT process had commenced. Key stages had included; the establishment of the Sheltered Housing Tenants Group, the Registered Social Landlord (RSL) selection process, including the establishment of a Selection Panel and the valuation of the sheltered housing stock.

It was explained that following a comprehensive selection process, details of which were provided to Members, the Selection Panel were unanimous in their endorsement of Erimus Housing as the preferred RSL partner for the SSVT of sheltered housing.

Cabinet noted that the proposals submitted by Erimus Housing include the modernisation of three sheltered housing schemes and demolition and new build of 3 schemes. This proposal was consistent with the proposals received by each of the shortlisted RSLs and an independent stock condition survey carried out on behalf of the Council. In two blocks, where demolition was proposed (Eden and Derwent House), accommodation consisted of flatted accommodation with shared bathroom facilities; in those instances modernisation to an acceptable standard (i.e. decent standard and the provision of self contained bathing and wc facilities) would not be possible. The third sheltered housing scheme proposed for demolition and new build was Witham House, this property had structural problems and was identified in the stock condition survey as in 'poor' condition and requiring extensive investment. In addition the majority of accommodation (19 of 24 units) only provide bedsit accommodation, which would prove unviable to convert and were becoming increasingly unpopular.

In each of the 3 sites proposed for redevelopment, Erimus Housing would re-provide quality elderly persons accommodation for both rent and sale. This proposal was consistent with the Councils strategy for elderly persons accommodation in terms of developing a range of affordable housing options for elderly people (including quality rented, intermediate tenure and outright sale).

Given its popular residential location, Witham House in Eaglescliffe was potentially the most financially viable of the sites in terms of future resale values. Initially all of the shortlisted RSLs proposed new build elderly persons accommodation exclusively for sale on this site. Erimus were aware that this proposal was not acceptable to the Council and had committed to a mix of sale and rented accommodation. The proposal would reduce the numbers of rented accommodation units currently available on this site. However the split between the numbers for sale/rent was yet to be agreed and would be subject to further discussion with Erimus Housing.

It was explained that there were 21 tenanted properties in Witham House. The timing of the improvement works at Witham House would inevitably impact on tenant numbers as the improvement/re-provision of accommodation across all 6 sites would be staggered over a number of years. During this time no further lets would be made at Witham House and therefore based on turnover rates averaging 10% it was anticipated the number of tenanted properties would reduce. In addition the Council's experience from decanting similar sheltered housing schemes indicated that

following the initial transit move, often only the minority of tenants choose to return.

It was acknowledged that the process of informing tenants of the Erimus proposal needed to be carefully managed across all six sheltered housing schemes to avoid undue alarm and distress. Cabinet noted that this would be undertaken through ongoing meetings at individual sheltered schemes and one to one visits with tenants and their family members/advocates.

The ODPM had specified that a transfer could not go ahead unless an Authority had consulted with those tenants whose homes would transfer and could demonstrate that a majority were not opposed. The Council was therefore legally required to make an 'offer' to those who would be affected by the transfer (in what was known as the 'formal consultation period'). Tenants would then be asked to vote on this 'offer', the transfer would only proceed if the majority of those who voted, voted yes.

In advance of the 'formal' consultation period, the Council, in partnership with the preferred RSL partner, would undertake a detailed and comprehensive consultation period with tenants, which would involve introducing the preferred partner and explaining the proposals. In addition, this period would also be used to draw up the 'offer' document which would include a series of 'promises' to tenants, specifically detailing how decent homes would be met, future policies on rents and repairs and levels of service improvement. Those promises could only be drawn up following detailed and ongoing consultation with residents. Promises needed to be clearly defined, time related and measurable as following the transfer they would be monitored by the Housing Corporation to ensure tenant expectations were fulfilled. On this basis it was not anticipated that a formal ballot would occur until late 2006/early 2007. During this consultation period all tenants would continue to receive the support, advice and guidance of the Independent Tenant Advisor.

In the event of a positive ballot outcome the Council would then apply to the Secretary of State to grant consent for the transfer. In order to ensure that the 'promises' made reflected the views of tenants resident at the time of the transfer, the ODPM expected authorities to minimise the time between ballot and transfer. Councils were therefore advised that transfer should occur within 6 months of the ballot decision being known.

During the period from ballot to possible transfer the council and preferred partner would continue to engage and communicate with tenants regarding the progress of the transfer. In addition this period would be used to draw up the transfer contract (which govern the sale of the housing and the relationship between the authority and the transfer RSL).

RESOLVED that

1. Members note the progress made to date in progressing the SSVT of the Council's sheltered housing stock.
2. Members endorse the appointment of Erimus Housing as the preferred partner Registered Social Landlord (RSL).

3. Members support the provisional timetable of transfer activity as detailed within the body of the report, culminating in the transfer of sheltered housing stock to Erimus Housing.
4. Members acknowledge the anticipated financial implications of the SSVT of sheltered housing as detailed within the body of the report.
5. In order to take the development forward Members agree to cease all new lettings in each of the sheltered housing schemes (with immediate effect).

RECOMMENDED to Council that

6. ***Subject to a positive ballot outcome, delegated authority be given to the Director of Law and Democracy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services to apply to the Secretary of State for consent to dispose of the land and to transfer it to Erimus Housing at nil consideration on terms to be agreed between the Parties.***

165 Interim Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Validation of Planning Applications.

Cabinet was asked to note and endorse an interim document to assist in the validation of planning applications.

The document would assist developers and Stockton Planning department in the validation of planning applications. It was intended to build upon this document and work towards a future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which would be formally adopted as part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).

The document would offer assistance and guidance to developers submitting planning applications detailing the expected requirements for a variety of types of planning application in order to achieve a quicker, more transparent and efficient planning service.

It was intended to outline the current validation procedures of planning applications received by Stockton Borough Council, providing guidance on the information required to be submitted as part of a planning application.

This was aimed at lessening the ambiguity of what was classed as a valid planning application and enabling the Local Planning Authority to have sufficient information to confidently determine planning applications while offering a clear and detailed requirement from the outset in order to provide a fast and efficient service.

The checklists provided within the application pack was by no means comprehensive and was aimed at covering the majority of information required for most types of planning application submitted. In certain instances and particularly with sensitive, complex and major applications additional information may be required, in such instances the Local Planning Authority would contact the applicant or agent in writing outlining the additional

information required and the application would remain invalid until all the required information was submitted.

Members noted some of the most common reasons why applications were considered to be invalid:-

- (i) The drawings submitted do not show sufficient details or key elevations were missing.
- (ii) The application forms/certificates were not correctly signed or dated
- (iii) Incorrect fees enclosed or fee cheque not signed
- (iv) Information submitted was still inadequate or incorrect
- (v) Scales of drawings were incorrect, or not accurate
- (vi) Key elevations or site plans were missing

RECOMMENDED to Council that:-

1. ***Approval for Officers to consult on the Validation of Planning Applications as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report be given.***
2. ***Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee and Cabinet Member of Regeneration and Transport, to refer this report to Cabinet and Full Council for it's approval and adoption as a SPD. The results of the consultation and analysis of representations made to be duly considered prior to adoption of the SPD and the Head of Planning be authorised to make any necessary amendments.***

166 Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents – Local Development Framework.

Cabinet considered a report that dealt with the preparation of Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents by the Joint Strategy Unit (JSU), on behalf of Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees Borough Councils.

It was explained that the new Local Development Framework would include a number of development plan documents that formed part of the statutory development plan. Development plan documents (DPD) in unitary authorities should include minerals and waste policies, which may be prepared as separate minerals and waste development plan documents. One of the Government's key planning objectives was the preparation and delivery of planning strategies which helped implement the national waste strategy, and supporting targets, and were consistent with obligations required by European legislation.

Joint working on local development documents was particularly encouraged. Two or more local planning authorities may work jointly to prepare minerals and waste development plan documents. At the meeting of the Tees Valley Planning Managers in June 2004, the Joint Strategy Unit (JSU) was invited to prepare joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents on behalf of

the five Tees Valley authorities (Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees Borough Councils).

It was explained that the Minerals and Waste development plan documents would replace the minerals and waste policies in the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan and it was proposed that they comprise:

- A Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD, which will contain the overall strategy for the development of waste and minerals in the Tees Valley. The Core Strategy is required to be in general conformity with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East
- A Joint Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD. This will identify specific sites for future development, and will contain detailed development plan policies for assessing minerals or waste planning applications in the Tees Valley. This will be in conformity with the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

The Minerals and Waste development plan documents would be subject to a sustainability appraisal, and an Annual Monitoring Report would assess the success (or otherwise) of the strategy and policies.

It was proposed to adopt the joint working arrangements originally set up for the Tees Valley Structure Plan for the preparation of the Minerals and Waste development plan documents. The arrangements were proposed, as follows:

- The JSU would manage the project
- The JSU would prepare most of the documents in draft, to be considered by all of the respective authorities through the Development Plans Officers (as part of a Steering Group)
- Each authority would be kept informed at the key stage of preparation and would be given the opportunity to comment on draft documents
- Results of consultation would be reported back to the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee and to each local authority
- Final draft documents at each stage would be endorsed by each local authority before being considered by the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee
- Adoption of the development plan documents would be undertaken by each local authority, following presentation to the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee.

It was proposed to engage consultants to assist with the preparation of the Minerals and Waste development plan document. The role of the consultants would be to identify and assess individual sites (including Environmental Impact Assessments), to undertake the sustainability appraisal process and to provide expert opinion at the independent examinations.

It was estimated that the total costs involved in progressing the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Site Allocations development plan documents to adoption would be in the region of £165,650. This figure was only a guide until tenders were received.

The distribution of costs between the Boroughs was yet to be decided. However, if the costs were split based on a population pro-rata basis,

Stockton's contribution would be in the order of £53,000. An alternative might be to distribute the costs between the Boroughs to reflect the number of sites in each authority, or to derive a "hybrid" costing system which combined the "population" basis with the "site" basis. The costs would be spread over the financial years 2006/07 to 2010/11.

Members noted some advantages of the Joint Strategy Unit preparing Tees Valley wide Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents as follows:

- Economies of scale
- A joined-up approach to a sub-regional issue. Waste management involves many cross-boundary issues and plans are best prepared at a sub-regional level. The JSU is in the best position to prepare a joint plan covering the Tees Valley and has in-house experience
- Frees up Council staff to concentrate on the preparation of other development plan documents
- Allows the documents to be prepared early in order to meet the national waste management targets
- Will coordinate with the revised Waste Management Strategy, also being produced by the Joint Strategy Unit

Members noted the proposed timetable from the appointment of consultants to the adoption of the Plan

Once the joint approach was agreed by all the five Tees Valley Authorities, the JSU would begin the tendering process to appoint consultants to undertake the preparation of the two Development Plan Documents.

RECOMMENDED to Council that: -

- 1. The principle of the Joint Strategy Committee taking responsibility for the preparation of the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents, on behalf of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council, and the other four unitary Tees Valley Authorities, be endorsed.***
- 2. The appointment of consultants to carry out this work be endorsed***
- 3. The expenditure of about £60,000 over four years from the Local Plan budget be approved***