EXECUTIVE

A meeting of the Executive was held on Wednesday 12 November 2025.

PRESENT: Mayor C Cooke (Chair) and Councillors I Blades, T Furness, P Gavigan, L Henman, J Rostron, J Ryles and N Walker

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: D. Hodgson (Local Democracy Reporting Service).

OFFICERS: S Bonner, C Benjamin, M Brown, G Field, L Grabham, R Horniman, A Humble and E Scollay

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors P Storey

25/38 WELCOME AND FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair welcomed all those present to the meeting and advised attendees of the fire evacuation procedure.

25/39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Name of Member	Type of Interest	Item/Nature of Interest
Mayor C Cooke	Non-Pecuniary	Item 14 – Tees Valley Investment Zone Memorandum of Understanding – Member of the MDC

25/40 MINUTES - EXECUTIVE - 8 OCTOBER 2025

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 8 October 2025 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

25/41 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR

The Mayor expressed his sadness that former Councillor Morgan McClintock had stood down, stating his views were always welcomed and that he brought useful and insightful comments to Council meetings.

25/42 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (IF ANY)

A question had been received from a Member of the public which the Mayor read out:

The problems affecting TS1 mirror that of North Ormesby, with the addition of regular street parties held and the Anti Social Behaviour issues this brings. Can North Ormesby be considered for a PSPO? If not please explain why not.

The Mayor invited the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods to respond. The Executive Member stated the Council was assessing where and when Public Space Protection Orders could be implemented in Middlesbrough and North Ormesby was being considered as part of that process. The Council and partners had a range of tools and powers that could be used to address Anti-Social Behaviour, and residents were advised to report any incident of crime and ASB to the relevant agencies e.g. the police or neighbourhood wardens.

The Mayor added that there had been a change in legislation regarding alley gates. As such the Council was exploring ways to gate alleyways which may assist with Anti-Social behaviour.

NOTED.

25/43 **QUESTIONS FROM ELECTED MEMBERS (IF ANY)**

None.

25/44 **MATTERS REFERRED TO EXECUTIVE FOR RECONSIDERATION FROM SCRUTINY OR COUNCIL (IF ANY)**

None.

25/45 **REPORTS FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD OR A SCRUTINY PANEL**

None.

25/46 **DELIVERY AGAINST THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN - PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Mayor submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report was to set out progress in delivering the Continuous Improvement Plan to ensure the Council could articulate its ongoing commitment to continuous improvement and capture activity that had been undertaken to deliver that commitment.

In March 2025, Council considered the final reports of both the Local Government Association (LGA) Corporate Peer Challenge team and the Middlesbrough Independent Improvement Advisory Board (MIIAB).

Both of those reports were hugely positive, recognising the improvements the Council had made over the previous two years on its improvement journey. They also contained a series of recommendations, designed to ensure the Council maintained an outcome focussed commitment to the principles of its continuous improvement journey as it transitioned from a period of intervention.

The plan also continued to track delivery of actions arising from the External Assurance review undertaken by Grant Thornton as part of the Exceptional Financial Support (EFS) application. It also included an actions arising from the Care Quality Commission inspection of Adult Social Care services.

A copy of the Continuous Improvement Plan and its status as of October 2025 was appended to the report. The Plan continued to evolve as actions were delivered and follow up actions were identified where necessary.

There were 49 actions within the plan. In June 2025 it was reported that 16 had been completed. Since that time a further six had been completed, bringing the total number of completed actions to date to 22. Two new follow up actions had been added since the Plan was last reported. The first new action would track the launch of arrangements to bring in external expertise to manage the Council's commercial property portfolio, following completion of market testing. The second new action built on completion of recruitment of additional capacity to support Members submitting Councillor Gateway inquiries. It would track delivery of an improvement plan to strengthen the system and respond to feedback from Councillors who were using it.

The Mayor stated that the Council was working hard to implement the actions contained in the Plan as part of the improvement journey. Thanks were expressed to all those involved in the Council's improvement journey.

OPTIONS

The Council could choose to maintain multiple documents capturing continuous improvement activity. However, this would have been an inefficient approach and would have reduced Members ability to see a comprehensive overview of the Council's ongoing activity in relation to continuous improvement.

ORDERED that Executive approve the updated Continuous Improvement Plan.

AGREED that Executive note the progress made in delivering the commitments within the continuous Improvement Plan.

REASONS

Having a Continuous Improvement Plan that captured all strategic continuous improvement activity provided Members and Officers with a comprehensive overview of improvement activity within the organisation as part of a framework of assurance reports. The plan ensured the Council was tracking this type of activity within one document. Successful delivery of continual improvement activity would improve the Council's ability to deliver against its Council Plan ambitions.

25/47 **REPROVISION OF LEVICK COURT**

The Executive Member for Adult Social Care submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report sought Executive approval to reprofile Levick Court that would ensure that a high-quality respite/short breaks service would be provided for residents and would ensure sustainability within the workplace.

In 2010, discussions began with the Tees, Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust (TEWV) and the Levick Trust regarding the relocation of existing respite services from the Council's provision at 4 St. Paul's Road and TEWV's Bankfields Court, Eston, to a new site of the former Levick House Care Home on land owned by the Levick Trust.

Construction commenced in 2011 to develop a 16-bed respite unit for adults aged 18 - 64, alongside 20 Older Person's Housing apartments. These apartments, intended to replace the previous care home on the site, were designed to meet the housing needs of older people in Middlesbrough. North Star Housing took on responsibility for managing the apartments as well as the building's repairs and maintenance.

However, in 2012, as the site neared completion, TEWV withdrew from the project, citing concerns about the ongoing revenue funding required to operate their element of the service. Their withdrawal also resulted in the loss of a £500,000 capital contribution, even though the building had been designed to meet clinical standards in line with their requirements. Following TEWV's withdrawal, the Council proceeded to move its respite service from St. Paul's Road and repurposed the remaining capacity at Levick Court to provide residential care. This facilitated the relocation of permanent residents from St. Paul's Road, and the service opened later in 2012.

Levick Court, operated directly by Middlesbrough Council, offered both residential and respite facilities for adults with learning disabilities aged 18 to 65. Historically the unit comprised of eight residential and eight respite beds. It had been operational for over a decade. During that time, the age profile of residents had increased, with the average age being around 60 years and some residents nearing 65. The facility was originally developed for a younger, working-age group, with a staffing model based on residents spending much of the day accessing community services. Staffing was therefore modelled on staff presence in mornings and evenings. As such the staffing model had not been able to accommodate individuals with increased daytime needs.

Respite care was vital for adults with learning disabilities and their families. It provided essential breaks, reduced carer stress, and improved the wellbeing of both carers and those receiving care. Respite services could help maintain family relationships, promote independence, and reduced the likelihood of long-term or permanent care placements.

However, demand for the service had declined in recent years, and the unit currently operated at around 37% occupancy. In some cases, Continuing Health Care (CHC) funding had supported the service to sustain capacity for individuals with complex needs, ensuring that appropriate placements remained available when required.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the service was temporarily closed, leading to a loss of income from both user contributions and CHC-funded placements. Since reopening, revenue had only partially recovered, and a significant service redesign had been undertaken. Social care demand projections indicated that only eight respite beds would be required to meet future needs. Given the current low occupancy levels and high unit costs, Levick Court had been identified as a service in need of substantial transformation.

To meet the objectives of the transformation programme, alternative delivery models were considered, and included:

An option appraisal was undertaken to determine the future of Levick Court. Currently, on average 20 clients access respite services at Levick Court on a regular basis, with support ranging from 20 to 88 nights per year. Four of these clients received some level of health funding toward their care. The service currently employs 22.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff, including 3.09 FTE vacancies.

- Developing an all-age short breaks provision, potentially merging with children's respite services.
- Creating an integrated health and social care respite service.
- Full closure of Levick Court.

The Mayor stated he was pleased Levick court was to remain open. He also stated that when the Council had sufficient financial capacity it could achieve positive outcomes. The Mayor expressed his thanks to all those involved in the creation of the report.

OPTIONS

A number of options were explored before considering engagement with the Integrated Care Board which included:

- **Remaining as is, however, was not financially viable.**
- **Work with children's services to explore respite – this was not viable to the capital investment required to modify the building due to the requirements around CQC and OFSTED.**
- **Working with a private organisation to deliver services – this was not financially viable.**

ORDERED the Executive:

1. **Approve the provision of health respite services at Levick Court, subject to the closure of the Most Suitable Provider (MSP) process being conducted by the Integrated Care Board (ICB).**
2. **Approve the revised fees and charges schedule for Adult Social Care, as outlined in Appendix one of the report.**

REASONS

The proposed revised model would deliver the efficiencies identified within the Adult Social Care Transformation Programme and would make best use of an existing asset. More importantly, it would ensure the ongoing delivery of short breaks and respite care at a local level, while fostering greater collaboration between health and social care partners. This approach aimed to deliver improved outcomes for residents and their families.

25/48 **MIDDLEHAVEN HOUSING**

The Executive Member for Development submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report sought approval to appoint Capital and Centric as the Council's development partner to lead the regeneration of Middlehaven and develop proposals for the area up to RIBA Stage 4.

Middlehaven was the key regeneration area in Middlesbrough, with the potential to transform the economic prospects of the town, and provide new communities for people to live in. Its proximity to, and influence on, the town centre made it vitally important that the development of Middlehaven was taken forward successfully.

The development of Middlehaven had been underway for some time and had seen a number of projects on site in recent years including:

- Completion of Boho X, the 60,000 sq ft headquarters of Double 11
- Outwood Riverside secondary school scheduled to be complete by Spring 2027

- Completion of the TTE technical training facility in March 2025

The ongoing investment in Middlesbrough Railway Station and Exchange Square also provided a much improved gateway into the area. Middlehaven was, however, most notably home to the fastest growing tech cluster outside of London within the Boho Zone, with innovative companies providing hundreds of digital jobs, serving clients including Microsoft and Sony.

The growth of the digital sector had been rapid and expansive, but risks being limited by a lack of available urban living options for young professionals who were not seeking the traditional suburban product available in the rest of the town. Unless a housing offer developed at the same pace as the sector, highly trained and highly sought after young people will potentially seek accommodation elsewhere.

It was therefore critical to the future success of the town that Middlehaven was developed.

The Executive Member for Development stated that previous initiatives to develop Middlehaven had been piecemeal, but this now needed to have a joined up approach. However, there was also a need to exercise caution to ensure the development of Middlehaven was robust.

The Executive Member for Children's Services agreed that while some caution should be exercised this was an exciting development for Middlesbrough and would be a be a significant boost to both the Middlehaven area and the town centre generally.

The Mayor stated he was confident about the development, and that it presented an opportunity to support Middlesbrough's next industry. The Mayor also stated the decision had been reached using robust governance and financial procedures and he was excited to see how communities could be involved.

The Mayor stated that for initiatives such as this it was important that all key stakeholders, such as Teesside University, were involved in the process as much as possible.

OPTIONS

The Middlehaven site was identified in the Mayoral Development Corporation – Consultation report that was endorsed by Executive on the 22 February 2023.

The previous proposal to transfer a number of Council assets over to the MDC had been paused by the Secretary of State due to wider concerns over the governance of mayoral development corporations.

In the absence of a decision by the Secretary of State, the proposal from Capital and Centric presented an opportunity to progress the comprehensive development of the site.

The Council could elect not to proceed with the appointment of Capital and Centric and the £3.6m Towns Fund allocation could be re-purposed for urban living initiatives across the town, but the redevelopment of Middlehaven would not proceed unless significant investment could be secured.

ORDERED that Executive:

1. **Approve the appointment of Capital and Centric as the Council's development partner to lead the regeneration and development of Middlehaven.**
2. **Approve the use of £3.6m from the Towns Fund grant allocation for Urban Living and Placemaking to develop designs up to RIBA Stage 4 to enable the procurement of a main contractor.**
3. **Delegates authority to the Section 151 Officer (in consultation with the Director of Regeneration) to agree any variations to the proposals within the overall budget allocation.**

REASONS

The redevelopment of Middlehaven was needed to address several critical challenges faced by the town and its surrounding areas, which were common to many towns and cities across the north.

These included:

- **a) A lack of high-quality urban housing that appeals to a broad demographic, particularly young professionals and families.**
- **b) Underused land with limited visual and economic contribution to the town.**
- **c) A population decline, and in particular, the out migration of economically active individuals, resulting in reduced discretionary spending and local investment.**
- **d) Highly trained or qualified young people leaving the town and not returning.**
- **e) The need for the Council to generate additional income streams, such as enhanced Council Tax receipts will be greatly enhanced by the development of Middlehaven.**

Addressing these challenges required a bold, collaborative approach to urban regeneration. Middlehaven's development would capitalise on the area's proximity to major transport links, its rich history, and its potential as a cultural and economic hub.

Capital and Centric had a track record of delivering award-winning developments that demonstrated their ability to combine expertise in creating a masterplan vision, with a commitment to long term community creation and curation. Their appointment as development partner for Middlehaven could positively impact residents and visitors for generations to come.

Uniquely, Capital and Centric were both a Development Partner and End User who would be invested in the area to ensure the sustainability of the site in the long-term.

This contrasted with previous proposals, which were to act solely as the Council's Development Partner.

25/49 **2025/26 TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Executive Member for Environment and Sustainability submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report was to gain approval for the funding allocations and to outline the delivery progress of the approved schemes.

Middlesbrough Council received City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement funding via Tees Valley Combined Authority.

The 2025/26 allocations were:

- £1.065m for Integrated Transport
- £2.339m for Highways Maintenance
- £0.750m additional DfT resurfacing grant

The total proposed programme (including Council funding) was £8.436m. The Scheme-level detail and financial breakdown was outlined in Appendix one of the report while progress against schemes was outlined in Appendix 1A of the report.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to all involved in the continuing delivery of the programme.

OPTIONS

Re-assessing the project proposals was not recommended. They had been identified using a robust scoring matrix and the prescribed funding criteria; to ensure effective and prudent allocation of resources. Reassessing proposals at this stage would have undermined the integrity of this established process and introduced significant delays to a time-sensitive delivery programme. With 75% of schemes progressing on schedule and 25% experiencing only minor delays, detailed in Appendix 1A, the current approach remained the most efficient and strategically sound.

Doing nothing was also not recommended. Failing to approve the updated funding allocations and associated programme management arrangements would jeopardise timely delivery, reduce the Council's ability to respond flexibly to delivery risks, and

would have potentially resulted in underspend or clawback of CRSTS funding. The infrastructure programme required forward planning and financial approval to secure contractor capacity, align delivery windows, and remain compliant with grant conditions. Delaying approvals would have impeded progress and risk non-delivery of schemes that were essential to maintaining the highway network and improving active travel infrastructure

ORDERED that Executive:

1. **Approve the continued allocation of CRSTS funding across both Highways Maintenance and Integrated Transport workstreams, noting that 75% of schemes were currently on programme (RAG: Green) and a further 25% were experiencing minor delays (RAG: Amber) but remained deliverable within the current or next financial year**
2. **Approve the implementation of mitigation measures for schemes at risk of delay or underspend — particularly those in the Carriageways, Structures & Bridges, and Stainton Way Phase 2 schemes — to ensure continued alignment with CRSTS grant conditions, avoid clawback risk, and maintain the Council's ability to meet statutory obligations.**

AGREED that Executive

1. **Note the progress to date on the delivery of the 2025/26 Capital Programme funded through the £4.154m City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) grant, as detailed in Appendices 1 and 1A of the report.**
2. **Note ongoing programme management flexibilities, allowing officers to reprofile or reallocate approved funds where appropriate to support accelerated delivery of shovel-ready schemes or respond to emerging priorities.**

REASONS

This update was necessary to ensure continued effective management of the CRSTS programme, considering delivery progress reported at Q2 (Appendices 1 and 1A of the report). While most schemes remained on track, a few key infrastructure maintenance and cycle infrastructure works were experiencing moderate delays which required Executive awareness and mitigation planning.

Without formal approval of revised profiles and proactive mitigations, the Council risked underspending the allocated CRSTS funds within the required grant periods.

The updated recommendations ensured that the authority remained compliant with grant conditions and maintained credibility with our funding partners.

Key programme risks had been identified in a small number of areas, notably:

- **Carriageways and Structures & Bridges: Delivery delayed due to ongoing contract/legal issues. Completion is now forecast for Q1 of 2026/27.**
- **Stainton Way Phase 2 and Ormesby Beck: Minor delays due to ward-level consultation and resourcing gaps earlier in the year. Mitigations proposed include carrying forward delivery into next financial year, accelerating delivery of 'Green' rated schemes, and utilising contingency allowances for inflation or emergent issues.**

While the overall programme remained strategically aligned and financially balanced: with a total funding envelope of £8.436m comprising £4.154m CRSTS and £4.282m Council funding, detailed at Appendix one of the report, the scale and complexity of schemes, combined with the need for formal approval of CRSTS allocations, meant the decision fell within Executive responsibility under Section 6.38 of the Executive Scheme of Delegation.

25/50 **TEES VALLEY INVESTMENT ZONE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

The Executive Member for Finance submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report was to seek approval for the Council to enter into an Memorandum of

Understanding (MoU) with Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA) governing the operation of the Tees Valley Investment Zone - Middlesbrough Site and associated programme.

On 20 February 2025, Regulations were laid before Parliament that created the Tees Valley Investment Zone - Middlesbrough Site for 24 years from 1 April 2025 as a designated area for the purposes of the local retention of non-domestic rates.

The Regulations referenced a map of the Site, which in part included an existing designated area, Tees Valley EZ Growth Extension: Middlesbrough historic quarter.

It covered an area with Shepherdson Way as its most eastern extent, the River Tees near to Durham Street at its most northern, North Road adjacent to the Hartington interchange at its eastern and Waverley Street at its most southern. A location map was included in Appendix two of the MoU, located at the end of Section one.

The Regulations also record the initial baseline established for the purpose of determining additional business rates income, which was £5,131,673. The effect of the Regulations and the MoU was that any sum over this amount would be retained to be shared for the purpose of reinvestment in the Tees Valley Investment Zone programme, with 50% being paid to the TVCA and 50% held by the Council.

The existing designated area would cease to exist in April 2041, at which time the portion within the Site would be included for the purposes of calculating additional business rates. The initial baseline income from the portion was £1,730,615 and, so rather than the Council continuing to retain its share of rates income that it might then have received from April 2041, the amount of additional income would be calculated by reference to the overall combined baseline of £6,862,288 and shared for reinvestment in the Tees Valley Investment Zone programme until March 2049.

The baseline was finalised in January 2025, before detailed arrangements had been shared around the allocation for retained business rates. Investment Zone funding was not yet deployed, so it could reasonably be concluded that any growth that there may have been in the 2025/26 financial year could not be attributed to the existence of the Zone, but that growth would nevertheless be retained. The MoU would require allocation of any sum to the Zone programme and sharing with TVCA.

OPTIONS

Do nothing. whilst it was possible that increased business rates income may have been received without entering into the MoU, the substantial gain for the town represented by the government funding provided through the Investment Zone would be lost.

The terms of the MoU had been modified so far as possible in discussion between Council officers and TVCA. The scope of the original proposals to government made by TVCA meant that limits existed to the extent of change that was possible without jeopardising the provision of the funding that is available.

ORDERED that Executive:

1. **Approves the reinvestment of additional business rates income due to the Council, generated from growth within the Tees Valley Investment Zone - Middlesbrough Site, only in meeting the needs of the Priority Sectors. This approval was subject to assurances, required from TVCA, around the decision-making processes for projects the TVCA was responsible for.**
2. **Delegates authority to the s151 Officer to finalise and authorise the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA)**

AGREED that Executive notes the Council’s engagement in delivering the Tees Valley Investment Zone programme.

REASONS

The decision was required as a pre-requisite to Central Government providing £80m of

funding available to the Tees Valley Investment Zone. If the Council was unable to enter into a MoU with TVCA, the funding would not be available to promote growth in the town.

It was a key decision that impacted on two or more wards and would likely have financial consequences totalling more than £250,000.

25/51 **TS1 PSPO EXTENSION - CONSULTATION RESULTS**

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report was to seek Executive approval for the request to extend the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) that covers the TS1 area. The current PSPO will expire on 25th November 2025.

PSPO's could be be determined by a Local Authority where it was satisfied that two conditions were met:

a) It was likely that activities in a public place within the Authorities area had, or would have, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality.
b) The effect of those activities was, or was likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature: as such as to make the activities unreasonable and that the effect of likely effect of the activities justified proposed prohibitions.

A PSPO did not have effect for longer than three years, however it could be extended more than once if required.

The current PSPO prohibited a list of actions within the designated area. The prohibited actions were listed in the report and included:

- Drinking Alcohol in public
- Littering
- Begging
- Skate boarding, using scooters, skates or bikes (including mechanically propelled
- bikes or vehicles) in such a way as to be a nuisance to others or cause damage to property
- Spitting
- Urinating or defecating
- Gangs of more than three causing harassment alarm or distress
- Verbal abuse and threatening and intimidating behaviour Dog control (including dogs to be required on leads, dog fouling and having control of more than four dogs)
- Rummaging in bins
- Appropriating monies for charitable or other purposes without a licence including asking members of the public to sign up to schemes.

To extend the PSPO Executive needed to be satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that the extension was necessary to prevent the occurrence or recurrence of the detrimental activities or to prevent an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities.

The current PSPO came into effect on 26 November 2022 for a period of three years. It would therefore expire on 25th November 2025.

The formal consultation on the extension of the PSPO ran for a two-week period starting on 03/10/2025 until 17/10/2025. The consultation was publicised via local media links as well as being prevalent on the Council's website. Letters were also sent to all key stakeholders and posters were displayed in public buildings alongside prominent signage displayed in various locations.

The results of the consultation showed there was strong support for an extension of the PSPO. The total number of respondents was 77. The makeup of the respondents was detailed in the report.

OPTIONS

Not to extend the PSPO. This was not recommended as there was still a high level of crime and antisocial behaviour in the TS1 area and the current Order gave powers to the Local Authority to act regarding the prohibited behaviour. If the order was not made the activities would reoccur or would increase in frequency or seriousness to the detriment of the community and the public.

ORDERED that Executive approve the request to extend the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) that covered the TS1 area for a further three years from the 25 November 2025

REASONS

The current PSPO expired on 25th November 2025.

The consultation supported the extension of the PSPO in the TS1 area for a further three years

It was felt the content of the report provided enough information to satisfy Executive, on reasonable grounds, that the extension was necessary to prevent the occurrence or recurrence of the activities prohibited or restricted in the Order or to prevent an increase in frequency or seriousness of those activities if the Order was to expire.

25/52 **WARM HOMES: LOCAL GRANT – HOME ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME**

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods submitted a report for Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report sought approval for the Council to take part in the Warm Homes Grant Scheme which would enable eligible residents to access funding to make their homes warm and safe to inhabit.

The government had committed to partnering with combined authorities as well as local and devolved governments to deliver insulation measures and other improvements such as solar panels, PV batteries and low carbon heating.

Their aim was to cut bills for families, reduce fuel poverty, and reduce carbon emissions in support of its net zero 2050 target.

The Warm Homes: Local Grant scheme was a government-funded scheme delivered by local authorities that would take the first steps to delivering on the ambitions of the Warm Homes Plan. It would provide grants for energy performance upgrades and low carbon heating to low-income households living in the worst quality, privately owned homes in England to achieve energy bill savings and carbon savings.

Middlesbrough Council, in partnership with Darlington Borough Council, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council and Stockton on Tees Borough Council had been awarded Warm Homes grant funding of £13.9m. The scheme aimed to improve the energy efficiency rating of around 700 homes in the Tees Valley.

The four local authorities had been developing the Tees Valley scheme to ensure the requirements for administering the grant funded scheme were met. The scheme would be delivered by a single private energy provider, chosen through the NEPO framework, and who had a proven track record of delivering energy efficiency schemes. The provider would use its own workforce and local trades to identify properties that would benefit from home energy improvements, assess what energy efficiency measures could be made to dwellings and carry out works to improve energy efficiency rating to EPC 'C' or above.

By working with an energy provider, who had extensive knowledge and experience delivering home energy improvements, this enabled a more streamlined, cost-effective and manageable delivery of the scheme. A turnkey provider could handle the complexities of delivering this large-scale programme of home improvements, deliver consistent services, address technical issues and supply issues effectively, as well as provide a single report on the delivery of scheme to consortium members.

Should the delivery of the grant scheme be managed by the local authorities granted funding, this would have significantly increased the demand on resources in each authority and as such may have led to the scheme not being viable.

There were three ways that properties could be approved for energy efficiency improvement works. These were:

i. The household lived in a valid postcode that fell within eligible income deciles 1-2 of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation. The report stated that properties in Income Deciles 1-2 of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation in Middlesbrough were predominantly in postcode areas TS1, TS2, TS3, and TS4.
ii. ii. The household was in receipt of a specified means-tested benefit.
iii. iii. The household's gross annual income was below £36,000 (or the equivalent) 'after housing costs' threshold for their household composition.

Darlington Council would coordinate and manage the grant funding on behalf of the consortium members. Middlesbrough Council's Public Protection Service would performance manage the grant usage in Middlesbrough and report this to the Director of Environment and Community Services.

The Mayor stated this was an important initiative and the Council had not played a role in housing for some time. He also stated there was a need for residents to have a decent standard of housing.

OPTION

Not to approve Middlesbrough's involvement in the delivery of the Warm Homes: Local Grant scheme. This decision was not recommended due to the benefits the scheme would bring to low-income households and the investment in housing stock in Middlesbrough.

Many local authorities had taken a consortium approach when applying for grant funding for local home improvements. This approach enabled authorities to benefit from economies of scale, maximise the amount of grant funding that could be awarded, effectively engage with a single turnkey provider and deliver the scheme on a large scale. Darlington Council had developed considerable experience in the delivery of home energy improvement schemes, alongside Stockton on Tees and Redcar & Cleveland. By joining with these Councils it had enabled Middlesbrough Council to offer a home energy improvement scheme that would benefit local people, particular those in low-income households.

ORDERED that Executive:

1. **Approves the Council taking part in Warm Homes: Local Grant Scheme.**
2. **Approves entry into associated agreements in relation to the grant.**

AGREED that Executive:

1. **Notes that the scheme will be delivered by Darlington Borough Council on behalf of Middlesbrough Council.**
2. **Notes that the Public Protection service will performance manage the grant usage of the scheme in Middlesbrough and report this to the Director of Environment and Community Services.**

REASONS

The proposed recommendation supported the Council's ambition to achieve a healthy place. To improve the energy efficiency of properties occupied by low-income households and properties that had substandard energy performance ratings.

The grant would improve energy performance in private residential dwellings to reduce fuel poverty and the health risks associated with poor energy protection, including risks linked to damp and mould. It would also make houses more cost-efficient to heat and create more sustainable dwellings.

25/53 **ANY OTHER URGENT ITEMS WHICH IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIR, MAY BE**

CONSIDERED.

None.

All decisions except the decision relating to item 15 (TS1 PSPO Extension – Consultation Results) will come into force after five working days following the day the decisions were published except unless the decisions become subject to the call in procedures.

The decision relating to item 15 (TS1 PSPO Extension – Consultation Results) will come into force immediately as it was considered under urgency provisions.