

DEVELOPMENT & REGENERATION DELIVERY PLAN – Stage 1 Report

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: Deputy Leader, Councillor Cath Giel

LEAD OFFICER: Fergus McMorrow

REPORT AUTHOR: Fergus McMorrow/Liam Murphy

This report sets out a framework and interim priorities as a first stage in preparing our development and regeneration delivery plan. It also addresses the future use of area based grant received to address worklessness.

Summary and Recommendation:

1. The Executive agree the policy framework for developing the delivery plan and in particular:
 - 1.1 Agree the key objectives as a summary of what we are trying to achieve. (Appendix 1)
 - 1.2 Agree in principle the targets for each of the key objectives, subject to further development (Appendix 2)
 - 1.3 Agree the Evaluation Criteria to be used for prioritising current and future schemes
 - 1.4 Agree to receive further reports on delivery mechanisms including
 - a) A new Whitehaven Town Centre delivery body
 - b) new proposals for South Copeland as a pilot for integrating our locality working arrangements and regeneration plan delivery
 - c) a new approach to succeed the current tourism partnership
2. The Executive agree the approach to using Working Neighbourhood resources currently held in reserves to meet the objectives in the Regeneration Plan.
3. The Executive agree that the Working Neighbourhood Fund is allocated so that over the life of the Fund 2008/9 – 2010/11

- 3.1 Up to a maximum of £200k over the life of the programme should be allocated for investment in strategy and policy development (e.g. specialist advice) for the Copeland Regeneration Delivery Plan, economic information and policy development and further support for the LSP team.
 - 3.2 Up to a maximum of £500k should be allocated for the fixed-term revenue funding for up to 5 community development locality working posts, to work within CBC Development Directorate for the purposes of taking forward locality working within the five localities, co-ordinating with partners community engagement/development, preparing locality plans with partners and supporting local partners to take forward components of those plans including project development, funding and performance management, specifically reviewing how these projects and local service provision can be linked to providing training and employment opportunities to local people.
 - 3.3 A minimum of £1m should be allocated to an economic development fund to tackle worklessness and the causes of worklessness by match-funding public initiatives and projects.
 - 3.4 A minimum of £280k should be allocated to fund community initiatives and projects.
 - 3.5 Proposals for allocating initial funds across the borough be brought to the Executive, and that the proposals for deciding spend of the Economic Development Fund and Community Fund for be delegated to Director and portfolio holder.
4. The Executive is asked to note the views arising from the consultation process and subsequently apply them in the prioritising process at a later date.
 5. The Executive is asked to agree to the interim priorities set out in Appendix 3 pending the development of the wider plan.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report both, describes the development of the regeneration delivery plan and addresses the issue of the future use of resources available for dealing with worklessness following receipt of working neighbourhood Fund grant. The two have been brought together so that the use of the

funding is set within a clear context. It is important that the Working Neighbourhood Fund resource is used in a way that ensures the most effective delivery of our regeneration objectives which address worklessness in the short term and the long term.

- 1.2 The Council has developed with Partners a number of strategic documents that set the direction for regeneration and the development of the Borough. These include principally the Energy Coast Masterplan™, the Sustainable Communities Strategy, elements of the Councils 5 year Corporate Plan and the Cumbria Area Agreement.
- 1.3 The Council has agreed to develop a delivery plan which articulates these documents and provides a clear set of priority actions to be pursued in Copeland. This will include initiatives the Council will seek to lead itself and others that we will seek partners to lead on. They will form a basis for managing both our resources and focussing our influence on other delivery partners. The outcome will be effective delivery of a clear set of priorities.
- 1.4 In order to determine our priorities and allow review and roll over of these we need to be clear about the framework within which the Council will take prioritisation decisions. This will include:-
 - i) clear objectives expressing what we are seeking to achieve, articulating our strategic plans
 - ii) targets linked to the objectives above
 - iii) evaluation criteria against which possible projects can be assessed. These will include a range of considerations including contribution to achieving our targets, funding potential, delivery capacity, deliverability etc
- 1.5 Implementation of this framework will lead to the development of the full delivery plan which will include a spatial presentation of initiatives to clarify key actions in each sub area. This will help to develop a route map to transition for each community and provide a base for locality working.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 This report seeks agreement to this framework and initial priorities for action. A full plan will be prepared following further assessment of projects against the framework once agreed. The intention is that the delivery plan will be available to inform the Council and its partners budgetary processes for delivery plan implementation 2009/2010. The plan will then be rolled forward in future years and new projects added, as necessary, within the same framework.

3. POLICY FRAMEWORK

3.1 Key Strategic Actions, Baselines and Targets

The objectives set out in Appendix 1 summarise the intent agreed within our strategic documents. Delivery of these will lead us toward the transition and development of our area that we seek. Appendix 2 sets out Baselines and targets against each of these objectives as they were available at the time of this report. Work is continuing to complete the development of proposed targets so they can be agreed by the Executive. Each objective will have a current baseline and proposed targets for both 2012 and 2020. Targets will need to be kept under review to make sure they remain relevant to changing circumstances.

3.2 Evaluation Criteria

In order to select priorities a set of agreed evaluation criteria is needed. These will be applied to each project considered for inclusion in the delivery plan both now, and in the future, until the framework is reviewed. It is proposed that the evaluation criteria should be:

1. Impact against targets
2. Value for money (cost against impact)
3. Potential funding availability
4. Practical deliverability (are there barriers that prevent delivery)
5. Capacity to deliver either with Council resources or within partner resources
6. Community support

3.3 Assessment of projects/initiatives against these criteria will initially produce a ranking developed by officers. This will be reviewed by Members to produce a final ranking and priority within the delivery plan. As Members are the elected representatives of the community they will provide the input under evaluation criteria 6. community support. A public consultation exercise has been carried out into priorities. The information produced from this can be used to inform Members in this process. In addition the views of local regeneration partnerships and community bodies can also be fed into the decision making process at this point.

3.4 It is the intention that the Regeneration Delivery Plan will be reviewed and updated annually.

4. CONSULTATION EXERCISE

4.1 The latest consultation exercise was carried out by consultants, Primed People, and a report was completed in late June. The primary aim of the community engagement process was to engage as many individual members of the community as possible and elicit their views on the regeneration needs of Copeland Borough. We wanted to discover their view of the current state of the Borough and establish priorities for action within the developing regeneration delivery plan.

4.2 A range of engagement methods were used covering over 1000 local residents. We :

- Set up **five focus group meetings** in each of the areas – Whitehaven; Millom; Cleator Moor; Egremont and Gosforth. At each of the focus group meetings attendees were asked to identify their prime likes, dislikes and things they would change about their locality. They were then asked to prioritise the actions they would like to see the Council work to enact.
- Created a **questionnaire** with 38 statements which were rated by respondents in street interviews and online. This questionnaire was circulated to key organisations and individuals throughout the area.
- Set up a **Youth Forum** with the help of the Cumbria Youth Alliance which was conducted on a Participatory Analysis basis.
- Conducted **street interviews** in the key towns identified and at community events

4.3. The key messages reflecting the perception of our residents were :

- An overwhelming agreement with the suggestion about improved roads and public transport
- The energy sector is well supported to provide future growth
- Tourism as a job creation opportunity is supported
- A strong desire to see the condition of buildings improved
- Information technology infrastructure is perceived as requiring improvement
- Concerns about whether there is the capacity to deliver
- The adequacy of amenities and facilities for both visitors and residents is questioned
- Business infrastructure and start-up support is considered to be weak

- The creative industries as an opportunity for growth are poorly understood
- Localism in terms of regeneration action planning, decision-making and community empowerment is supported
- A need for local people to be able to engage and understand what is happening in their area.
- A desire for more community engagement is clearly expressed by members of the community, offering them an opportunity to be involved, informed and integrated into the process of regeneration within their communities.
- Copeland is seen as a great place to live by the majority
- The importance of social, economic and physical regeneration is convincingly expressed
- Overwhelming support for an acute hospital in Copeland
- The image of Copeland is generally viewed as not having improved enough over time.
- There is a need for the Council to increase awareness of its plans and strategies.

4.4 This raises a range of issues that will need to be addressed through the development of our delivery plan priorities and in the way we move our delivery mechanisms forward. In particular, the development of locality working arrangements will do much to meet the desire for community empowerment and engagement. The full results of the consultation are available for members to examine in the members room. Individual copies can be made available to members to assist in the prioritising process as it moves forward.

5. FUNDING THE PLAN

- 5.1 Once a fully agreed plan is available that we are confident meets Copeland's needs we will then determine how it can be best funded using the ranges of sources that currently exist and will exist in the future. It is important that the plan is both needs and opportunity driven and not driven by funding criteria
- 5.2 The best match between projects and potential funding resources will be examined and funding proposals developed. Where there is no ready funding source that matches what we need to do, then we will work to

influence the criteria for funders. Sources of fund that are likely to contribute are:-

Urban Regeneration Company
North West Development Agency/Cumbria Vision
Copeland Borough Council mainstream funding (incl. Working Neighbourhood funds)
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Sellafield Parent Body Organisation
Cumbria County Council
Coalfields Funding
English Partnerships
Housing Corporation
Copeland Homes
West Cumbria Development Fund
Copeland Community Initiatives Fund
Cumbria Tourist Board
Central Government Initiatives
Private Sector
ERDF/other European

Private sector funding must be maximised and a significant challenge will be to create a climate that will allow the private sector to generate a return. This will be particularly difficult over the next few years given the financial climate. However, we must now prepare for medium term improvement in the financial climate if we are to take opportunities that arise.

6. PROJECT ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The next report to the Executive will provide a full list of known projects that have been supported, in principle, in the past and are competing for future resources. Many will be drawn from the suggestions in the full Energy Coast master plan document. This list will be assessed against the evaluation criteria proposed in this report. Recommended priorities will then be considered by the Executive. A workshop will be held to engage members before the report is finalised. It should, again, be noted that the delivery plan will identify both, projects the Council will lead on, and projects we believe to be a priority but will ask others to lead. Priority projects will not, therefore, be limited by our own capacity to deliver. This will allow our leadership role to be fully supported. However, those projects that we lead, will of course need to match our capacity.
- 6.2 The delivery plan will not only set out priority projects but also keep under review the mechanisms for delivering all projects. At the present time major changes are being discussed in relation to delivery mechanisms

and these will need to be incorporated into the final proposals in the plan. Currently economic regeneration delivery countywide is being reviewed with the intention of putting in place stronger delivery structures.

- 6.3 Retaining and updating local delivery mechanisms is essential not only to deliver more and faster but also to respond to the consultation responses which show the need for increased leadership, local engagement and empowerment. This is particularly important with the move to Cumbria-wide delivery mechanisms at a strategic level.

7. INTERIM PRIORITIES

- 7.1 Whilst the full delivery plan is being prepared there are some clear and urgent priorities that have emerged from strategic analysis and discussions with stakeholders. It is important that no momentum is lost during the development of this approach. To deal with this, some interim priorities are set out so our position on them remains clear and any uncertainty is removed. These include projects that the Council has already committed to and is actively delivering.

- 7.2 The schedule at Appendix 3, whilst still ‘work in progress’ and subject to significant further development, sets out key projects. Many of these are focused on Whitehaven as the cultural and economic centre which, if transformed, will catalyse change throughout the area. The projects themselves range from shorter term “quick wins” to longer term, transformational projects.

- 7.3 In order to limit uncertainty during this process, it is proposed that projects stated as priority 1 on the schedule are confirmed as our priorities pending the future completion of the plan and the schedule itself.

7.4 DELIVERY ARRANGEMENTS

Amongst these priorities are a number of reviews of existing delivery organisations/arrangements where urgent strengthening is considered important. These organisations would work closely with either West Lakes Renaissance or through the emerging delivery arrangements for West Cumbria, as appropriate.

7.4.1 Delivery Vehicle for Whitehaven

- It is essential that the right structures are in place to deliver the step change required to transform Whitehaven as one of the key drivers of the Copeland economy over the next few years. Outside

the nuclear industry the town is the largest contributor to the economy with 4500 jobs in the town. It is key to diversification. Unfortunately it has recently suffered a significant downturn. It needs new momentum to drive it forward. Discussions with partners need to move forward quickly on models for a new focussed delivery vehicle, how it might operate and how it would be funded. This organisation would be private sector led, with input from Copeland Borough Council, Whitehaven Harbour Commissioners and other stakeholders. It could be directly responsible for leading projects in Whitehaven Town Centre, Bransty/North Shore and Pow Beck/Ginns. We would also propose that the organisation has a town centre management role, ensuring that new developments and public realm improvements are maintained.

- In addition to this, given the important role of the conservation area within Whitehaven Town Centre, it may be necessary to set up a Building Preservation Trust to concentrate on refurbishing and bringing back to use specific buildings which would in turn attract private investment. The proposal will be developed further as part of the Conservation Area Plan commissioned by the Council.

7.4.2 Delivery Vehicles for Market Towns Areas

- Market Town Initiatives are coming to an end and urgent consideration needs to be given to the future of arrangements in Egremont and Millom. There are also local arrangements for regeneration delivery in North East Copeland (centred on Cleator Moor) which are relatively robust and have not been reliant on the Market Towns Initiative for support. All three will need to be reviewed to ensure arrangements are fit for purpose in the light of our emerging locality working arrangements.
- South Copeland (incorporating Millom and Haverigg) should be the urgent priority for review and revised sustainable arrangements developed. The area is isolated and lacks the critical mass to support the range of projects in the programme. It is also an area that benefits less from the critical mass of regeneration activity in North Copeland and needs effective integrated structures to develop and implement its own solutions and programmes for the future. It is, therefore, proposed that South Copeland Locality Working arrangements are reviewed as a pilot which is subsequently used to inform locality working arrangements throughout the Borough.

7.4.3 Tourism Delivery Arrangements

- A considerably enhanced tourism development and marketing structure will be needed to create the step change in the visitor economy which Copeland aspires to. This organisation would work in partnership with Local Authorities, Cumbria Tourism, Lake District National Park and other stakeholders. Its role would be to create a strategy and action plan for West Cumbria, linking the Energy Coast to the Adventure Capital brand for Cumbria. This initiative would build on the significant potential for tourism provided by an enhanced urban realm in Whitehaven and the Market towns and the natural environment in the area.
- the option put forward by partners is for a strengthened West Coast Tourism Partnership with the executive working alongside the area based Regeneration Team for the West Coast. The remit would include:
 - Accommodation improvement scheme
 - Festivals and Events
 - Sense of Place work
 - Coastal activity
 - Walking and cycling development
 - Area-based marketing
 - Public Relations activity linked into priority Cumbria Tourism themes
- Funding for the programme would primarily be drawn from the Local Authorities, WCDF, Cumbria Vision and Energy Coast Initiative.

8. INTEGRATING WORKING NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND

- 8.1 The objectives in the delivery plan are largely focussed on dealing with worklessness in one way or another. Either by supporting individuals to become more competitive in the labour market or by creating new employment opportunities in the future. We need to ensure that the resources set aside in reserves for this purpose have the maximum impact in delivering the overall plan. It needs to address any barriers we have to successful delivery. This will mean using the funding to lever much larger amounts of funding for effective projects and making sure that we have the capacity to deliver.
- 8.2 The draft framework includes specific targets related to worklessness linked to the Cumbria Area Agreement. However, to achieve these targets successful delivery will be needed across the whole plan. The use of Working Neighbourhood Funding is determined by this Council so it provides the maximum flexibility to support successful delivery.

8.3 Some projects to deal with worklessness are being developed on a County Wide basis and should benefit from funding from other sources including the current round of European Regional Development Funding. In view of the leverage these projects are likely to bring it is proposed that, in principle, provision is made to support these as appropriate. We will need to ensure that these are appropriately directed towards our priority communities. We also need to be geared up to manage our part of this process. It is also important that some of the resource remains available for more localised responses within our priority localities.

8.4 To take this forward it is proposed that the use of WNF seek to address worklessness through:

- Strategy and policy development
- Increased capacity for local community development and regeneration, and
- New project investment funds

8.4.1 Strategy and Policy Development

It is proposed that up to £200k of the fund be allocated over the 3 year life of the programme for strategy and policy development, particularly and buying-in of specialist resource to assist moving elements of the delivery plan forward. Other contributions may be made to Copeland's allocation to the LSP Team for their role in planning programme development, and also to the policy development of locality working.

8.4.2 Local Community Development and Regeneration

In order to get best use from the WNF, it would be appropriate to invest it in resource that can draw down more funds and allocate these alongside the WNF programme and provide support for new locality working arrangements. It is proposed, therefore, to use up to £500k over 3 years to fund up to 5 new community regeneration posts. These staff would supplement the Council's current community renewal staff and work with the Policy & Performance team and the LSP team.

8.4.3 Copeland has access to a number of investment funds that would allow financing of further measures to tackle worklessness and the causes of worklessness. The role of the community regeneration officers would be to increase the Council's capacity to develop projects, secure additional funds, and monitor projects for accountability. They would have an important role in delivering our regeneration plan. Each officer could adopt an area focus supporting the development of our approach to locality working.

8.4.4 Funding priority would be given to projects benefitting wards with the greatest needs, (Sandwith, Mirehouse, Cleator Moor South, Distington and Frizington). This would be supported by the proposed prioritisation frameworks which have a specific objective aimed at reducing inequalities between neighbourhoods so a high score against this objective would result in a higher priority rating.

8.4.5 The Officers would be based centrally within the Council and would help to re-create the former Community Renewal Team within the Development department, but should be considered an additional asset to the Council's work in regenerating the community.

8.4.6 Investment Funds

It is proposed that the majority of the WNF remains flexible with spending decisions taken as much as possible at the local level. The proposal is that 2 investment funds are established using WNF. The Worklessness Fund would be used to provide match-funding of up to £1m over the 3 year period for projects and initiatives designed to address worklessness and the causes of worklessness, while the Community Initiatives Fund of around £280K would be used to fund marketing campaigns and incentives for the work of the whole WNF programme.

8.4.7 It is proposed that funds be allocated in advance of the 5 locality areas of Whitehaven, Cleator Moor, Egremont, Mid-Copeland and South Copeland, through the locality working structures to be set up in conjunction with the County Council, Parish Council and other community stakeholder. In the meantime, for the first year, spending decisions would be taken by the Executive. As a guide it is proposed 50% of the funding is directed to the localities of need to support their competitiveness and 50% supports initiatives in the areas of opportunity that will create the employment opportunities.

8.4.8 Under the Sustainable Communities Strategy, the West Cumbria Strategic Partnership (LSP), through the local authority leaders group, will develop a policy framework in order to provide the broad agenda for the locality working structures. It will be the responsibility of each locality structure to identify, prioritise and address the issues of deprivation identified through the LSP and link this into the economic development needs of the Travel to Work Area through the Council's broader regeneration delivery plan.

The individual assessment and programme design within each locality area would be provided by a 'locality action plan' that would help to prioritise the issues of concern and inform our Copeland wide regeneration delivery plan. The locality action plan could seek to

develop/commission individual projects, or ‘top-up’ mainstream services, or a mixture of both. It is intended that each locality would have a start-up fund approved by the Council through its powers of well-being, and be comprised of Working Neighbourhood Fund and other sources of funding.

8.4.9 Allocation of funds across localities

It does not necessarily follow that all 5 localities within Copeland would receive the same amount of initial funding from the Council. The Council would need to consider the issues facing the whole of the borough. One argument would be that deprivation is a fundamental challenge to the borough and therefore allocations should be made pro rata on the relative extent of deprivation. Another argument is that there are examples of deprivation in some parts of the borough that are not significant enough to be recognised as ‘deprived areas’ but are long-standing and do not readily attract other forms of funding. In this scenario, allocation of funds to localities could be done on a population (per capita) basis. A further paper will be brought to the Executive on this.

8.4.10 Financial Summary

The summary of the proposed allocation is set out in the table below

Working Neighbourhood Fund Allocation	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	Total Allocation
	<i>£'000</i>	<i>£'000</i>	<i>£'000</i>	<i>£'000</i>
Policy Development	0	100	100	200
South Whitehaven schemes	460	260	0	720
Community Development posts	100	200	200	500
Worklessness fund	100	450	450	1,000
Community Initiatives Fund	80	100	100	280
Total	740	1,260	1,000	2,700

[Note: the allocation to South Whitehaven has been agreed at an earlier meeting of Executive]

9. **NEXT STEPS**

- 9.1 Following the agreement of this policy framework there will be a further report on the Regeneration Delivery Plan which will produce for members consideration a fuller plan which proposes priorities. These priorities will emerge from the application of this framework. An executive member workshop will be held to challenge proposed priorities
- 9.2 The agreement of our key objectives will allow the development of materials to help effective communication of our intentions.

- 9.3 A series of further reports have been referred to and these will be brought back to the Executive.

10. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 There are significant implications for the use of both human and financial resources. Prioritisation of the final regeneration plan will lead to budgetary and human resource allocations.
- 10.2 A clear delivery plan will lead to a more effective use of resources and ensure external funders and partners are appropriately influenced to direct resources at initiatives that are most important to the Copeland community.
- 10.3 Working Neighbourhood Funds are agreed for three years unless this grant is reviewed a budgetary saving of £1m per annum would be needed when this funding programme ends.

11. IMPACT ON CORPORATE PLAN

- 11.1 The proposals in this report directly set out our proposals for implementing large elements of the Council's Corporate Plan.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Objectives

Appendix 2 – Baseline & targets

Appendix 3 – Draft Project Schedule (work in progress) with Interim Priorities

List of Background Documents:

List of Consultees: Corporate Team. Development Directorate Managers

CHECKLIST FOR DEALING WITH KEY ISSUES

Please confirm against the issue if the key issues below have been addressed. This can be by either a short narrative or quoting the paragraph number in the report in which it has been covered.

Impact on Crime and Disorder	significant
Impact on Sustainability	significant
Impact on Rural Proofing	significant
Health and Safety Implications	None

Impact on Equality and Diversity Issues	significant
Children and Young Persons Implications	significant
Human Rights Act Implications	None
Monitoring Officer comments	No legal comments
S. 151 Officer comments	The proposed allocation is in line with current known commitments. The position can be reviewed once the 2007/08 Accounts have been certified and, thereafter, on an annual basis

Is this a Key Decision? Yes