



WARDS AFFECTED
Abbey, Beaumont Leys, Belgrave, Chanwood,
Coleman, Latimer, Mowmacre, North Braunstone, Rowley
Fields, Saffron. Spinney Hill, West Humberstone, Wycliffe.

Cabinet

19 November 2001

Single Regeneration Budget –Review of programmes.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT, DEVELOPMENT &
COMMERCIAL SERVICES**

1. Purpose of report

This report reviews all programmes funded under the Single Regeneration Budget. In previous years, each SRB programme was reported separately. However, as the funding agency, *emda*, is moving towards merging all SRB budgets into a single “pot”, it was considered appropriate for the first time to consider all SRB programmes together.

2. Summary

This report (with Annex) reviews the current position of all programmes funded by the Single Regeneration Budget, and highlights:

- key achievements for the last financial year, and
- key policy issues arising, in:
 - the City Council’s Accountable Body role
 - role of local partnerships
 - relations with *emda*
 - land assembly and development

3. Recommendation

(a) Members are asked to note and agree on the achievements of the SRB programmes in 2000/01 and to consider the policy issues set out in the report.

(b) Members are asked to note the recommendation of the Strategic Planning and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee that Cabinet gives further

consideration to the appropriate use of Section 106 powers, Compulsory Service orders and public grant to developers.

4. Report

Overview

4.1 The Single Regeneration Budget provided over £5.28 million grant in 2000/1 and therefore represents a significant source of income for the regeneration of communities facing social exclusion and deprivation.

Achievements

4.2 Caution should be exercised in approaching the summary tables in the Annex report. Each programme has been invited to set its own indicators at the beginning of the year, and circumstances have often made those targets less and less relevant as the year continued. The programmes are therefore not directly comparable with each other and target outputs within a programme have often been rescheduled to later in the programme.

Accountable Body

4.3 The City Council provides public sector leverage and is also the Accountable body for these programmes. Members may consider that the significant income outweighs the financial risk that “Accountable body” status entails, particularly as systems and procedures are in place to ensure financial security and probity.

Local autonomy

4.4 Relations between the SRB programme bodies, the City Council and *emda* are crucial:

- There is a significant move towards local autonomy for programme delivery, which inevitably reduces the City Council’s direct control over programmes.
- It is not yet clear how *emda* will respond to these local partnerships, whether directly, through the sub-regional strategic partnership (being established) or via the local authority.

Finance

4.5 Programme managers comment that although *Emda*’s programme approval and monitoring has improved since a named officer has been appointed there, *emda* could still improve its service in the following areas :

- It would be desirable for *emda* to permit the transfer of underspends to the next financial year

- Individual programmes are subject to continual and repeated audit which is sometimes time-consuming and can appear oppressive
- The implications of a move to an integrated single delivery plan are not yet known.
- *Emda's* obligation to reduce spending has led to further renegotiations this year

Site development

4.6 The reclamation of brownfield sites also raises significant issues that could be addressed in the City Council's relation with the Leicester Regeneration Company and *emda*:

- Hostile market conditions fail to progress the assembly of brownfield sites. The City Council will therefore continue to have a role in site assembly, working closely with the Leicester Regeneration Company and *emda*.
- "Section 106 agreements" allow for positive social outcomes to be negotiated between prospective developers and the City Council as planning authority. However, when otherwise commercially unattractive sites are being redeveloped with support from public funds, negotiation of section 106 agreements can seem to be an added imposition, and might work to hinder redevelopment. Members may wish to reconsider policy in these limited circumstances.

Employment

4.7 Meeting targets on access to employment for local residents is an issue in some areas of the City. This may be due to general economic conditions, including recent redundancies in manufacturing and falling investment. It may be because residual unemployment is becoming confined to specific marginalised groups, who face the greatest barriers to the labour market.

- The issue is being addressed by the Economic Development Group, which is working with other key agencies to develop an employment strategy for the City.

5 Other implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	PARAGRAPH REFERENCES WITHIN SUPPORTING PAPERS
Equal opportunities	No	
Policy	Yes	4

Sustainable and environmental	No	
Crime and disorder	No	
Human Rights Act	No	

6 Consultations

Programme Managers (Regeneration Group) and Finance Section of Environment and Development Department; and the Braunstone Community Association

7 Background Papers

Outturns for 2000-2001 and Delivery Plans for 2001/2 as submitted to the East Midlands Development Agency.

8 Author of this Report

Andy Thomas

Extension: 6516

Email: thoma001@leicester.gov.uk