

OUTCOME DELIVERY PLAN CONTENTS

SCS / LAA Outcome

7.1 Access to facilities and services is enhanced across the county
 7.1.4 Improvements to market towns centres, shopping centres and rural centres to enable more effective access to services

Also the following Place Priorities: B1.9, B2.10, B3.11, C1.1, C5.1, C6.1, H1.11, H2.1, H3.2, HB1.1, M1.1, NW1.1, NW2.1, OW1.1, OW2.1, OW3.1, HB3.2.

LAA Indicator, Baseline and Targets

L 14: Satisfaction with [PLACE NAME] as a good place to shop, visit and do business.

2008/09 baseline – 60%

2009/10 target – 62%

2010/11 target – 64%

Geographic Area Covered	County wide	Currently focusing on the following settlements: Ashby, Blaby, Broughton Astley, Coalville, Earl Shilton, Hinckley, Loughborough, Lutterworth, Market Bosworth, Market Harborough, Melton Mowbray, Oadby, Shepshed, South Wigston, Syston, Thurmaston, Wigston. However these settlements are also being reviewed to ensure they are fit for purpose.
	Other	
Any District or local targets		

Outcome Delivery Lead Officer	Helen Harris, Better Places Team Leader
Outcome Delivery Partnership(s)	Access to Services Working Group

What do we do now to deliver the outcome?

Please give a brief description of the current approach used to deliver the outcome/target and the partners involved. Estimate of current resources used.

The County Council currently draws together all Town Centre Managers and project officers from across the county every six weeks to share best practice. Joint events have been put on across the county and bench marking is an issue which all major centres face. Melton Mowbray, Lutterworth and Market Harborough all complete the Welland Benchmarking process annually. None of the town centres collect footfall figures with the exception of Loughborough in its Carillion Court shopping centre. It is therefore difficult to assess how each centre is performing as no common performance target exists. This is why the satisfaction survey is vital to provide a consistent baseline.

What options are there to deliver on the new target?

The options suggested to achieving the outcome/targets – what new interventions/services could be commissioned?

The Better Places Team has been created to co-ordinate the improvements of towns, urban areas and rural centres in Leicestershire working towards the priorities in the places section at the end of the Sustainable Community Strategy. The team has started by completing an audit of what is happening in each centre by other LCC departments, District Councils and other providers such as the PCT, police and CVS. We are working with Town Centre Partnerships and are getting involved with masterplan projects as they arise. The goal of the team is to produce Investment Plans to co-ordinate the delivery and funding of priorities in each centre in order to maximize the use of the resources we already have and to draw in more funding in the future.

These Investment plans will be a summary of the site specific masterplans (mostly focused on physical infrastructure) and projects arising from healthcheck action plans (includes softer more community based actions) and other Town Centre Action Plans such as those produced by Flying Giraffe Consultants for Syston and Shepshed.

What could we stop doing, do less of or better to focus on this target?

What options are there for reconfiguring or decommissioning other services to refocus on the priority outcome?

LCC resources have already been reprioritised to establish the Better Places Team, the team will provide additional support by district and will help to co-ordinate and align LCC investment / services to key market towns and large rural centres. As well as secure other external funding where appropriate. The team will work closely with district council colleagues.

What alternative providers exist?

Commissioning – what alternative delivery agencies or partners exist?

The Better Places team will provide strategic co-ordination to this work, however direct delivery will be through a broad range of partners including district councils.

What is the recommended approach and reasons why?

Options appraisal and recommendations on preferred option. What evidence is there that the approach will work?

As outlined above no consistent measure exists across the range of settlements and by setting this indicator it comprises a number of aspects such as range and quality of shops, cleanliness of town centre, accessibility, range and quality of services, events and perception of crime. This indicator therefore is applicable to all size of settlements and takes into account a range of factors.

What is delivery of the target dependent on?

Include the assumptions being made in terms of preferred delivery option?

- Joint working across a range of partners, strong relationships between the Better Places team and district colleagues.
- Funding secured to implement Investment Plans / Master Plans
- External factors such as crime, cleanliness, public realm, events / services closing hence the cross cutting nature of this target.
- The current economic climate and general well being of local people can impact on the target.

What is innovative about the proposal?

The proposal is innovative in that a range of issues are being included in one indicator.

How will the project contribute to other SCS/LAA outcomes?

The improvement of local market towns and rural centres potentially impacts on a range of SCS / LAA priorities including improving general health and well being, the physical environment, as well as strengthening the local economy.

See list of places priorities in box 1.

What are the risks to delivery?

Include Key Risks to Delivery – likelihood/impact on target delivery and action required to mitigate.

- Better Places team as the catalyst to move projects / improvements forward.
- Timescales required to make sufficient impact on improving Market towns and Large Rural Centres can be lengthy.
- Accuracy levels of the survey.
- External influences on peoples satisfaction levels e.g. the economic climate and spending levels can impact on peoples perceptions.
- Funding available not sufficient to deliver Master Plans / Investment plans.

Milestones/Timescales – Outline Implementation Plan

Include key delivery actions and milestones – by when?

Implementation of schemes to deliver the increase in satisfaction levels are heavily influenced by the town centre masterplans and improvement partnership action plans or Healthcheck Action plans – see below for the main towns and their projects;

Loughborough Masterplan- currently implementing Eastern Gateway and Devonshire Square proposals together with the inner ring road.

Hinckley Masterplan- currently implementing Bus Station site, Atkins Building and Britannia Centre proposals together with public realm scheme in Upper Castle St.

Shepshed – Action plan from Flying Giraffe - proposed public realm scheme in Market Place.

Syston – Flying Giraffe report produced in 2006 we are currently working on a potential public realm scheme.

Thurmaston – has completed a Healthcheck Action Plan and we are working on a potential public realm scheme.

Earl Shilton – Healthcheck Action plan – currently working on quick win environmental projects post by-pass and funding for a masterplan for the town centre and the Sustainable Urban Extension of 2000 houses to the SE of the town.

Barwell – currently working on Parish plan and funding has been sought for SUE of 2500 houses to the west of the village. We are also assisting with the Barwell Access Centre project.

Market Harborough – HIT (Harborough Improvement Team) has its own Action plan .

Lutterworth – LIP (Lutterworth improvement Team) is currently working on the shambles court public realm project and the Sherrier centre project which are both identified in the masterplan.

Broughton Astley – newly formed BAIT (Broughton Astley Improvement Team) will be developing its Action Plan shortly.

Melton Mowbray- masterplan is currently being produced but has been put on hold because of the fire in the council building which is influencing sites in the town centre.

Blaby- masterplan is almost complete and we will be working with Blaby District Council to Assist in the implementation of various projects.

Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston – masterplans are currently being worked on that will lead to Area Action Plans being produced we are currently assisting with various proposals including the South Wigston Access Centre.

Ashby- currently assisting the struggling partnership on proposals for a potential community centre.

Coalville- masterplan has been produced and an application is being worked on by ASDA.

Other projects are being worked on such as the Bagworth Access Centre which is obviously within a priority neighbourhood.

What resources are being provided by Lead/Partner Agencies.

The Better places team has 4 full time managers and 4 full time officers to support them who cover the county by splitting it into Districts – Structure can be attached. Most districts have fulltime officers to cover each town centre partnership or Improvement Teams that are working on the improvement of services in the town centres.

Financial and other resources (if any) sought from LT for delivery?

Please provide estimate of costs and new resources required to deliver on preferred option. Include resources being used and any bids for extra funds.

Identify staffing resources being sought?

What are the estimated project closure costs?

Funds will be required to undertake the Market Towns and Villages survey bi-annually: £40,000. Previous studies have received funding from the LSEP as well as through LAA funding.

Investment plans will identify individual projects for which separate funding will be sought – for example using Growth Point and Single Pot funding – the BP team will work closely with districts and the LRP through the new sub regional arrangements to try and secure this additional funding as required. The money requested through the LAA pot is only for the bi-annual survey which will be used to measure the impact of the range of projects that are being delivered in each centre.

Who is involved?

Agencies that will be involved in contributing to target delivery.

County Council, Districts, Leicestershire Promotions, Employers.

What contributions are expected from partner agencies?

Contributions to the indicator will come indirectly from district councils for example via

particular projects that take place in the main town centres.

What are the communication channels?

Identify arrangements to communicate progress on the outcomes.

Through partners, the Access to Services working group, linking with LT Communications.

COMMENTS

It was suggested that this indicator would be better placed under Stronger Communities, after discussion between Stronger and Access to Services, the following has been agreed:

Stronger Communities is about building up the Social Capital of communities, which although it relates to the delivery of services, it is not its primary concern.

The indicator was developed from the Places Priorities which identified that access to a good quality town / centre with a range of services is a key priority for many CF areas. It is improvements to general access to and around the town, along with the quality and range of services available that will impact on peoples satisfaction.

It is considered that the Access to Services group has the correct representation to take this indicator forward, including Economic Development Officers and representatives from the Stronger Communities Group.

[Link to Nov 09 update](#)