

Note

References to the Quality of Life Plan

- A – Strong community Leadership
- B – More openness through public scrutiny
- C – Improve access to services
- D – Protect the environment and character of the District
- E – Promote tourism and green leisure opportunities
- F – Encourage low cost housing
- G – Develop better opportunities for young people

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 1

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><u>Community & Leisure Management</u> – Additional resources to support work of Community & Leisure Section, including monitoring the PFI Leisure Contract and supporting the Tourism Initiatives being driven by the Quality of Life plan.</p> <p><i>During the budget making process last year, the resignation of the Leisure Officer was taken as an opportunity to make budget savings. As a result, resources to monitor the new PFI Leisure Contract and develop leisure and tourism opportunities and initiatives have been very limited. Work is often reactive, rather than proactive. The Community & Leisure Committee received and approved the revised Leisure & Cultural Strategy in September, but in doing so acknowledged that some objectives were unlikely to be achieved within the remaining life of the Strategy. The Committee supported the need for additional staff to help complete the Strategies objectives and meet those identified in the Quality of Life Plan, particularly in relation to Tourism initiatives and emerging Corporate Plan.</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction– (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 33,000 including On Costs Comprising: -</p> <p><i>Salary costs £ 29,000 incl. On Costs</i> <i>Working budget £ 4,000</i></p>

4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	Net Effect (£) 33,000 including On Costs Comprising: - as above
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>Monitoring of the Leisure Contract is essential to ensure arrangements are meeting contractual obligations of all parties.</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	A, E
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>More proactive approach to Leisure Contract monitoring, leisure and tourism development and implementation of initiatives from the Quality of Life plan/Corporate Plan</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	1 April 2004
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proactive monitoring of the Leisure Contract</i> • <i>Proactive pursuit of opportunities for leisure development in the district e.g. with town & parish councils</i> • <i>Support for the development of tourism initiatives across the district</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>None if appointment agreed</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Certain</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recent publicity associated with the opening of the new Leisure Centres necessitates the Council taking a more proactive role in monitoring the performance and activity of the Leisure Contractor</i> • <i>The initiatives of the Quality of Life plan require the Council to proactively engage in the economic and sustainable development of the district</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>Agreement to this growth item will enable existing staff within the Community & Leisure section to work more effectively towards committed strategies and work plans e.g. Leisure & Cultural Strategy for Uttlesford</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Availability of staff to work with the Leisure Contractor will lead to positive partnership possibilities e.g. activities for people with disabilities, Concession/Leisure Cards</i> • <i>The implementation of the tourism</i>

		<i>initiatives will be pursued in partnership with existing and new markets and partners</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>None</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any)	<i>None</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>None</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Implement</i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 2

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><i>Leisure & Administration - Introduction of a Leisure Card for local residents should be discussed with Leisure Connection. Introduction should be at no extra cost to the Council, if possible.</i></p> <p><i>The existing PFI Leisure Centre Contract has no requirement for the leisure contractor, Leisure Connection, to provide a Leisure Card or Concession Scheme for users of the Leisure Centre, disadvantaged groups, residents of the district etc.</i></p> <p><i>Since commencement of the PFI Contract on 1 December, however, Leisure Connection has introduced, at no cost to the Council, a scheme at each Centre that allows free access for carers when accompanying a person with disabilities.</i></p> <p><i>Leisure Connection has advised that it would be prepared to enter into an arrangement with the Council to introduce a Concessions Card Scheme for residents that fall into the category of “disadvantaged groups”. This category includes residents of Uttlesford who are unemployed, registered disabled or claim Income Support - defined by benefit claimant categories.</i></p> <p><i>It is prepared to provide up to 500 Concession Cards at a potential cost of £25,000.</i></p> <p><i>*See more detailed attached proposal*</i></p>

		<p><i>Discussions have been held with Leisure Connection about the potential to introduce other schemes, including charging more to non-residents and discounts for the Over 60's and students. However, it is concerned that higher charges for non-residents would have a detrimental affect on usage, particularly at the Mountfitchet Romeera Leisure Centre where many users are being attracted from Bishop's Stortford and surrounding villages. With regard to discounts for Over 60's the Census Statistics show that in Uttlesford over 20% of the population fall into this category. Leisure Connection is not able to fund a Concession Scheme for this category of the population, given the potential costs involved. Equally, with 4% of the population (2,700) being students or school children (aged 16 – 74) the permutations and costs associated with student discount schemes mean that Leisure Connection would not be able to fund it. Leisure Connection do offer facilities at a reduced charge for under 16 year olds.</i></p> <p><i>For information, Leisure Connection is involved in a countrywide scheme to provide discounted access to its facilities. The Scheme is being developed by the Connexions Service and encourages young people to "earn" points, which translate into discounts. They can gain points by attendance at school, college and Work Based Learning as well as some voluntary activities. Discounts could be available with a wide range of high street shops and at leisure centres. The Scheme has not been fully developed in Essex but, if and when it is, it is envisaged that it will translate into opportunities for discounted access to the Leisure Centres in Uttlesford.</i></p>
3.	<p>Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc</p>	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p><i>No Cost, unless 'Maximum' exceeded</i></p> <p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p>
4.	<p>Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.</p>	<p><i>No Cost, unless 'Maximum' exceeded</i></p> <p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p>

5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>None</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	<i>E, F, G</i>
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>N/A</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<i>As soon as practical after approval by the Council</i>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>Certain categories of Uttlesford residents will be able to use the Leisure Centres in the district at a reduced cost, e.g. those on Low Income, the Unemployed, People with disabilities and their carers – see attached proposal.</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>Leisure Connection is prepared to support the scheme to a maximum level. This is above the current number of existing potential users of the scheme. However, to progress with the scheme the Council would have to commit to meeting the cost of the scheme when/where it exceeds the maximum. It will be necessary to enter into a formal agreement – see attached proposal.</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Certain</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Members support the introduction of a Leisure Card and particularly a scheme that benefits the disadvantaged.</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>Leisure Connection would manage the scheme but officers may have to deal with correspondence emanating from the scheme</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Leisure Connection would seek to work in particular with local disability groups to promote the scheme effectively.</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>If Members are minded to agree to the principle of the Concessions Card Scheme, officers and Leisure Connection will consult with the Uttlesford Access Group on the development and implementation of the Scheme.</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any)	<i>None</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>There are numerous permutations for Leisure Card schemes. Others schemes, such as reduced cost of access to leisure facilities for all residents, would have to be met in full by the Council as there is no contractual requirement of Leisure Connection to introduce an Leisure Card scheme.</i>

18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Implement – The Council would be given advanced warning if it appeared that the ‘Maximum’ was being reached.</i>
-----	--	---

**Budget Review Item Report – Item 2 - Appendix
Concessions Card Scheme Proposal – Uttlesford Leisure Centres**

TYPE	BENEFITS	ANTICIPATED COSTS/TAKE UP
<p>“Concessions Card” Scheme</p> <p>The Scheme would be available to residents of the district who fall into the following disadvantaged groups i.e. Unemployed, registered disabled, on Income Support - defined by benefit claimant categories.</p>	<p>Residents eligible to apply for a “Concessions Card” would be able to receive the benefits of the existing “Centre Membership Card” at a discounted fee.</p> <p>Currently a “Centre Membership Card” is available to Centre users and costs an adult £25 and a Junior £15. It gives a reduction on facility charges of 60p and 45p respectively, allows the card holder to book courts and classes up to 8 days in advance over the telephone and payment for the booking is not required until the time of play/use.</p> <p>Leisure Connection is prepared to offer an annual “Concessions Card” which will provide the benefits of the “Centre Membership Card” to eligible residents described above at a discounted fee of £10 for Adults and Juniors.</p> <p>The Scheme will be run on a trial basis for 2 years, enabling Leisure Connection and the Council to assess the impact and give notice of any amendments or additions to the Scheme.</p>	<p>Using as a guide the 2001 Census figures on the National Statistics Website the total population for Uttlesford of 68,946 there are the following populations in the disadvantaged categories –</p> <p>Unemployed – 1.7% or 1,172 Registered Disabled – 3.4% or 2,345 Adults and Juniors Income Support – 12.6% or 1,830</p> <p>These figures total 7.7% of the population of Uttlesford or 5,347 residents.</p> <p>Leisure Connection is prepared to offer up to a maximum of 500 Concessions Cards to eligible residents. This equates to a potential cost to Leisure Connection of £25,000 on the assumption that each user visits the facility once per week, giving a 60p saving per person, per week.</p> <p>Clearly, it is impossible to predict the potential take up of the Scheme or how the population growth might affect it. The basis set out above would be monitored closely and Leisure Connection would provide the Council with regular reports on take up and attrition rates. This will enable officers to advise the Council if the maximum allocation of 500 Cards is approached and consider whether it wishes to provide financial support for the Scheme.</p> <p>It will be necessary to enter into a formal agreement with Leisure Connection for the provision of the Scheme and this would include a monitoring and review mechanism.</p>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 4

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><u>Community Information Centres -</u> <i>Review the provision of CICs as part of the proposed reviews of access to services and administrative support. Include consideration for the provision of a CIC in Stansted, a mobile service and more flexible use of resources.</i></p> <p><i>An Access to Services Task Group of Officers has been established to consider options for access to services and administrative support and report to Resources Committee in January 2004. As part of the recent prioritisation of services exercise both these items received the least support as potential growth item.</i></p> <p><i>Currently the Council provides CIC facilities at the Council Offices in Great Dunmow, in Thaxted and the Council Offices in Saffron Walden. Some Council services are also provided by the Tourist Information Centre in Saffron Walden e.g. sale of refuse bags. The Thaxted CIC also provides a Tourist Information Point, run by volunteers, and a base for the local Police Constable.</i></p> <p><i>Stansted Parish Council is positively in favour of pursuing a partnership with the Council to provide a CIC in Stansted. The Parish Council resides in the Crafton Green building together with a Health Clinic. This building is too cramped for a CIC to be incorporated within it. However, an opportunity may present itself if the Health Authority and Uttlesford PCT are able to secure a site for a new Health Centre and GP Surgery in Stansted. The Health Clinic would then vacate the Crafton Green building, freeing it up for joint use by the Parish Council and a CIC. In addition, the Parish Council is pursuing the newly found owner of the Peter Kirk School building, seeking agreement for the building to be donated to the community for Parish Council, CIC and voluntary group (e.g.</i></p>

		<p>CAB) use.</p> <p>Clearly, should the Council wish to secure an agreement with the Parish Council for the provision of the CIC at either site it will be necessary for budgetary provision to be made. It is suggested that, at this early stage, provision could be made in the budget on the basis of the Thaxted CIC, e.g. 10.5 hours per week, contribution to rent and utility costs amounting to £20,000p.a.</p> <p>An alternative to the opening of another fixed site is the option for a Mobile Officer, with external access to the Council's IT systems, to offer a one-stop shop surgery approach in various locations across the district on issues such as housing, benefits, refuse etc. This option would require cooperation from and partnerships with Parish Council's, the UPCT etc. to enable access to community sites such as village halls, Doctor's surgeries etc. to provide a base from which the officer would meet people and access the Council's IT system.</p> <p>The work of the Access to Services Task and Finish Group could consider the feasibility of the Mobile Officer option.</p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 15,000 – 45,000. (dependent upon which option is chosen or if both are progressed).</p> <p>Comprising: - Stansted CIC - £20,000 + Capital Mobile Unit - £15,000 - £27,000. Depends whether employee is part or full time.</p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect as above (not including Capital)</p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<p><u>Stansted CIC</u> - Would require Agreement with Stansted Parish Council for provision of CIC.</p> <p><u>Mobile Unit</u> - Would require office provision/usage agreement with other community site providers</p>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	A, F
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better	Would enable more information to be

	interdepartmental working	<i>available in the community.</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<i><u>Stansted CIC</u> – dependant on availability of buildings <u>Mobile Unit</u> - Suggest it should be considered by the Access to Service Group</i>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>Information would be available within the community. Mobile Officer would take Access to Services into the community arena</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>None</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i><u>Stansted CIC</u> – likely <u>Mobile Unit</u> – depends upon the access to services findings and recommendations</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i><u>Stansted CIC</u> – Stansted Parish Council is very keen to pursue a partnership with the Council for the provision of this service. <u>Mobile Unit</u> - Views of stakeholders to be ascertained during Access to Services review.</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i><u>Stansted CIC</u> – would require employment of part time member of staff, who would require training and supervision. <u>Mobile Unit</u> –would require employment of a part or full time member of staff and necessary cover arrangements during leave.</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i><u>Stansted CIC</u> – Stansted Parish Council, Voluntary Sector <u>Mobile Unit</u> – to be identified as a result of the Access to Services work.</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i><u>Mobile Unit</u> – to be identified as a result of the Access to Services work</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	<i>None</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>More flexible use of resources to be covered as part of access to services.</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i><u>Stansted CIC</u> – consider allocation of budget this time next year for 2005/06 <u>Mobile Unit</u> – option to considered under the umbrella of the Access to Services review.</i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 5

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><u>Museum -</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review income budgets.</i> • <i>Consider opportunities to generate more income to meet a deficit caused by the removal of Admission Charges.</i> • <i>Consider potential capital projects to enable the generation of more income and reducing the level of ongoing maintenance programme</i> <p><i>With regard to income generating opportunities, these are severely restricted by the limitations of the existing Museum building. There is no opportunity to expand the shop space without encroaching on valuable reception area and circulation space and little potential to offer other money making ventures with out considerable resources e.g. Tea shop.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that it would not be possible to make up the shortfall if Admission Charges were to be removed. Although it is likely that shop income and donations would increase these are unlikely to make up the shortfall.</i></p> <p><i>Work is currently being carried out to assess the potential for the development of the Museum building. It is considered that there is scope to provide a two story extension to the Museum building which would accommodate a new larger entrance hall and shop, WCs, a multi-purpose education room, a special exhibitions gallery and improved staff/research accommodation. Consideration is also being given to other ancillary facilities such catering facilities. Research is being undertaken into what sources of funding might be available to support the development, including what sources the Museum Society could apply through its charitable status. It is anticipated that a report will be presented to Members in the</i></p>

		<i>new year with details of the proposals.</i>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<i>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate) Net Effect (£) 7,000 Comprising: -</i>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<i>Net Effect (£) 7,000 Comprising: -</i>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>None</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	<i>E, F, G</i>
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>N/A</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<i>N/A</i>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>Free admission to the Museum will attract more visitors and can be used to help market the Museum</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>Additional income does not make up the shortfall.</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Free Admission – Certain Make up shortfall – Unlikely</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Some customers have advised that Free Admission would make them more inclined to visit the Museum more often. Officers consider that it would not be possible to meet the shortfall given the lack of opportunity to expand the shop etc.</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>Would require volunteer staff to work proactively with customers to encourage purchases from shop and donations</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Museum Society</i>

15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>Consultations would be required if Museum is developed</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	<i>None</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>None</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Removal of Admission Charges - Do not implement unless Council is prepared to forego loss of income Capital Project – continue considerations</i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 6

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<i>Tourist Information Centre – Sunday Opening should be investigated and costed.</i> <i>Currently we pay the existing staff overtime to cover the cost of Sunday opening between beginning of May and end August. This budget will allow Casual Assistants to be employed to provide this service and reduce the overtime budget.</i>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate) Net Effect (£) 1,300 Comprising: - <i>Employment of Casual Assistants to staff the TIC on Sunday mornings</i>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	Net Effect (£) 1,300 p.a. + inflation etc. Comprising: -
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>None</i>

6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	<i>E, F, G</i>
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>Will mean that Full Time TIC staff will not be required to cover shifts, releasing them to concentrate on provision of daily service and reducing the overtime budget.</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<i>Beginning May 2004</i>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>Provision of consistent Sunday TIC service during peak tourism season</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>Inability to recruit casual staff, although temporarily this problem could be addressed by the use Full Time staff</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Very possible</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Statistics for current service ...BV Review, National encouragement and expectation of access to services.....</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>A pool of Casual Staff are currently being trained to assist with Saturday opening and these will be used to operate the Sunday morning service</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>N/A</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>N/A</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	<i>N/A</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>For a small increase in the budget it will be possible to ensure a more consistent and definitive Sunday TIC service during the peak tourism season</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Implement</i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 10

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><u>Community Safety –</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £18k will be required for a statutory Crime & Disorder Survey. This can be funded from reserves as a one-off cost. • In addition, the CCTV equipment maintenance contract is to be re-tendered, which may have budgetary consequences. • In general, Community Safety should be examined for greater partnership and sponsorship possibilities. <p><i>The CCTV maintenance contract has been re-tendered and costs confirmed – see below.</i></p> <p><i>The Community Safety budget already includes an income target of £30,000 from partnership and sponsorship funding. However, this is not going to be achieved and the target is unlikely to be met.</i></p> <p><i>Staff work with partners to secure effective partnership and sponsorship funding. Funding that is available is generally for one-off projects, rather than ongoing revenue costs.</i></p> <p><i>If Staff are to spend more time seeking partnership/sponsorship possibilities these would detract from the grass roots work that is being undertaken</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction– (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 45k Comprising: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ £ 18k Community Safety Survey (one off) ➤ £ 6.5k Annual CCTV Maintenance Contract ➤ £20K partnership/sponsorship income (very unlikely to achieve)
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) 26,500 Comprising: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CCTV Maintenance Contract/Per Annum for a three year contract ➤ £20K partnership/sponsorship
5.	Details of any legal or contractual	<i>Required to meet Crime & Disorder Act</i>

	necessity to implement this item.	1998
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>Essential for effective maintenance of CCTV equipment</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approve	<i>1 April 2004</i>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>CCTV is proven to improve feelings of safety on the streets and car parks where provided. They have led to successful prosecutions. In addition, failure to maintain the units will result in system failure and a potential increase in crime.</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i><u>Additional income from partnership/sponsorship funding</u> - Tighter criteria for partnership/sponsorship funding which restricts opportunities for application further and reduces funding potential</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i><u>CCTV</u> – Certain <u>Current target for partnership/sponsorship income</u> – Very Unlikely <u>Additional income from partnership/sponsorship funding</u> – Very Unlikely</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i><u>CCTV</u> - Partners wish to see the system continue as there has been a demonstrable reduction in crime where CCTV is in operation. <u>Partnership/sponsorship</u> – partners have advised that resources are finite</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i><u>CCTV</u> is monitored by the Community Safety Officer <u>Partnership/sponsorship</u> - Seeking Partnership/sponsorship funding is time consuming and not necessarily guaranteed to provide a positive outcome</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i><u>CCTV</u> - Partners already contribute to the ongoing line rental costs involved in running the CCTV system <u>Partnership/sponsorship</u> - partners are maintained and pursued wherever possible and appropriate.</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	None
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any)	None
17.	Other Comments	None
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <u>CCTV</u> – Implement ➤ <u>Current target for partnership/sponsorship funding</u> – Reduce budget to £10k from £30k ➤ <u>Additional income from partnership/sponsorship funding</u> – limited opportunities exist

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 11

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><u>Drug Awareness –</u> <i>This budget should be examined for greater partnership and sponsorship possibilities.</i></p> <p><i>The Drugs Awareness budget already includes an income target of £20,000 from partnership and sponsorship funding. However, this is not going to be achieved and the target is unlikely to be met.</i></p> <p><i>Staff work with partners to secure effective partnership and sponsorship funding. Funding that is available is generally for one-off projects, rather than ongoing revenue costs.</i></p> <p><i>If Staff are to spend more time seeking partnership/sponsorship possibilities these would detract from the grass roots work that is being undertaken</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 10,000 Comprising: -</p> <p><i>Partnership/sponsorship income (very unlikely to achieve)</i></p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) 10,000 Comprising: -</p> <p><i>Partnership/sponsorship income (unlikely to achieve)</i></p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>Strategic links associated with the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 which is a statutory obligation.</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	A, G
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>If Staff are to spend more time seeking partnership/sponsorship possibilities these would detract from the grass roots work that is being undertaken</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	N/A

9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	N/A
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>If Staff are to spend more time seeking partnership/sponsorship possibilities these would detract from the grass roots work that is being undertaken</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Very unlikely</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Partners are already contributing to projects, both in monetary and staffing terms</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>If Staff are to spend more time seeking partnership/sponsorship possibilities these would detract from the grass roots work that is being undertaken</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Partners are already contributing to projects, both in monetary and staffing terms</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	N/A
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	N/A
17.	Other Comments	<i>None</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i><u>Partnership/sponsorship funding - Do not implement</u></i> ➤ <i><u>Current target for partnership/sponsorship funding – Reduce budget to £10k</u></i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Officers Suggestion – Item 12

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Community & Leisure</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><i>Birchanger TIC – This facility provides valuable advice to visitors and potential visitors to the district. It is based at the Birchanger Service Station – an important point of entry to the Uttlesford.</i></p> <p><i>Officers are aware that ECC is to withdraw its funding to the service to the tune of £5k, which will mean that the facility will have to close.</i></p> <p><i>Officers believe that the loss of this service will have a detrimental effect on Tourism in the district as it is a major entry point and helps to encourage people to use local roads and explore the district. A Grant of £5k would enable the service to continue and require the Birchanger TIC service to enter into a SLA with the Council which would ensure that the district is effectively promoted.</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction - (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 5,000 Comprising: - <i>Increase to Tourism Budget</i></p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) 5,000 Comprising: - <i>Increase to Tourism Budget</i></p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>An SLA would be entered into with the Birchanger TIC</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	<i>E, F</i>
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>N/A</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<i>1 April 2004</i>

9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>See 1 above</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>See 1 above</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Certain</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>N/A</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>Officers would have to work with the Birchanger TIC to ensure the SLA is met.</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Officers would have to work with the Birchanger TIC to ensure the SLA is met.</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>N/A</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	<i>N/A</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>None</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Implement</i>