

Agenda item 5 (i)

Appraisal application form for Interaction NMP Board

1. Title of proposal	Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and Childrens Play Area		
2. Date submitted	October 2007		
3. Summary of proposal (max 150 words) i.e. what does the proposal involve and what will it achieve?			
<p>The proposal includes for the provision of a Multi Use Games Area and the construction of a childrens play area on land at the rear of the Jaywick Community Resources Centre.</p> <p>The land is approximately 0.2 ha in area and lies between Brooklands Gardens East and Brooklands Gardens West and the public footpath on the north side. The area is zoned as protected existing recreational space. It is currently owned by the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) and negotiations are in hand to obtain their agreement to the proposal.</p> <p>The Jaywick Community Resources Centre is being extended and will provide much needed indoor facilities for children and young people in the area to meet and enjoy drop-in and structured educational, social and leisure activities. There are however no existing outdoor facilities in the immediate area for children and young people to enjoy outdoor games and sporting activities.</p> <p>In order to provide a structured and balanced provision of activities for children and young people in this area of deprivation this proposal provides for a facility to be constructed where they can be encouraged to enjoy physical activity and a healthier lifestyle.</p> <p>The existing junior play area at the side and rear of the Resources Centre is outdated and will be required to be re-sited as part of the Resources Centre extension and the opportunity is being taken to provide a modern facility alongside the Multi Purpose Court</p>			
3. How much will the proposal cost in total?			
	From NM	From other sources	Total
Capital	£209,249		£209,249
Revenue			

Total	£209,249		£209,249
4. Organisation responsible			
Name of contact and position	Inclusion Ventures Ltd Andrew Mowle Administrator		
Address	12 Crown Road, Clacton-on-Sea, Essex. CO15 1AT		
Phone	01255 426560		
e mail	agmiem@aol.com		

B The proposal

1. What is the problem you are trying to address?

Set out the problems and causes, using statistics and evidence where available – referring to the delivery plan and its targets and outcomes.

There are no leisure and recreational facilities in the Brooklands and Grasslands area of Jaywick and very poor engagement with children and young people by outside agencies. There is low resident satisfaction with community provision in terms of facilities for children and young people.

The surrounding infrastructure is very poor and the housing units have no gardens so without areas for play there is no chance for children and young people to enjoy leisure and sporting activities.

2. Proposal objectives?

List the objectives for the proposal (these should be measurable)

Provision of outdoor play facilities in the Brooklands and Grassland area of Jaywick as identified by Neighbourhood Action Panel (NAP).

To provide leisure facilities for agencies to work with the children and young people in the area to improve their health and provide sporting activities.

To counteract the isolation from leisure facilities felt by the children and young people of the area

3. How do you propose to address the problem?

List the activities and set out who will benefit.

Organised play activities will be provided for children and young people by Inclusion Ventures and other agencies.

The facility will be available for the whole community as the area has low car ownership and similar facilities in other areas are hard to reach. This will alleviate the sense of isolation for families in the area.

Young people will be encouraged to organise play activities and games and they will be encouraged to take up volunteering and take qualifications and career development in the sports related field.

Diversionsary activities to reduce the incidence of crime by young people.

Community spirit is enhanced when investment is made in the provision of facilities for children and young people which gives hope for the future.

4. How does this proposal address the problem. List activities and describe evidence from similar initiatives if possible.

A similar approach has been taken in the past on the Percy King Estate where a multi purpose court has been in existence for a number of years at the rear of the Coppins Hall Community Centre. The area originally had the highest incidence of juvenile crime in Tendring but since sporting diversionary activities have been provided in the area on a regular basis the level of crime and anti-social behaviour have shown a remarkable decrease.

When facilities such as this are provided funding can be attracted to the area for sporting and leisure activities for children and young people.

Similar projects which have been successful have been completed in many areas such as Tees Valley, Nuneaton and Enfield.

5. Community involvement

How have residents been involved in developing the proposal?

The Neighbourhood Action Panel (NAP) for Jaywick has identified as one of its community actions and priorities for the provision of facilities for the children and young people in Jaywick.

Plans will be put on public display in the Resources Centre and all residents in the Brooklands Gardens area will be written to as part of the planning and public consultation exercise. Plans will also be sent to the Jaywick Community Forum, Jaywick NAP and Neighbourhood Watch for their public meetings.

6. Management arrangements?

Describe the arrangements for ensuring the proposal is managed, monitored and delivered as planned. Please give names of two references or referees (people that you've worked with before) that we can contact in advance of the appraisal process.

The project will be managed by the The Livemore Partnership (TLP) who are managing the extension to the Resources Centre and regular progress meetings will be held to monitor the project from inception to completion and who will have close liaison with Tendring District Council Leisure Department who will take over the facility upon completion. Full financial control will be exercised by Inclusion Ventures Ltd together with TLP.

7. Risks

Risk	Impact	Likelihood Low /Medium / High	Importance Low /Medium / High	Contingency and/or mitigation actions
Initial implementation or build risks for the project				
EEDA do not approve the project on their land	The project cannot proceed	Medium	High	Deadline to be fixed for the end of July
There are no deep excavations on this project so unforeseen conditions are minimised	Any problems can be easily overcome	Low	Low	Contingency sum in contract
Weather or supply delays	Build time allows for several weeks for completion by end of March 2008	Low	Low	Actual build time is short
Planning delays	Preliminary discussions have been held with planning officers who have indicated that as zoning is recreational then there should be no problems	Low	Low	Project planning allows for 4 weeks slippage in planning process.

C Finances

1. What is the total cost of the proposal?					
Itemise the total spend as much as possible and set out the period this will cover, indicating what proportion is required from NM					
	item	£ year 1	£ year 2	£ year 3	Total
Capital (NM)		209,249			209,249
Revenue (NM)					
Total (NM)		209,249			209,249
Other funding					
Total		209,249			209,249
2. Value for money					
Explain how this proposal provides value for money not only in terms of cost but also in terms of quality					
<p>The project will be managed by an experienced firm of chartered surveyors and experienced in project management. The project represents good value for money in terms of high quality and sustainable materials.</p>					
3. What resources are already invested by your, and other, organisations in the area on this issue?					
<p>Inclusion Ventures Ltd are committed to working with the children and young people in Jaywick and have grant funding of approx £50,000 per annum to do so. They run the youth sessions from the Resources Centre, Outdoor sports sessions at Crossways Park and indoor sessions at Jaywick Methodist Church Hall. Approx 40 children and young people attend our sessions in Jaywick.</p>					
4. Why is NM money needed?					
<p>The project will assist in meeting the mandatory outcomes of the SSCF funding and improve the quality of life in a disadvantaged neighbourhood. It will provide much needed play and recreational facilities for young people and enable other agencies to work with the young people of the area to improve their quality of life, reduce crime and improve health. It will assist in bringing inclusion back into the lives of those youngsters that have become alienated and excluded from their community, education and employment.</p>					

5. Can you be paid this money in arrears, or do you need it to prime the project?

The project will need to be primed

6. Who are your organisation's auditors? (Please attach a copy of your last set of audited accounts)

Jamesons
Chartered Accountants of 92 Station Road, Clacton-on-Sea. CO15 1SG

D Options

1. What other options have been considered to address this proposal and if they were, why have they been rejected?

Play facilities in the area are urgently needed and despite extensive investigations no other suitable site has been found in the area

E Measuring and sustaining the impact

Taking into consideration the objectives for the project set out in section 2, what outcomes do you hope to achieve? (i.e. overall results and benefits that relate to the delivery plan ?

How will the outcomes be measured?

Community satisfaction through public meetings of the Jaywick Forum, Neighbourhood Watch and Neighbourhood Action Panel.

Young People's satisfaction and usage of the facilities

Reduction in youngster's anti-social behaviour and nuisance.

Increased health awareness.

2. Identify up to 3 performance indicators which can be used to evaluate the impact of the project

a) Numbers of young people using the facility

b) Reduction in anti-social behaviour by young people

c) Reduction in numbers of young people in NEET (not in education, employment and training)

3. What monitoring arrangements will be put in place?

Set out your milestones (what you will have done by when) and outputs (things you can count to measure your activities) How will spend be monitored?

- Approval by EEDA for land use by the 31 October 2007
- Planning approval by 1 December 2007.
- Completion of construction by 3 March 2008.

Spend will be monitored by fortnightly progress meetings between the Livermore Partnership and Inclusion Ventures.

4. Evaluation

Following implementation of the project how will you evaluate if your objectives have been met and ensure that there is continuous improvement?

At the present time Inclusion Ventures run weekly sessions in the Jaywick Resources Centre and under our current funding arrangements quarterly reports and statistics are compiled for The Fair Share Trust, Connexions and Essex County Council. The reports will be extended to include SSCF data and the young people attending sessions in the Centre and on the new facility will have their own input into regular user surveys and satisfaction.

5. The long term and future

What is the exit strategy when NM resources are no longer available and how will the benefits be sustained?

The Tendring District Council will maintain the facility upon completion.
Inclusion Ventures Ltd have funding secured for the next 12 months and are currently in discussions with several main stream funders such as Fair Share, Comic Relief, Childrens Fund, Big Lottery for further long term funding.

Appraisal and approval structures

Amount of funding	Appraisal method	Approval required
Up to £2.5k	Neighbourhood Manager can carry out appraisal and submit for approval	Neighbourhood Manager and 2 Board members one of whom should be a resident board member if possible
Over £2.5k	Neighbourhood Manager and two board members one of which should be a resident board member if possible must go through the project appraisal form and submit for approval	Full Board

Signed:.....(project proposer)

Date:.....

Name: Andrew Mowle for Inclusion Ventures Ltd

Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board – Chris Kitcher

Proposal Multiuse Games Area

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources?	Yes	Continuation of provision of ongoing funding from Tendring District Council.
Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation?	No	The proposal does not detail what is to be provided.
Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes?	?	No reference to health/NEEP.
Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea?	No	Only from NAP. What about children? No publication yet.
Will it make a lasting difference?	?	Evidence not provided.
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	Yes	
Does it provide best value?	No	Details sketchy – little evidence to detailed outcome.
Is it too risky?	No	Very expensive at £5231/child.
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?	No	
Section A	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Is it clear what is being proposed?	No	Is it just surfaced area or what.
Is it clear how much money is required?	Yes	
Is it clear who the responsible organisation is?	Yes	
Section B		
Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities?	No	Sketchy evidence for attaining objectives and ongoing maintenance. Who will keep if it is not funded in later years.


Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?	Yes	
Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services?	Yes	But not on a sustainable basis.
Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)?	No	
Are management arrangements adequate?	No	Problems are future up keep.
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?	No	Assurances from TDC for continuance needed.

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?	No	Do not specify what will be provided. Also it does appear to me to be very expensive for what is proposed. This is very nearly a £1/4M development in an area where the future is uncertain at the present time with respect to flood risk and long term development.
Does the proposal provide value for money?	?	Difficult to assess without above details.
Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation?	No	
Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required?	No	
Section D		
Have other options been adequately considered?	No	
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?	No	Measurement of sustainability does not match performance indicators.

Have appropriate performance measures been identified?	No	See above.
Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?	No	Probably failed already.
Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?	Yes	
Is it clear what the exit strategy is and how the benefits can be sustained?	No	

Decision of appraisal panel

Recommend approval	
Do not recommend approval	
Recommend changes required before approval	✓
If so, please state or refer to above sections See comments above which need to be fully answered before approval can be considered	

Name	CHRIS KITCHER
Signed	
Date	2 NOVEMBER 2007

**Appraisal Checklist – Interaction NMP Board
Jaywick MUGA & Childrens Play Area**

Richard Day

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources?	No	
Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation?	Yes	
Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes?	Yes	
Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea?	Yes	Although the need for additional recreational facilities is clear there is little evidence in the application that the potential users of the facilities have been consulted (e.g. young people) on what they would want in terms of the actual facilities to be provided.
Will it make a lasting difference?	Yes	
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	No	
Does it provide best value?	Yes	If an appropriate MUGA satisfying the needs of local young people
Is it too risky?	No	
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?	Yes - but	The building of the facility is covered. It is not clear how much resource will be committed to monitoring and evaluating the use of the facility.
Section A	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Is it clear what is being proposed?	Yes	
Is it clear how much money is required?	Yes	For the creation of the facility.
Is it clear who the responsible organisation is?	Yes	

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Section B		
Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities?	Yes	As an initial proposition OK but more information required as detailed above reference the potential use/ users of the MUGA and the management of the facility once in place

Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?	Yes	
Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services?	Yes	
Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)?	partially	Proposal indicates consultation will continue after initial approval. I would like to see confirmation that groups such as the Jaywick NAP have confirmed their support plus that the potential users have been consulted prior to commitment of finance.
Are management arrangements adequate?	Yes	
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?	Yes	Risks in terms of the building of the MUGA have been dealt with. There is an additional risks post implementation that the facilities will not be used adequately or they will be misused and increase anti social behaviour linked to youth nuisance. Post implementation risk management is linked to the need to clarify how diversionary and recreational activities will be encouraged and managed.

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?	Yes	Assuming no change to design if consultation with users raises issues.
Does the proposal provide value for money?	Yes	

Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation?	Yes	
Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required?	Yes	
Section D		
Have other options been adequately considered?	Yes	
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?	possibly	See below.
Have appropriate performance measures been identified?	possibly	The outcome measures given (community, youth satisfaction etc) may be a bit vague, how will we measure responses at public meetings. Can usage be measured other than in general terms? Anti Social behaviour can be measured in terms of recorded incidents but for what area and will there be some kind of baseline set? Health awareness? The performance indicators section E2, only cover some of the measured outcomes. The NEET figure is a measure of something not shown as an outcome.
Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?	Yes	If above clarified
Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?	No	
Is it clear what the exit strategy is and how the benefits can be sustained?	Yes	The proposal indicates TDC will adopt the facility once built, I assume they will then maintain the facility.

Decision of appraisal panel

Recommend approval	
Do not recommend approval	

Recommend changes required before approval	✓
<p>If so, please state or refer to above sections</p> <p>I am supportive of the application but would like the following clarified</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirmed there will be consultation with potential users so young people buy into the project prior to construction and confirmation that community groups such as the NAP formally support the project 2. More detail of the plan for working with young people and making best use of the facility once operational. 	

Name	R.N. Day Support Inspector Essex Police
Signed	Richard Day
Date	8/11/07

Agenda Item 5 (i)

Multi-use Games Area

Response to appraisal queries from Inclusion Ventures

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Does this proposal impact on mainstream services or resources?	Yes	The bid includes for a ten year commuted maintenance sum of £20k
Do we know what level of service are delivered by and resources committed to the area by this organisation?	No	Inclusion Ventures will continue to work with the children and young people in the area. We currently provide 60 man/hrs per week of staff time to the youth project and propose to bring in an additional 10 man/hrs per week of other agency workers on sports related activities
Will this help us achieve our agreed outcomes?	?	Reference is made in the bid to young people being encouraged to enjoy physical exercise and a healthier lifestyle and a reduction of young people in NEET.
Is it based on the needs and wishes of local people? Have they been involved in the creation of the project idea?	No	There has been an exhibition of the proposals in the Resources Centre for the past 4 weeks, the proposal has received extensive coverage in the local press and on local radio. The youngsters themselves have been involved in formulating the content and design of the project. Letters have been sent out to all nearby residents. In all the past surveys over the last ten years residents have highlighted the lack of facilities for young people and nothing for them to do.
Will it make a lasting difference?	?	There are no play facilities for young people in the immediate area and this will provide a lasting facility on an area of open space designated for community use.
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	Yes	
Does it provide best value?	No	This type of project has proved to be very successful at Percy King Estate and has greatly assisted all agencies working with young people. It provides a focal point for activities, reduces anti-social behaviour and improves health. The area will be well landscaped, have a young childrens play area, seating etc which will provide an area

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
		which all the family can use and benefit from.
Is it too risky?	No	It is not an exclusive feature to the young people who visit Inclusion Ventures sessions but is available to all residents and families not only in Brooklands and Grasslands but all of Jaywick. Taking Brooklands and Grasslands alone at approx 700 families this approximates to £300 per/head
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?	No	I have 40 years experience of managing construction projects, S & A Surveyors have a proven track record in managing projects and Inclusion Ventures have a proven record with their funders of monitoring and evaluating projects.
Section A	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Is it clear what is being proposed?	No	The project included for a MUGA, young childrens play area, landscaping seats etc. Detailed plans are available and Coppins Hall MUGA is there to see the finished article
Is it clear how much money is required?	Yes	
Is it clear who the responsible organisation is?	Yes	
Section B		
Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems, objectives and activities?	No	The problems are identified are that there are no facilities for young people in the area, no play facilities and none of the housing units has a garden. The project will facilitate the work by agencies in encouraging the young people to lead healthier lifestyles and engage in physical activities.
Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?	Yes	
Is it clear how the proposal relates to existing service delivery in the area, and neither substitutes nor duplicates related services?	Yes	Other than Inclusion Ventures there are no other agencies working in Jaywick with young people and there are no childrens facilities in Brooklands and Grasslands. In terms of sustainability all public services will come to an end if funding is not available.

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
Have residents been adequately involved in developing the proposal (or their views taken into account)?	No	See above regarding publicity and consultation.
Are management arrangements adequate?	No	Ten year commuted maintenance sum built into the bid
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?	No	Can or will TDC commit to beyond ten years ?

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?	No	Detailed plans are available. In all the plans produced so far over the past ten years for the regeneration of Brooklands and Grasslands the central area which is zoned for open space and community use has been maintained. The project provides for a pleasant area that can be enjoyed by all residents. If no further investment is allowed in this area because of the possible flood risk then what is to become of the residents and their families?.
Does the proposal provide value for money?	?	See above
Is adequate information provided on the resources already invested by the organisation?	No	See above
Is an adequate explanation provided for why NM money is required?	No	This project is what Safer, Stronger Communities funding is all about.
Section D		
Have other options been adequately considered?	No	For the past ten years agencies have been looking for an open space and funding to provide recreational facilities in this area for youngsters without success.
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?	No	See above
Have appropriate performance measures been identified?	No	See above

Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?	No	Do not understand the note
--	----	----------------------------

Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?	Yes	
Is it clear what the exit strategy is and how the benefits can be sustained?	No	The project will be handed over to TDC with a commuted maintenance sum of £20k. Continued work by IV and other agencies in this area with young people.