

**TO: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**ON: 25 JANUARY 2001**

**Agenda Item No: 4**

**Title: MATTER REFERRED FROM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
SUB-COMMITTEE FOR DECISION**

**Author: John Grayson (01799) 510455**

**PROPOSED ERECTION OF 4 TWO-BEDROOMED SHELTERED BUNGALOWS  
TO RELATE TO EXISTING SHELTERED SCHEME, WITH SUPPORT CAR  
PARKING, AT REAR OF HANOVER PLACE, ABBEY LANE, SAFFRON WALDEN  
- UTT/1380/00/FUL**

### **Introduction**

- 1 This report refers to a planning application which Members of the Sub-Committee have referred to this Committee for decision. It relates to a departure from the District Plan which the Sub-Committee recommend be approved.

### **Background**

- 2 A copy of the report to the Sub-Committee meeting on 15 January is attached. Further details about the discussion at the meeting will be reported orally.

RECOMMENDED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Background Papers: planning application file UTT/1380/00/FUL.







**Agenda Item No: 5**

**Title: DRAFT REVENUE ESTIMATES 2001/2002**

**Authors: Michael Dellow (01799) 510310  
Adrienne Dellow (01799) 510311**

**See separate document**

-----

**Agenda Item No: 6**

**Title: DETR WHITE PAPER OUR COUNTRYSIDE: THE FUTURE,  
A FAIR DEAL FOR RURAL ENGLAND**

**Author: J Bosworth (01799) 510453**

### **Introduction**

- 1 As Members will know the Government has published the above White Paper. This report identifies a few key points and comments on them in the context of Uttlesford. The Council will need to monitor developments to ensure it tries and get what limited opportunities may be available for Uttlesford.

### **Key Points of the White Paper**

- 2 (a) General Services. A rural service standard, setting out minimum standards and explaining how they will be delivered will be published and updated as modernisation of public services progresses. Within this programme there are pledges to safeguard rural schools against closure and connect them to the internet by 2002; create more childcare and early education places; increase resources for rural ambulances; improve GP services through mobile units and set up new one stop health care centres. There will be extra rural policing and more officers will be appointed. These improvements will be delivered by more effective use of technology. A pilot scheme will be set up to offer banking, one stop internet access, pensions, benefits, prescriptions and health advice. A £15 million 'community service fund' will be established to which village shops, pubs and garages can apply for grant aid. A mandatory 50% rate relief to pubs, garages and shops is proposed.
- (b) More affordable homes for local people. Planning authorities will be able to insist on a proportion of social housing even on the smallest site and, 'where necessary, may look for one affordable home for every house developed for the open market'.

- (c) Better Transport. Over the next three years subsidies for rural buses will be increased by 45%. Other financial incentives will be introduced including a new special Parish fund to which Parishes will be able to apply for up to £10,000 to buy a minibus, or set up a social car scheme, or pay to divert an existing bus route.
- (d) Rejuvenating market towns. An extra £37 million will be available. Rural businesses will be assisted through the Government's Small Business Service. The Countryside Agency is to identify a 'national beacon town network' featuring 10-20 towns demonstrating problems and experiences from which others can learn. A national best practice programme will be devised. PPG 13 will be revised to emphasise the role of market towns.
- (e) Help traditional industries. The new England Rural Development Programme will invest £1.6 billion in the countryside by 2006. Farmers will be helped to diversify and there will be additional funds for woodland grants. Farmers will find it easier to convert farm buildings for example, 'by reducing unnecessary legislation and planning restrictions'.
- (f) Increase tourism. The English Tourism Council and Countryside Agency will produce a joint strategy to promote rural tourism which will include a review of current planning guidance.
- (g) Protecting and enjoying the countryside. The importance of reusing brownfield land is highlighted. Planning authorities will be asked to maintain valued and distinctive features of the countryside and new guidance relating to wildlife sites and biodiversity will be issued.
- (h) Greater decision making at a local level. The Government wants to give rural people a stronger voice on the delivery of services. 'Regional rural sounding boards' will be established to monitor delivery of policy in rural areas. Town and Parish Councils whose quality meet certain criteria will be able to work more closely with partner authorities to take on greater responsibility. £5 million will be available to 1000 rural communities to 'develop town and village plans to put to the local planning authority'. There is also a pledge to set out in national guidance the 'role that town or village plans can play now as Supplementary Planning Guidance'.

### **Comment**

- 3 (a) General services. The protection of rural schools and the provision of extra policing and health provision is welcomed. The proposal to introduce a mandatory 50% relief to pubs and garages, as well as shops would financially assist Uttlesford. The Council currently operates a discretionary relief scheme in relation to certain types of shops, sole village pubs, post offices and petrol filling stations. Relief applies to premises with a rateable value below £12,000 with relief up to 100% being offered. If a mandatory relief is introduced, the Government would

normally foot the costs of the mandatory element so there could be financial savings to this Council.

- (b) Affordable homes. It is interesting to note that the shared ownership housing at Ashdon is mentioned as a case study. The proposal to introduce more affordable homes is welcomed. The White Paper reminds that in settlements of 3000 or less no thresholds apply so where there is a clear need for affordable housing, the local authority can seek a proportion of affordable housing, even on the smallest site. The Paper says this provision is not always used to fullest effect and promotes its wider adoption. Clearly it will be necessary to justify such affordable housing and its delivery will, to some extent, depend upon an appropriate policy in the new Local Plan. The best practice guidance that the Government intends to issue may assist.
- (c) Better transport. The proposal to introduce additional funding is welcomed and Officers will work closely with County colleagues and through the Uttlesford Transport Strategy to try and achieve better services. The new proposed Parish Fund should allow selected rural communities greater freedom to introduce measures appropriate to individual communities.
- (d) Rejuvenating market towns. The extra £37 million will only be available to fund regeneration in or near Rural Priority Areas so there will be no direct benefit to Uttlesford. The proposed 100% capital allowance for creating 'flats over shops' could encourage better use of vacant first floor premises in towns such as Saffron Walden.
- (e) Traditional industries. Of the measures to assist the farming industry the one most likely to be of relevance is the Government's 'determination that the planning system should be sufficiently flexible' to allow diversification to happen. Of particular interest is the proposal to revise PPG13 to clarify the framework for considering the transport implications of rural development proposals. The Paper says 'we are confident that this will lead to more diversification proposals being accepted by planning authorities'. Members will recall previous concerns expressed about speeding traffic, and the size of vehicles, in rural areas. The new guidance is awaited with interest. The issue will be considered in the new Local Plan.
- (f) Increase tourism. The Council's Leisure and Tourist Strategy promotes sensitive and sustainable tourist initiatives.
- (g) Protecting and enjoying the countryside. The target of 60% of new housing on brownfield sites will assist in reducing the pressure on the Uttlesford countryside. The intention to revise PPG17, Sport and Recreation, will give a clearer framework to make provision of open space in and around towns. A new Countryside and Rights of Way Bill is aimed at providing a fairer system for landowners and users. A deadline of 25 years will be set for registering forgotten historic footpaths

and bridleways which will eventually provide certainty for local landowners and users alike. The commitment 'to protect green belts as a means of helping to keep our towns and cities compact and distinct' is particularly welcome. Planning decisions, the Paper advises, should consider the overall value of the land in deciding which countryside should have the greater protection and that the countryside should be protected 'for its own sake'. National policies for the historic environment are being reviewed by English Heritage and the outcome will be announced later this year. The Paper recognises the impact of both noise and light pollution in rural areas and, for example, states that all rural local authorities should take the issue of light pollution into account in their planning decisions. There are again issues here for the new Local Plan.

- (h) Greater decision making at a local level. The 'quality' Town or Parish Council could undertake services funded from its own resources, look after the village environment (litter, bus shelters, village greens, cemeteries etc), support community transport schemes and childcare provision, seek sites for affordable housing and help develop youth activities and services for the elderly and help in drawing up a Town or Village Plan. Guidance as to how such a quality parish may work will be published and may be relevant to a limited number of local councils within Uttlesford. The objective of the White Paper to achieve an enhanced status for 'quality' Town and Parish Councils within local government to deliver a wider range of services, working closer with all tiers of local government, is agreed and one where this Council may be able to assist. Further information is awaited on the idea of producing a 'Parish Plan' that is consistent with the local development plan, which can be endorsed by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

## **Conclusion**

- 4 There are a number of issues that need to be taken into account in preparing/updating local plans and policies, particularly in relation to the Local Plan. It is also important for the Council to do what it can to ensure that a number of statements of good intent are realised for the Uttlesford community.

RECOMMENDED that the Council takes into account appropriate matters in the Rural White Paper in reviewing its plans and policies and does what it can to ensure that the more general statements in the White Paper are realised to the benefit of the Uttlesford community.

Background Papers: Rural White Paper



**Agenda Item No: 8**

**Title: ECONOMIC STRATEGY**

**Author: Roger Harborough (01799) 510457**

### **Introduction**

- 1 This report recommends that the attached draft strategy be approved for the purposes of consultation. It has been revised to refer to the Government's Rural White Paper.

### **Background**

- 2 In 1996 a detailed Economic Position Statement was prepared and consultation was undertaken on whether the Council should be involved in economic development initiatives. The Council has since then consulted on an annual action plan and economic development budget proposals. These plans and the consultation responses have been fed into the corporate budget preparation process for the relevant financial year. In the interim the Essex Economic Partnership and other strategic bodies have become established and this, together with the identification of community priorities in the Best Value Performance Plan, suggests that a strategic reassessment would be timely.
- 3 At the Committee meeting on 30 November 2000 it was agreed that the Council should fully participate in the Essex Economic Partnership and pay the annual subscription fee of £3,500 for the year 2001/02.

### **Draft Uttlesford Economic Strategy**

- 4 The draft strategy reviews the changes in the local economy over the last five years and the activities the Council has been involved in. It puts this in the context of the Council's strategic objectives and community priorities, the objectives of the East of England Development Agency and the Essex Economic Strategy and concludes that the way ahead is for the Council to work with strategic and other partners to meet the needs of the local community.
- 5 Grant support for economic development has been the subject of a best value review. There is a report on the recommendations of this review elsewhere on the agenda.

RECOMMENDED that the attached draft strategy be approved for the purposes of consultation

Background papers: Essex Economic Partnership papers  
Essex County Council Enterprise Strategy, ECC, 1999  
Moving Forward - a Strategy for the East of England,  
EEDA, 1999

UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

ECONOMIC STRATEGY  
2001-04

Consultation Draft  
November 2000

## **Draft Uttlesford Economic Strategy**

### **Introduction**

1. The draft strategy reviews the changes in the local economy over the last five years and the activities the Council has been involved in. These are put in the context of the Council's strategic objectives and community priorities, the objectives of the East of England Development Agency and the Essex Economic Strategy and concludes that the way ahead is for the Council to work with strategic partners to meet the needs of the local community.

### **Background**

2. In 1996 a detailed Economic Position Statement was prepared and consultation was undertaken on whether the Council should be involved in economic development initiatives. The Council has since then consulted on an annual action plan and economic development budget proposals. These plans and the consultation responses have been fed into the corporate budget preparation process for the relevant financial year. The range of actions are outlined in paragraph 8 below.

### **The Council's Strategic Objectives**

3. One of the Council's five objectives is to manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community. Its Best Value Performance Plan 2000/01 explains that 'Uttlesford's proximity to clusters of firms engaged in growth areas like information technology, pharmaceuticals and biotechnology, the growth of employment at Stansted Airport and the availability of good air, rail and road links from Stansted mean that it has potential to be an area of significant job growth. The Council has a direct influence on the number of such jobs in the balance it strikes between allowing development and concerns about other factors such as the countryside and traffic. Managing the economy also means trying to ensure other important issues are addressed, such as local people having the right skills and transport to take up the growing number of jobs available. The Council can support other organisations in this. Farming and local shops are examples of small local businesses going through difficulties, though, and there are measures the Council can take both directly and with others which affect these businesses' ability to find new sources of income. It can, for example, support tourism and proposals to enhance the attraction of our local centres.'

### **Community Priorities**

4. Towards the end of 1999 the Council consulted all households and many organisations working in Uttlesford on some suggested community priorities. These had been identified from the response to comprehensive public opinion and youth surveys carried out in 1995/6, work with focus groups in 1998 and contributions from the Uttlesford Local Agenda 21 Forum. There was general support for the view that these priorities clearly identified what was important to residents and organisations. Significantly, there were no particular priorities

which directly related to the strategic objective of managing the economy to meet the needs of the whole community. Priorities, however, included reducing waste at source and increasing recycling, minimise pollution, trying to control large lorries on rural roads, ensuring that new development proposals are related to service/infrastructure provision and increasing accessibility by improved public/community transport. A large majority of people who responded to consultation during 2000 on the issues which the Council's local plan review should address did not think more land is required to create jobs and meet business needs. Business enquiries to the Essex Investment Office or East of England Investment Agency for land and premises suggest a limited requirement within Uttlesford or elsewhere in close proximity to Stansted Airport. Regular consultation with the chambers of trade and commerce and business representative groups, including the Local Centres Partnership, has highlighted their concern about the need to continue to promote Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden, Stansted Mountfitchet and Thaxted as local centres for shopping, services, leisure and recreation including tourism. The Council's Economic Strategy clearly has to take all these various concerns into account.

### **The Current State of the Economy in Uttlesford**

5. It seems probable that the lack of any particular community priority relating directly to managing the economy to meet the needs of the whole community is due to the current generally buoyant economic position in Uttlesford.
6. Uttlesford is the least deprived district in Essex and amongst the least deprived in the East of England and, indeed, nationally. In 1996, the proportion of the district's economically active residents unemployed and claiming benefit was around 4%. It is now around 1%, varying between 300 and 350 persons. Most claimants on the unemployment register have been unemployed for a relatively short time. People in Uttlesford are better qualified than the Essex averages in terms of Adult Learning Targets. The Essex TEC Household Survey 2000 suggests that commuting patterns have not changes significantly since 1991. Of all Uttlesford residents in jobs or self employment, 50% remain within the district to work and another 7% work from home. About 14% work in London and 6% in Harlow. Mean earnings in Uttlesford are slightly higher than the Essex average (by 1.3%). A slightly higher percentage of the district work force is self employed than the Essex average. The most frequent reason for becoming self employed, locally, is "to become one's own boss", the TEC survey found.
7. Stansted Airport is undoubtedly a factor in the tight labour market in the district. On airport employment has grown from 5,512 persons in 1995 to 9,500 in 2000. With increased efficiency in its operation, however, BAA's forecasts of the labour it needs have been scaled down and its assessment now is that the number of people employed on airport at 15 million passengers p.a. will be 11,100. In 1997, about 1,900 airport workers lived in Uttlesford. They represented about 28% of the airport work force and 5% of the district work force. This indicates, though, that even within Uttlesford, Stansted currently does not dominate the economy.

## **What Economic Initiatives has the Council taken in the last five years?**

8. The Council has:
- \* Actively explored the interest of the business community in setting up a Business Forum to further involve local businesses in the development of the Council's objectives, strategies, budgets and service plans and to provide an additional way of businesses meeting other businesses, although there is currently no Business Forum;
  - \* Supported the establishment of Business Link Essex to provide advice to small and medium sized businesses;
  - \* Supported the publication of a business directory to help local supply chain development;
  - \* Supported the provision of an Uttlesford Enterprise business counselling service for start ups and small enterprises;
  - \* Supported the Prince's Youth Business Trust which assists young people setting up in business;
  - \* Provided a Tourist Information service and promoted tourism;
  - \* Supported village shops and other rural service sector businesses through rate relief and contributing to the Essex Village Shops Development Scheme grant fund;
  - \* Promoted local centres including specific grant support;
  - \* Encouraged economic development appropriate to the character of the area through its local plan proposals and planning policies;
  - \* Supported Work Based Training, skills and training counselling initiatives and the Saffron Walden Environmental Task Force under the New Deal initiative.
9. Most of these actions have been undertaken with partner organisations, and in several cases they have been the lead. The Council has regularly monitored the outputs which have been achieved, but identifying specific outcomes has proved more difficult. The state of the economy in Uttlesford suggests, however, that the need for direct intervention is limited.

### **The Rural White Paper**

10. The Government published its White Paper "Our Countryside: The Future" in November 2000. This set out the range of existing policy initiatives for rural communities, as well as a number of new initiatives. This strategy is intended to be consistent with the Government's approach nationally. There are a number of common themes, including support for vital village services, flexible

local transport, regeneration of market towns as service centres and hubs, and widening the local economy in rural areas. The details of the new initiatives headlined in the White Paper will be released in due course and subject to further consultation. Uttlesford may benefit from some of the nationally available schemes, but targeted measures are likely to be focused on the designated areas suffering from a concentration of economic and social problems (Rural Priority Areas).

### **What are other partners doing?**

11. During the past five years there have been some significant changes with the emergence of new partners and some rationalisation.
12. A new regional development agency, the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) has been created. Its role is essentially a strategic one:- to give focus and direction to implementing the regional priorities set out in the regional economic development strategy "Moving Forward"; to take action on its priorities; to coordinate its own activities and those of its partners at a regional level; to share best practice and help build the region's knowledge and capacity; and to be a powerful influencing and lobbying voice on behalf of the East of England. EEDA has acknowledged the need to refresh and strengthen its first economic development strategy.
13. An East of England Investment Agency was formed in 1997 to improve the performance of the region in attracting inward investment. It works closely with the Essex Investment Office, part of the County Council's Enterprise Division, and the EEDA.
14. The responsibility for the preparation of draft regional planning guidance passes in April 2001 to the East of England Local Government Conference. In Regional Planning policy guidance issued in October 2000, the Government stresses that

"regional planning guidance should complement and assist the implementation of Regional Development Agency's strategies in achieving high and stable levels of growth and employment, while ensuring that the benefits of economic growth can be shared by everyone, thus delivering a better quality of life. In developing policies to assist economic development and regeneration, the regional planning body will need to draw on the RDA's work in identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the regional economy. This will enable the regional planning body to identify the areas where land needs to be released for economic development or where policies targeted at facilitating development need to be focused."

The East of England Local Government Conference will also be responsible for developing a regional transport strategy.

15. An East of England Regional Assembly comprising local authority, business, trade union, health, education and the public and voluntary sectors has been established. EEDA anticipates that it will play a key part in building support for the regional economic development strategy.
16. EEDA's view is that the delivery of regional action plans will draw on the many active, innovative partnerships operating in the East of England. Local economic partnerships will take a leading role on sub regional issues. It is committed to working with these partnerships.
17. The Essex Economic Partnership (EEP) was officially launched in October 1998. Business, local authority and economic interests are represented on its board. It has successfully bid for a franchise from the DTI to provide the national small business service in Essex. It has recently achieved company status and has restructured itself as a holding company with two wholly owned subsidiary companies:- Essex Small Business Service and ReMaDe Essex. ReMaDe stands for Recyclables Market Development in Essex. It is a business focused initiative which aims to develop new markets for recycled materials.
18. The EEP has a number of strategic priorities:- to increase the levels of foreign and UK investment into the county, particularly into areas of greatest need; to ensure provision of efficient transport and communications networks as well as suitable sites for development; to encourage the growth of competitive, customer focused businesses, with "winning" company characteristics; to create a motivated multi skilled work force, committed to lifetime learning; to strengthen the competitive position of the different sub Essex economies and reduce disparity between them; and to strengthen links with the EU and improve capacity to access EU funding to meet identified needs. It aims to be the principal interface between organisations and agencies in Essex in the economic field and EEDA/Go East.
19. The intention is that the Essex SBS business plan will stress the important role of the SBS in supporting the strategic objectives for economic development across the county. Although the SBS will have operational autonomy in pursuing its primary objective of delivering a first rate business support service to businesses in Essex, strategically it will be informed by EEP priorities.
20. The EEP is currently seeking to facilitate the establishment of Local Area Strategy Groups, in recognition of the disparate nature of the Essex economy. One for South East Essex was launched in 1999. These groups are intended to identify local issues and ensure EEP support is channelled to meet local needs. They will report local issues in relation to the SBS to the EEP board and develop a dialogue with the SBS, informing and influencing its priorities. It has been suggested by the Association of Essex Authorities that Uttlesford should participate in both the North Essex and West Essex groupings.
21. ReMaDe Essex is based on a successful model which has operated in the US and elsewhere in the UK. It has a target of finding additional markets for 200,000 tonnes of recycled materials by 2004. In particular, it is seeking to

find alternatives to returning materials to the original manufacturers of, for example, glass and paper, in order to break their monopoly positions over the price paid for recycled material. ReMaDe is likely to consider pump priming the adoption of new processes by firms.

22. Business Link Essex and the Essex Training and Enterprise Council will cease to exist from April 2001. A new body, the Learning and Skills Council is being established by the DfEE to coordinate adult learning and training. Some of the TEC's surpluses over which it has discretion have been allocated to the EEP and to particular priority areas within Essex.
23. Essex County Council shares the same joint strategic priorities as the EEP. These are set out in paragraph 17 above. It has a very succinct vision of Essex in 2015 as "the enterprise county", of improved competitiveness, and of a greener world with more flexible companies, employers and employees. Its role includes:- pressing the Government for enough resources to allow the County Council to provide the services needed; developing planning policies and processes that sustain and revitalise towns and their centres; encouraging building on brownfield sites and promote the continuing viability of village communities; and maintaining roads and bridges and minimise congestion, particularly where this adversely affects the economic prosperity of the county. It has annual action plans, in particular in relation to regeneration activities, international development and employment development services.

#### **What does Uttlesford District Council want to achieve?**

24. The Council wants to deliver its five strategic objectives:-
  - safeguarding the environment and enhancing it for future generations;
  - managing the economy to meet the needs of the whole community;
  - improving the health and safety of our community;
  - ensuring the choice of homes better meets our community's needs; and
  - ensuring better access for all in our community to services and jobs.

It needs to do so in ways which acknowledge the community priorities referred to in paragraph 4 above.

#### **How will the Council do this?**

25. The Council's Economic Strategy is important to all of the above objectives. The Council will work with its partners to develop and implement plans, policies and programmes which progress the objectives. Those most closely related to this Economic Strategy are the Uttlesford Cultural and Leisure Strategy, Local Plan, and Transport Strategy. The links with other strategies will also be developed. For example, the Crime and Disorder Strategy and its concern to address fear of crime in local centres, is obviously related to the Economic Strategy's identification of promotion of local centres as an issue.



26. The Council will support the provision of an efficient transport and communications network that meets the needs of businesses and of employees for travel to work. This should enable people to make the choice to use more sustainable travel modes and reduce the rate of growth of trips by car, especially those where the driver travels alone. The Council wants to ensure that foreign and UK commercial investment is channelled to areas of greatest need, the regional Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration (PAERs), including East Essex, Harlow and Thames Gateway. It supports good communication links between Stansted Airport and the PAERs so that they can benefit from Stansted's network of air transport services for business travel and freight distribution. The potential of Stansted Airport to facilitate business travel, and thereby assist in attracting inward investment to Essex, is acknowledged. The Council will consider carefully the economic consequences of any further expansion at Stansted Airport, together with environmental and social consequences. The airport has planning permission for development which will enable it to handle the forecast 15 million passengers p.a. by 2004/5, an increasing proportion of whom are expected to be business travellers. In 1999, 30% of its 9.5 million passengers were on business. The Council supports the Stansted Area Transport Forum; the new A120 and West Anglia Route Modernisation rail investment programme; and the priority attached to multi modal improvements to the inter urban transport network between the M11 and Harwich to improve access to Europe, and cross country and regional access to Stansted Airport, the Haven Ports and the designated PAER in East Essex. It will contribute to the development of appropriate regional planning guidance, a regional transport strategy and economic development strategy for the East of England including support for safeguarding the efficient function of the M11 motorway as a strategic transport corridor with limited access.
27. The Council will review proposed sites for business in the context of its local plan review. Land proposed for business parks in the adopted local plan have not been implemented. It has sufficient land to meet County Structure Plan requirements up to 2011. The Council will need to consider what action it should take, if any, to increase the supply of readily available sites to ensure that the scale of development envisaged in the structure plan over the next ten years to 2011 is fully developed in that time frame.
28. The Council will support initiatives to encourage a strong competitive business base in Uttlesford, which is open to innovation and new technology.
29. The Council will support initiatives to raise the level of skills in Uttlesford's work force, based on lifetime learning, to meet the labour needs of growing industrial sectors and enable people to move between jobs. It will build on experience of IIP pilots to develop skills of its own staff and with Uttlesford Environmental Task Force New Deal environment option scheme. It will support the North Essex Learning Partnership.
30. The Council will support initiatives to regenerate the economies of local centres and the continued diversification of the economy in rural areas away from a reliance on farming to wider range of sustainable business activity, including

tourism. In particular, it would like to encourage local businesses to embrace e-commerce more comprehensively, enabling more specialist retailers to access national niche markets.

31. The Council will support initiatives to encourage businesses to minimise waste, maximise recycling rates and to use recycled materials.

#### **How will the Council provide this support?**

32. A new agenda is developing at the more strategic level, within Essex, at the county sub regional level and regionally. The issues at stake are core to the Council's strategic objectives and the community priorities. It is important that the Council engages fully in this agenda.
33. By working with local partners to develop a North Essex economic development strategy (Uttlesford, Braintree, Colchester and Tendring) and West Essex economic development strategy (Uttlesford, Epping Forest and Harlow), and the EEP, the Council can work to ensure that its objectives are taken into account by other influential partners. This applies to the regional planning guidance and regional transport strategy, to the structure plan and local transport plan, to business advice services, to training provision and recycling.
34. The nature of the most pressing issues faced by the Council do not necessitate substantial direct investment by the Council itself, even if it was able to do so. The Council faces the prospect of significantly reduced income from revenue support grant the Government pays to local authorities over the next few years, and its ability to fund initiatives directly is extremely limited. Accordingly, its modest programme of actions over the past 5 years is likely to reduce further.

#### **Indicators and targets**

35. An important measure of the Council's success in achieving its desired outcomes is performance against the targets in its Local Agenda 21 Strategy. These measure achievements in terms of social progress which recognises the needs of everybody, effective protection of the environment, prudent use of natural resources and maintaining high and stable levels of economic growth. Outcomes of particular significance to this economic strategy are:-
  1. Educational attainment of 19 year olds;
  6. Number of village facilities;
  13. Percentage of airline and airport workers driving to work at Stansted
  19. Long term unemployment.
36. The Council will regularly monitor:- the take up of employment land; the implementation of planning permission for employment uses in, for example, rural buildings; and floor space change and other indicators of economic health in the local centres. It will monitor enquiries received by the Essex Investment Office for land and premises; the views of business representative groups; the

development of company travel plans and businesses implementing environmental management systems.

37. The 2001 Census will provide new indicator data on, for example, participation rates of people of economically active age in the labour force. Comprehensive information will also be available on commuting patterns.

### **Conclusion**

38. The Council will work with strategic and other partners to address the following key issues:-

- \* an efficient transport and communications system that meets the needs of businesses and employees for travel to work;
- \* efficient transport links between Stansted Airport and Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration;
- \* appropriate regional strategies for the East of England which safeguard the efficient function of the M11 motorway as a strategic transport corridor with existing limited access within Uttlesford;
- \* ensuring that the scale of business development envisaged in the structure plan over the next 10 years to 2011 can be fully developed within that time frame;
- \* a strong competitive business base which is open to innovation and new technology;
- \* raising the level of skills of the work force;
- \* regeneration of the economies of local centres and continued diversification of the economy in rural areas away from a reliance on farming;
- \* encouraging businesses to minimise waste, maximise recycling rates and to use recycled materials.

**Agenda Item No: 9**

**Title: BEST VALUE REVIEW - GRANTS**

**Authors: John Bosworth (01799) 510453, Roger Harborough (01799) 510457, and Alex Stewart (01799) 510555**

### **Summary**

- 1 This report recommends various courses of action in respect of the grants that fall within the responsibilities of this Committee, as considered at the Best Value Sub Committee on 27 November 2000 and Policy and Resources Committee on 19 December 2000.

### **Preferred Options recommended in the Review**

- 2 The recommendations are as set out in the report to the Best Value Sub Committee. An extract as it relates to this Committee is appended. The grants, and recommendations, falling within the responsibilities of this Committee are:
  - Tree Planting Scheme – reduce grant from £5,000 to £2,500 because of comparable contribution from Stansted Airport. Review next year.
  - British Trust for Conservation Volunteers – continue grant of £5,000.
  - Urgent Repairs to Buildings at Risk and Miscellaneous Environmental Grants – see below
  - Listed Building Grants Scheme – discontinue grant of £5,000
  - Saffron Walden Conservation Grant – see below
  - Conservation Enhancement Grants – reduce grant from £1,000 to £500
  - Local Centres Promotion – retain budget of £20,000. Try to attract additional EU funding. If unsuccessful, no change to existing scheme.
  - Prince's Youth Business Trust (PYBT) – cease grants
  - Village Shop Development Scheme – transfer grant of £3,000 from county-wide scheme, plus transfer of £1,000 previously reserved for PYBT, to a new Uttlesford community enterprise shop scheme.
  - Business Development Services North West Essex – see below

### **Update and additional comments**

- 3 Saffron Walden Conservation Grant Scheme

Essex County Council have suggested very recently targeting this scheme on: Buildings at Risk in the town and other important listed buildings in a state of disrepair; listed and unlisted historic buildings whose repair/ reinstatement would significantly improve the townscape of the conservation area; and historic boundary walls whose repair would achieve the same impact. Targeting would apply for the first six months of the financial year, after which the balance of the grant fund could be applied to the repair of any listed building in the conservation area. The County Council has also suggested

that the District Council should pay the County Council a fee for administering the scheme in respect of every grant project that is seen through to completion. Officers are discussing these proposals and further information will be provided at the meeting.

### **Urgent Repairs to Buildings at Risk and Miscellaneous Environmental Grants**

The Council has only used its powers on two occasions, the last being in relation to 15 High Street, Great Dunmow. On reflection, it is considered more appropriate to make no specific provision in the budget. If the circumstances did arise, consideration could be given to using reserves to fund necessary action. Accordingly, it is suggested that the budget provision be reduced from £1,500 to £500. This would enable small miscellaneous environmental grants to be maintained.

### **Business Development Services (North West Essex)**

The Grants Review recommended that no change be made to the annual provision for a grant of £5,000. The Committee received a report on this organisation at its last meeting, which indicated the uncertainty about its future role after April. This is when the Essex Small Business Service (SBS) begins operating. The organisation's position remains unclear, but as previously reported, responsibility for business advice to small firms will pass to the SBS. A financial contribution from this Council will not be necessary to ensure that local firms have access to the SBS advice. The advice currently provided by the Enterprise Agency will, therefore, continue.

RECOMMENDED that the Recommended Option for each of those grant schemes within the responsibility of this Committee, as set out in the Appendix to this report, be approved, subject to any additional information reported to the meeting, and the following variation:

The Urgent Repairs to Buildings at Risk and other Miscellaneous Environmental Grants budget provision be reduced from £1,500 to £500 to cover the latter element only, and consideration be given to using reserves to fund necessary action on buildings at risk as circumstances arise;

Background Papers: Letter from Conservation and Grants Officer, Essex County Council 8 January 2001

**Agenda Item**                    **Appendix to Agenda item 9**  
**No:**  
**Title:**                            **BEST VALUE REVIEW OF GRANTS**  
**Author:**                        **Sarah McLagan**                    **(01799) 510560**

**(Member Reference Group members: Councillors Miller, Green and Morson)**

**Summary**

- 1 This report puts forward Preferred Options for the future delivery of the Grant Schemes reviewed under the Best Value Review of Grants. It recommends that the Options and Action Plan presented in the report be approved.

**Introduction**

- 2 The Best Value Review of Grants has considered 14 Schemes. To depict the results of the Review, the Member Reference Group (MRG) and Review Team have developed the appended tables. The tables include details of the recommended Option for the future delivery of each Grant Scheme, and indicate the Budgetary/Efficiency Savings achieved, where appropriate.
- 3 The following paragraphs provide details of the process that has been undertaken to reach the conclusions provided in the tables.

**Grant Schemes Reviewed**

The Best Value MRG and Review Team for Grants has undertaken a fundamental review of the following Grant Schemes :-

	(£)	(£)
<b>(a) "Amenities" Grants –</b>		<b>166,820</b>
administered by Community & Leisure Services		
made up of:-		
Large Scale Project Grants	40,000	
Village Initiative Grants	10,000	
Ad Hoc Grants	10,000	
Voluntary Organisation Support Grants	106,820	
 <b>(b) "Environmental" Grants -</b>		 <b>23,000</b>
administered by Planning Services,		
made up of:-		
Historic/Listed Building Grants	5,000	
SW Conservation Area Grants	5,000	
Conservation Enhancement Grants	1,500	
Annual Tree Planting Grants	5,000	
Grant to British Trust Conservation	5,000	
Volunteers		
Other Miscellaneous Grants	1,500	

(c)	<b>“Economic” Grants -</b>	<b>29,000</b>
	administered by Planning and Community & Leisure Services, made up of:-	
	Promotion of Local Centres Grant	20,000
	Prince’s Youth Trust Grant	1,000
	Business Development Service	5,000
	Village Shop Development Grant	<u>3,000</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>218,820</u></b>

5 The Review has not taken into account previously listed entries for Local Agenda 21, North West Essex Business Directory and the Community Support Grant. It was decided that the latter should cease to exist from 1 April 2001 by the Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting in September. The other two refer to budgets that are used to meet Council commitments in terms of enabling meetings/events to take place and support to partnership initiatives and, therefore, these two are considered as contributions to costs and do not fit the terms of reference of the Grants review.

6 The Review has estimated that the total cost of administering the Grant Schemes is £27,850, including Management Charges. Although it is difficult to quantify the cost of Members attending meetings at which grants are determined in money terms, it has been identified that each year the process currently involves approximately 10 special meetings and approximately 14 agenda items to be considered in the normal cycle of meetings.

**Do these Grant Schemes have to be provided?**

7 The provision of Grants is a discretionary function permissible under various Local Government Acts.

8 The review of Grants has considered the question of whether the Schemes should be provided under this power from a number of view points, including :-

- What would be the effect if a Grant Scheme were to cease or the budget available were reduced,
- What is the opinion of the Grant recipients about the Grant Scheme they have applied to, in terms of:-
  - the efficiency and effectiveness of the Grant and the Grant making process,
  - helpfulness of staff,
  - availability of information about the Grant Scheme and the application process,
  - who benefited from the Grant,

- Could the Grant Scheme be provided in another way more effectively/efficiently, such as by –

- another body,
- less Member involvement,
- amalgamating Grant Schemes,
- giving Officers delegated authority to determine Grants.

9 The review also considered how effective each Grant Scheme Criteria is in achieving the Council's Strategic Objectives. It also sought to Benchmark the Council's schemes against other local authority provision. This proved to be a fairly fruitless exercise as the only useful comparative information was that about processes and criteria. This information will be used when pursuing the Council's preferred option for each Grant Scheme.

10 The review asked the above questions of each of the Grant Schemes under review. The answers helped the MRG to confirm the preferred Option for the future delivery of each Scheme.

#### **Does the Council have to provide the service?**

11 The review considered opportunities for, and the implications of, an external provider managing Grant Scheme(s) on behalf of the Council. The Team concluded that :-

- There is no one organisation with the expertise to manage all of the Schemes.
- The Council would have to monitor the provider to ensure its objectives were being met. It is estimated that administrative savings would be minimal.
- An administering organisation would charge the Council for its services. It is estimated that these costs would exceed current costs, having discussed the proposal with colleagues and partners.
- There would be confusion to the customer, especially if the service were fragmented e.g. some Schemes outsourced, others retained in-house.
- The Council would lose an element of control of the funds that it is making available to the community, and, therefore, credit for provision/support would be diluted.

#### **How can the service be improved?**

12 The review process has ensured that each Grant Scheme has undergone a rigorous review to ascertain whether it should continue and, if so, whether its criteria are appropriate to meet the Council's objectives.

Having addressed these two fundamental issues, the review then considered what could be done to improve the effectiveness and, if possible, achieve 2% efficiency savings for the delivery of each Scheme. The table in the appendix illustrates how, in the opinion of the MRG, these objectives can be met.



- 13 The MRG has identified actual savings of £8,000 through cessation of the Listed Building Grants Scheme (£5,000), the Conservation Enhancement Grants Scheme (£500) and the Tree Planting Scheme (£2,500). In addition, efficiency savings have been made where Schemes have been refined/redefined.

The appendix gives details of these under the heading “Budgetary/Efficiency Savings”.

## Action Plan Summary

<b>GRANT SCHEME</b>	<b>ACTION REQUIRED</b>	<b>BY WHOM AND WHEN</b>
Large Scale Project Grant Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devise redefined Criteria</li> <li>• Approve redefined Criteria</li> <li>• Advertise availability of Grants</li> <li>• Determine Grants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Grants Advisory Panel – by 31/01/01</li> <li>• Community Services - 06/02/01</li> <li>• Officers - 09/02/01 (c/d 12/3/01)</li> <li>• Officers - 23/03/01</li> </ul>
Ad Hoc Grant Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devise redefined Criteria</li> <li>• Approve redefined Criteria</li> <li>• Introduce redefined Scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DGAP – by 31/01/01</li> <li>• Com. Services - 06/02/01</li> <li>• Officers - 01/04/01</li> </ul>
Voluntary Organisation Support Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give delegated authority for Criteria to be determined by DGAP + Chairs of Community Service and Amenities Sub Committees</li> <li>• Determine Criteria</li> <li>• Advertise availability of Grants</li> <li>• Determine Grant allocation</li> <li>• Confirm Grant allocation</li> <li>• Advise VOs of Grants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best Value Sub-Committee - 27/11/00</li> <li>• DGAP + Chairmen by 22/12/00</li> <li>• Officers by 31/12/00 (c/d mid 01/01)</li> <li>• DGAP by 31/01/01</li> <li>• Com. Services – 06/02/00</li> <li>• Officers - 14/02/01</li> </ul>
Tree Planting Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm funding arrangements with STAL</li> <li>• Produce improved leaflet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers - ASAP</li> <li>• Officers - before 01/04/01</li> </ul>
British Trust of Conservation Volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor effectiveness and efficiency of Grant Scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers - On-going</li> </ul>
Listed Building Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise of cessation of Grant Scheme, as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers – as necessary</li> </ul>
Saffron Walden Conservation Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor effectiveness and efficiency of Grant Scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers - On-going</li> </ul>
Conservation Enhancement Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor effectiveness and efficiency of reduced Grant Scheme budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers - On-going</li> </ul>
Other Miscellaneous Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor effectiveness and efficiency of reduced Grant Scheme budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers - On-going</li> </ul>
Local Centres Promotion Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess requirements of Leader + and other appropriate sources of funding</li> <li>• Form Local Action Group</li> <li>• Formulate application</li> <li>• Await result</li> <li>• Implement LCPB criteria if unsuccessful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers – within appropriate timescales</li> <li>• Officers – by 31/01/01</li> <li>• LAG – by 01/05/01</li> <li>• By 09/01</li> <li>• From 09/01</li> </ul>
Prince's Youth Business Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise of cessation of Grant Scheme, as appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers – as necessary</li> </ul>
Village Shop Development Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve Criteria for new Grant Scheme</li> <li>• Advertise new Scheme</li> <li>• Determine Grants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning &amp; Development – 22/03/01</li> <li>• Officers – 04/01</li> <li>• Officers</li> </ul>
Business Development Services (NWE) Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor effectiveness and efficiency of reduced Grant Scheme budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers – On-going</li> </ul>

RECOMMENDED that the Recommended Option for each Grant Scheme, as set out in the Appendix, and the Action Plan in the report, be approved

Background Papers: Best Value Review of Grants – master file

<b>TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME</b>	<b><u>VILLAGE INITIATIVE GRANTS SCHEME (VIGS)</u></b>	<b><u>LARGE SCALE PROJECT GRANTS SCHEME (LSPGS)</u></b>
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To fund environmental or social projects which are of benefit to the community.	To fund environmental or social projects which are of benefit to the community
Budget Amount Used Cost to provide	£10,000 £ 5,196 £ 4,260 (not including Member meetings)	£40,000 £28,042 £ 4,530 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> <li>To ensure better access for all our community to services and jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> <li>To ensure better access for all our community to services and jobs</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Useful means of funding community projects. Works would have proceeded in 6 of 7 projects if only 75% grant were available	Useful means of funding community projects. Works would have proceeded in 8 of 13 projects if only 75% grant were available
Continue ?	No. Projects could be funded by LSPGS as both Schemes under spent - criteria would require alteration	Yes. Grants assist in accessing national grant scheme funding. Administratively onerous, therefore, improvements needed.
How Scheme Improved ?	Budget under spent - either transfer budget to under funded Scheme or cease to provide and save budget	Budget under-spent – incorporate VIGS criteria. Reduction in administration costs achieved by fewer Member meetings.
Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stop Scheme. Transfer budget to VOSG. Incorporate principles into LSPGS</li> <li>Stop Scheme and make saving</li> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Administered by another body</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redefine criteria to incorporate VIGS criteria. Give officers delegated authority.</li> <li>Stop Scheme and make savings</li> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Administered by another body</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget.</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Stop VIGS.</b></li> <li><b>Transfer budget to VOSG.</b></li> <li><b>Incorporate principles of VIGS into LSPGS</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Redefine criteria to incorporate VIGS criteria.</b></li> <li><b>Give officers delegated authority.</b></li> </ul>
Justification	To provide better value for money to the Council in terms of use of budget and administrative savings.	To provide better value for money to the Council by enabling the same amount of projects to be funded and in terms of budget and administrative savings.
Implications/ Opportunities	No administration Less confusion with other schemes No Member meetings Under spent in 99/00 Transfer £10,000 to VOSG Transfer principles to LSPGS	Less confusion with other schemes No Member meetings and associated administration Under spent in 99/00
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>No Member meetings (3 in 99/00)</b> <b>No associated support costs (£4,260)</b>	<b>No Member meetings (5 in 99/00) and associated administration</b> <b>Decisions made more quickly</b>

TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME	AD HOC GRANTS SCHEME	<b><u>VOLUNTARY ORGANISATION SUPPORT GRANTS (VOSG)</u></b>
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To fund or provide start-up costs for projects/initiatives which are of benefit to the residents/individuals.	To fund on-going costs of Voluntary Organisations
Budget Amount Used Cost to provide	£10,000 (included Millennium Grant Scheme) £ 9,065 £ 5,120 (not including Member meetings)	£106,820 £106,820 £ 5,700 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve the health of our community and ensure that Uttlesford remains a safe place to live.</li> <li>To manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve the health of our community and ensure that Uttlesford remains a safe place to live.</li> <li>To manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community</li> <li>To ensure better access for all our community to services and jobs</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Helpful funding towards projects/initiatives being pursued by individual/communities. Works would have proceeded in 10 of 11 projects if 75% grant were available	Means of supporting local, voluntary services. Grant benefits the local community through services provided
Continue ?	Yes. Administratively onerous, therefore, improvements needed. Majority of projects would have proceeded with 25% less grant	Yes. Grants assist in providing local services that the Council would otherwise have to consider providing Budget stood still for 3 years and likely to be over-subscribed – can budget be increased ?
How Scheme Improved ?	Reduce budget & transfer saving to an under-funded Scheme or cease to provide and save budget. Introduce matched funding requirements of 25%. Reduction in administration costs achieved by fewer Member meetings	Criteria needs to accommodate local branches of national organisations to enable more local support. Utilise under-spends from VISG and Ad Hoc Grant Scheme to meet demands for increased funding and from new applicants.
Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Reduce budget to £5,000. Transfer £5,000 to VOSG. Introduce matched funding criteria @ 25%. Give officers delegated authority.</b></li> <li>Stop Scheme and make saving</li> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget, give officers delegated authority</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce lower grant limit of £1,000 Enter SLA with recipients of Grants over £5,000. Offer 3 year funding with no growth Increase budget of £106,820 by £5,000 utilising savings from Ad Hoc Grant Scheme Create new 1 year core funding scheme and offer Max. grant of £1,000, using £10,000 from VIGS.</li> <li>Stop Scheme and make saving</li> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget to £56,000 and only support CAB</li> <li>Administered by another body</li> </ol>
Recommended Option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Reduce budget to £5,000.</b></li> <li><b>Transfer £5,000 to VOSG.</b></li> <li><b>Introduce matched funding criteria @ 25%</b></li> <li><b>Give officers delegated authority.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Introduce lower grant limit of £1,000</b></li> <li><b>Enter SLA with recipients of Grants over £5,000.</b></li> <li><b>Offer 3 year funding with no growth</b></li> <li><b>Increase budget of £106,820 by £5,000 utilising savings from Ad Hoc Grant Scheme</b></li> <li><b>Create new 1 year core funding scheme to offer a max. Grant of £1,000, using £10,000 from VIGS.</b></li> </ul>
Justification	To provide better value for money to the Council by enabling the same number of projects to be funded and in terms of budget	Enables Partnership approach, which meets Strategic Objectives. Enables funding to local branches of national

	savings.	organisations. Enables joint monitoring opportunities
Implications/ Opportunities	No Members meetings Decisions made more quickly Under spend in 00/01 predicted Transfer £5,000 to VOSG Annual information report to Members	Local branches of national organisations can apply. More money for more organisations and/or more money for current and/or new recipients/projects. Closer working relationship with Vol. Sector. Increased budget – using savings of £10,000 from VISG and £5,000 from Ad Hoc Grant Scheme Fulfils central Government Voluntary Sector Compact requirements
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>No Member meetings (5 in 00/01)</b> <b>Decisions made more quickly.</b>	<b>Joint monitoring potential which could reduce administrative input</b> <b>Advisory Panel meetings increased by 1 per year.</b> <b>Reports to Community Services increased by 1 per year</b>

TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME	TREE PLANTING SCHEME	<u>BRITISH TRUST OF CONSERVATION VOLUNTEERS</u>
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To supply trees, hedging and sundries for Parish Councils and private individuals	To make a one-off payment to the BTCV as part of a Service Level Agreement
Budget Amount Used Cost to provide	£ 5,000 £ 5,000 £ 2,790 (not including Member meetings)	£ 5,000 £ 5,000 £ . 40 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Scheme is well received.	Grant provides valuable assistance to meet costs of local environmental projects
Continue ?	Yes. Enables Council to contribute to environmental enhancement projects. Some concern about number of trees lost.	Yes. Grants assists local environmental projects and Parish Councils
How Scheme Improved ?	Continue to secure partnership funding from STAL to enable reduction in Council's contribution. Produce a leaflet to help reduce tree loss	Grant currently administered efficiently and effectively under SLA
Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If STAL agree to continue external funding reduce the Grant Scheme budget and produce a leaflet</li> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Secure additional funding to increase the number of trees planted</li> <li>Stop UDC Grant. Administer STAL element only</li> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget, require Parish Council contribution.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Stop Scheme and make savings</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>If STAL agree to continue external funding, reduce the Grant Scheme budget.</b></li> <li><b>Produce a leaflet to help to reduce loss of trees.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Status Quo</b></li> </ul>
Justification	To provide better value for money for the Council and still enable the same amount of trees to be funded.	Environmental projects are undertaken in the District at a cost effective rate under a Service Level Agreement.
Implications/ Opportunities	Slightly increased administration No reduction in trees planted Discussion needed with STAL	None
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>Actual Savings of £2,500</b>	<b>Grant currently administered efficiently and effectively.</b>

<b>TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME</b>	<b><u>LISTED BUILDING GRANTS SCHEME</u></b>	<b><u>SAFFRON WALDEN CONSERVATION GRANT</u></b>
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To provide grants for repairs to Listed Buildings	To provide grants for repairs to buildings in the Saffron Walden Conservation Area.
Budget	£ 5,000	£5,000
Amount Used	£ 4,993	£4,804
Cost to provide	£ 1,040 (not including Member meetings)	£ 520 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Scheme is well received. However, works would have proceeded without the grant being available	Scheme is well received
Continue ?	No. Lack of grant unlikely to affect number of buildings repaired.	Yes. Grants assist in conservation of listed buildings in Conservation Area in Saffron Walden. External funding/administrative support provided by ECC.
How Scheme Improved ?	Stop Grant Scheme	Closer liaison with ECC on some projects.
Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stop Grant Scheme</li> <li>2. Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>3. Status Quo</li> <li>4. Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Status Quo</li> <li>2. Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>3. Stop Grant Scheme</li> <li>4. Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Stop Grant Scheme</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Status Quo</b></li> </ul>
Justification	From survey, unlikely to affect number of buildings repaired.	Assists in regeneration of Town Centre Achieves high standard of repair in District's prime concentration of Listed buildings
Implications/ Opportunities	No administration Budgetary savings of £5,000 Little impact on number of buildings repaired	Enables similar number of buildings as previously supported to be repaired to high standard.
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>Actual Savings of £5,000</b> <b>No associated support costs (£1,040)</b>	<b>Scheme currently administered by ECC efficiently and effectively.</b>



TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME	<b><u>CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT GRANTS SCHEME</u></b>	<b>OTHER MISCELLANEOUS GRANTS</b>
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To provide grants for small scale schemes which improve the local environment.	To provide grants for urgent repairs to buildings "at risk" in the district.
Budget Amount Used Cost to provide	£ 1,500 £ 774 £ 540 (not including Member meetings)	£1,500 £ 0 £ 510 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Scheme is well received. However, works would have proceeded with reduced grants budget	Grant is well received when urgent requirement to carry out repairs or appropriate applications are received.
Continue ?	Yes. But opportunity to reduce Grant budget	Yes. Grants assist in conservation of buildings "at risk" and in meeting other miscellaneous calls for financial support in relation to Conservation.
How Scheme Improved ?	Reduce Grant Scheme budget	Significant increase in Grant Scheme budget.
Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Stop Grant Scheme</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status Quo</li> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Stop Grant Scheme</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Reduce Grant Scheme budget</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Status Quo</b></li> </ul>
Justification	From survey, probably no significant reduction in projects supported.	Money available if needed for emergency repairs on buildings "at risk"
Implications/ Opportunities	Budgetary savings of £500	If all of Grant allocated, administrative costs would increase.
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>Actual Savings of £500</b>	<b>Scheme currently administered efficiently and effectively.</b>

TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME	<u>LOCAL CENTRES PROMOTION BUDGET</u>	PRINCE'S YOUTH BUSINESS TRUST
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To provide grants for projects undertaken by the four main settlements	To provide grants which assist young employed people to start up new business in Uttlesford
Budget Amount Used Cost to provide	£ 20,000 £ 20,000 £ 1,530 (not including Member meetings)	£1,000 £1,000 £ 70 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To safeguard the environment and enhance it for future generations</li> <li>To manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community</li> <li>To ensure better access for all our community to services and jobs</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Grants have enabled projects of demonstrable economic benefit to the community	Grant is put into Essex "pot" No applications by young person from Uttlesford for 2 years
Continue ?	Yes. But may be able to utilise Grant to access funding from other sources – such as European funding schemes e.g. Leader +	No. Grant could be more usefully used to help new Village Shop Development Grant Scheme
How Scheme Improved ?	Use Grant to access funding from other sources – such as European funding schemes e.g. Leader +	If young people from Uttlesford had benefited from PYBT grant, continuation could be justified.
Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Grant Scheme budget to access funding from other sources. If unsuccessful, offer grants to Local Centres which have strategic plans. Give officers delegated authority.</li> <li>Stop Grant Scheme</li> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Status Quo</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stop Grant Scheme. Transfer Grant Scheme budget (£1,000) to new Village Shop Development Scheme.</li> <li>Stop Grant Scheme</li> <li>Reduce Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Increase Grant Scheme budget</li> <li>Status Quo</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Grant Scheme budget to access funding from other sources.</li> <li>If unsuccessful, offer grants to Local Centres which have strategic plans.</li> <li>Give officers delegated authority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Stop Grant Scheme.</b></li> <li><b>Transfer Grant Scheme budget (£1,000) to new Village Shop Development Grant Scheme.</b></li> </ul>
Justification	Would potentially enable more projects to be undertaken and offers a strategic approach to economic development throughout the District.	To provide better value for money for the Council in terms of use of budget and administrative savings There have been no applications for grants in the last 2 years.
Implications/ Opportunities	Could enable access to external funding More projects could be undertaken Greater staff input Annual information report to Members on Grants made	No administration No Member meetings Transfer £1,000 to new Village Shop Development Grant Scheme Potential economic advantage to small village communities
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>Potential for value for money/added value</b> <b>Potential for more money to come into the district</b> <b>Ease of monitoring</b> <b>More officer time/involvement</b> <b>No Member meetings (1 in 1999/00)</b>	<b>No Member meetings</b> <b>No associated support costs (£70)</b>

<b>TITLE OF GRANT SCHEME</b>	<b><u>VILLAGE SHOP DEVELOPMENT SCHEME GRANTS</u></b>	<b><u>BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SERVICES (NW ESSEX) LTD</u></b>
Purpose of Grant Scheme	To provide joint funding to a ECC scheme to help village shops survive	One off Grant payment to the BDS to enable it to offer a free advisory service to new and established small businesses delivered locally in Uttlesford
Budget Amount Used Cost to provide	£ 3,000 £ 3,000 £ 1,530 (not including Member meetings)	£5,000 £5,000 £ 370 (not including Member meetings)
Council's Strategic Objectives met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community</li> <li>To ensure better access for all our community to services and jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To manage the economy to meet the needs of the whole community</li> <li>To ensure better access for all our community to services and jobs</li> </ul>
Recipients Opinion	Grant is put into ECC "pot" Uttlesford Village Shops received No financial assistance in last financial year	Grants goes towards funding of service to provide essential business advice to new and established small businesses in Uttlesford
Continue ?	Yes. But could be more usefully utilised if the Council were to allocate the Grant itself.	Yes. Provides advice and contacts with banks, solicitors etc to district's small firms.
How Scheme Improved ?	Create a new Scheme, which the Council administers itself. Add the PYBT budget to increase grant available.	Promote services available
Options	<p><b>1.Create a new scheme which offers grants of up to £1,000 to "pump prime" community shops in District utilising the VSDS budget (£3,000) and the PYBT budget (£1,000). Give officers delegated authority</b></p> <p>2. Stop Grant Scheme 3. Reduce Grant Scheme budget 4. Increase Grant Scheme budget 5. Status Quo</p>	<p>1. Status Quo 2. Stop Grant Scheme 3. Reduce Grant 4. Increase Grant</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a new scheme which offers grants of up to £1,000 to "pump prime" community shops in District utilising the VSDS budget (£3,000) and the PYBT budget (£1,000).</li> <li>Give officers delegated authority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Status Quo</b></li> </ul>
Justification	Gives the Council more control of it's own grant budget Offers the community the chance to improve its own facilities	Enables Council to contribute to economic development of the district, with little administrative burden
Implications/ Opportunities	More administration More control for the Council Increase budget to £4,000 utilising £1,000 from PYBT Potential for more community shops to be supported/ developed	Enables continuation of useful advice/contacts to local businesses
Budgetary/ Efficiency Savings	<b>Money utilised within the district Decisions made quickly</b>	<b>Scheme currently administered efficiently and effectively</b>