

Agenda Item 3a

Appraisal application form for Interaction NMP Board

A Summary and basic information

1. Title of proposal	Clearance of vacant dilapidated dwellings in Brooklands, Jaywick		
2. Date submitted			
3. Summary of proposal (max 150 words) i.e. what does the proposal involve and what will it achieve?			
<p>The demolition of vacant dilapidated dwellings and site clearance, particularly in those cases where it has not been possible to determine ownership, in accordance with Section 79 of the Building Act 1984. This section gives a discretionary power to local authorities to deal with such premises if considered to be seriously detrimental to the amenities of the neighbourhood. A local authority may serve notice on the owner to either repair or restore the dwelling, or if the owner so chooses he may demolish it. If the owner does not appeal and fails to comply with the notice, the local authority may either restore or demolish the dwelling in default and recover costs. It is anticipated that at least 4 vacant dwellings will be demolished by 31 March 2008 and help improve the appearance of the area. Some of the funding will be used to remove fly tipped material deposited on cleared sites if considered unsightly or prejudicial to health.</p> <p>The provision of cleared sites will assist in any site assembly programme and also be taken into account when developing plans for the future regeneration of Jaywick.</p>			
3. How much will the proposal cost in total?			
	From NM	From other sources	Total
Capital	£21,300		£21,300
Revenue			
Total	£21,300		£21,300
4. Organisation responsible			
Name of contact and position	Chris Kitcher Acting Head of Environmental Services		
Address	Environmental Services, Council Offices, Weeley, Essex CO16 9AJ		
Phone	01255 686741		
e mail	ckitcher@tendringdc.gov.uk		

B The proposal

<p>1. What is the problem you are trying to address?</p> <p>Set out the problems and causes, using statistics and evidence where available – referring to the delivery plan and its targets and outcomes.</p>
<p>Dilapidated dwellings are an eyesore and encourage fly tipping and vermin. The removal of such structures will improve the amenity of the area and demonstrate the Council's and its partners' commitment to the overall improvement of the area.</p>
<p>2. Proposal objectives?</p> <p>List the objectives for the proposal (these should be measurable)</p>
<p>Improvement in the appearance of the locality. Discourage fly tipping. Will assist in any site assembly programme. Will be taken into account in future regeneration plans. Demonstrates the Council's and its partners' commitment to the improvement and regeneration of the area.</p>
<p>3. How do you propose to address the problem?</p> <p>List the activities and set out who will benefit.</p>
<p>Demolition and clearance of dilapidated vacant dwellings. Local residents by improving the appearance of the locality and encouraging outside investment.</p>
<p>4. How does this proposal address the problem. List activities and describe evidence from similar initiatives if possible.</p>
<p>Please see 2 above.</p>

5. Community involvement

How have residents been involved in developing the proposal?

General consensus of local opinion identified in earlier surveys is to clear vacant dilapidated dwellings.

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.

Proposal will be managed by the Council's Environmental Services. Designated officer(s) will make appropriate investigations and liaise with Legal Services prior to service of notice and before execution of work in default.

Cleared sites will be monitored to deal with fly tipping issues.

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				
Possibility that monies expended will not be recovered from the owners concerned.	The purpose of the bid is to secure funding to demolish vacant dilapidated dwellings. Although attempts will be made to recover costs it may not be practicable/viable to do so especially if ownership is not known	High	Medium	A caution (charge) will be registered against the land at HM Land Registry to "flag up" monies owing if land were sold.
Possibility that the owner of a cleared site may seek compensation as he would not be able to obtain planning permission for new build on existing site.	Possibility of complaint to Local Government Ombudsman or Land Tribunal. Possibility of County Court action re: damages.	High	High	Council will need to be able to demonstrate that it made all reasonable enquiries to identify and notify owner of intended action prior to work in default.

Risk	Impact	Likelihood Low /Medium / High	Importance Low /Medium / High	Contingency and/or mitigation actions
Ongoing risks if objectives are not met				
Cleared site may attract fly tipping.	Adversely affect amenity of area, attract further fly tipping and provide harbourage for rodents.	High	High	Vacant sites to be monitored. The cost of removing fly tipped waste has been reflected in the bid.

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)	Demolition and site clearance	£21,300			£21,300
Revenue (NM)					
Total (NM)					
Other funding					
Total	£21,300				£21,300
2. Value for money					
Explain how this proposal provides value for money.					
Clearly demonstrates the Council's and partners' commitment to the area, instills confidence in local community and will assist in regeneration of the area.					
3. What resources are already invested by your, and other, organisations in the area on this issue?					
None due to lack of resources.					
4. Why is NM money needed?					
No other funding streams identified.					

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

Funding needed to pay contractors for demolition and site clearance.

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

Audit Commission

D Options

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

Not relevant.

E Measuring and sustaining the impact

1. 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?

Demolition of at least 4 vacant and dilapidated dwellings, by 31 March 2008.

2. 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?

4 dilapidated premises demolished by 31 March 2008 and cleared sites monitored to deal with fly tipping issues. The cost of removing fly tipped waste has been reflected in the bid.

Council will need to be able to demonstrate that costs incurred were reasonable.

3. Evaluation
How will you measure success and use lessons learnt?
Number of Cleared sites.

4. The long term and future
How will the benefits be sustained when NM resources are no longer available?
Not relevant as Jaywick Master Plan will secure long term regeneration.

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:Chris Kitcher.....

Appraisal 16/6/07 - Ron Stephenson

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	
Will it make a lasting difference?	Yes	
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	No	
Does it provide best value?	Yes	
Is it too risky?	No	
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?	Yes	
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	
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?	Yes	
Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?	NO	

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)?	Yes	
Are management arrangements adequate?	Yes	
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?	Yes	

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?	Yes	
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, nothing available	
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?	Yes	
Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?	Yes	
Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?	Yes	
Is it clear how the benefits can be sustained?	Yes	

Decision of appraisal panel

Recommend approval	Yes
Do not recommend approval	
Recommend changes required before approval	
If so, please state or refer to above sections	

Name	Ron Stephenson
Signed	Ron Stephenson computer generated signature
Date	18 th June 2007

**Proposal: Clearance of vacant dilapidated dwellings in
Brooklands, Jaywick. - Mildred Newton**

Date 18/6/07

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	
Will it make a lasting difference?		It will become part of the Jaywick Masterplan.
Is this a substitute for mainstream funding?	No	
Does it provide best value?		Could prove very expensive if litigation ensues.
Is it too risky?		Not if all avenues have been explored to find the owner(s) of the buildings.
Are we confident it will be well managed, monitored and evaluated?	Yes	Rather than become a target for fly-tippers, the cleared site could be used for a children's playground monitored by CCTV.
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	
Is it clear who the responsible organisation is?	Yes	
Section B		
Is it a convincing proposal in terms of setting out problems,	Yes	

Summary	Yes/no	Notes / changes required
objectives and activities?		

Will the proposal contribute to the delivery plan outcomes?		Only marginally and if the sites are regularly inspected and maintained.
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)?	Yes	
Are management arrangements adequate?	Yes.	
Have risks been adequately considered and planned for?		They have been considered but one cannot plan for what the owner(s) may or may not do.

Section C	Yes or no	Notes / changes required
Are the finances clear and reasonable and do they provide adequate detail?	Yes	
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?		There are no other options.
Section E		
Have measurable outcomes been identified?	Yes	
Are adequate monitoring arrangements in place?	Yes	
Are mechanisms in place for evaluation?	Yes	
Is it clear what the exit	Yes	

strategy is and how the benefits can be sustained?		
--	--	--

Decision of appraisal panel

Recommend approval	
Do not recommend approval	
Recommend changes required before approval	X
<p>If so, please state or refer to above sections</p> <p>The Council should ensure that all reasonable steps have been taken to locate the owner(s). Have neighbours, local Estate Agents, Water Company, Council Tax Department been approached for any information they may have regarding ownership? Council taxes and water rates must have been paid on the properties at some time. It is also possible that one person owns all 4 buildings and may have instructed agents to sell them on a buy-to-let basis – it is worth asking Sands and sheens.</p>	

Name	Mildred Newton
Signed	<i>M. F. Newton</i>
Date	18/6/07