



*Kelham Hall
Newark
Nottinghamshire
NG23 5QX*

Tel: 01636 650000

www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

Chairman: Councillor D.J. Lloyd
Vice-Chairman: Councillor K. Girling

Members of the Committee:

Councillor D. Batey
Councillor M. Cope
Councillor Mrs R. Crowe
Councillor Mrs G.E. Dawn
Councillor G.P. Handley

Councillor P. Peacock*
Councillor A.C. Roberts
Councillor F. Taylor
Councillor T. Wendels
Councillor Mrs Y. Woodhead

Substitutes

Councillor Mrs K. Arnold
Councillor Mrs M. Dobson
Councillor P.C. Duncan
Councillor N. Mison
Councillor B. Wells

AGENDA

MEETING: Economic Development Committee

DATE: Wednesday, 18 January 2017 at 6.00pm

VENUE: Room G21, Kelham Hall

**You are hereby requested to attend the above Meeting to be held at the time/place
and on the date mentioned above for the purpose of transacting the
business on the Agenda as overleaf.**

If you have any queries please contact Helen Brandham on 01636 655248.

AGENDA

	<u>Page Nos.</u>
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest by Members and Officers and as to the Party Whip	
3. Declaration of Any Intentions to Record the Meeting	
4. Minutes of Meetings held on 23 November 2016	3 – 6

PART 1 – ITEMS FOR DECISION

5. Tourism Strategy	7 – 19
6. Growth Investment Fund (Think BIG) Update Report	20 – 27
7. Capital Expenditure Newark Town Council – Maps & Signage	28 – 29
8. Local Development Framework Progress Report	30 – 43
9. Economic Development Committee Revenue Budget 2017/18 to 2021/22	44 – 69

PART 2 – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

10. Nottinghamshire Pre-Development Fund	70 – 75
--	---------

CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT ITEMS

None

NEWARK & SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** held on Wednesday, 23 November 2016 in Room G21, Kelham Hall at 6.00pm

PRESENT: Councillor D.J. Lloyd (Chairman)
Councillor K. Girling (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: D. Batey, Mrs R. Crowe, G.P. Handley, P. Peacock (Opposition Spokesperson), A.C. Roberts, T. Wendels and B. Wells (Substitute)

SUBSTITUTES: Councillor B. Wells for Councillor Mrs Y. Woodhead

91. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M.G. Cope, Mrs G.E. Dawn, F. Taylor and Mrs Y. Woodhead.

92. DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS AND AS TO THE PARTY WHIP

NOTED: that no Member or Officer declared any interest pursuant to any statutory requirement in any matter discussed or voted upon at the meeting.

93. DECLARATION OF ANY INTENTION TO RECORD THE MEETING

NOTED: that an audio recording was to be made of the meeting by the Council.

94. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 14 SEPTEMBER 2016

AGREED (unanimously) that the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

95. COUNCIL'S DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18 – 2021/22

The Committee considered the report presented by the Assistant Business Manager – Financial Services in relation to the progress to date on the budget for 2017/18 and future years.

The report set out the overall strategy of how the budget was to be developed and the timetable for this. The report provided information as to the current financial environment for local government and that a 4 year funding settlement to 2019/20 to provide funding certainty and stability to enable more proactive planning of service delivery and support strategic collaboration with local partners was available as part of the 2016/17 Local Government Finance Settlement. However, this was only in relation to Revenue Support Grant and Rural Services Delivery Grant which in 2019/20 would equate to £113,000. Paragraphs 5.0 to 5.5 of the report noted the already approved budget strategy, and set out the estimated savings therefrom. Details of the Draft Revenue Budget Proposals were set out in Paragraph 6.0 to 6.8.

The Assistant Business Manager advised that the formulation of the draft budget for the current year had been difficult due to the amount of unknown factors in local government funding, adding that savings were still being sought.

A Member of the Committee queried whether the Council were in a worse or better financial position following the establishment of a building control partnership agreement with North Kesteven District Council. The Business Manager and Chief Financial Officer – Financial Services advised that the charges listed in the budget reflected the initial costs of embedding the partnership. Currently the Council's position showed a slight improvement and work was ongoing to improve the budget position going forward.

In relation to the budget provided for Heritage, Culture and Visitors a Member of the Committee commented that estimates had, in the past, been inaccurate and that the situation needed to be monitored to understand how the service was performing, adding that the amalgamation of the budgets did not provide Members with a clear picture of the situation. The Chief Executive advised that the amalgamation of the budgets provided a complete picture and gave a realistic position. Should the budgets be separated issues would be raised in relation to staffing costs etc. as these would need to be divided up and allocated proportionally across the budgets. He further advised that these issues would be discussed at the Committee's budget briefing to be held on 15 December 2016.

A Member of the Committee stated that it was difficult to ascertain what work had already been undertaken in relation to identifying budget savings. He noted that the previous year had resulted in an underspend of £700,000, some of which had been put into reserves and some into this year's budget and queried whether this action was sustainable. The Assistant Business Manager advised that budget adjustments had already been actioned where savings had already identified. She added that budgets had been reduced accordingly if it was known that a saving would be realised year on year.

The Chief Executive advised that Members' views and suggestions for potential budget savings were being sought but that Officers had already begun the process. He added that the biggest financial challenges to the Committee were from outside its remit and that further details would be discussed at the meeting to be held on 15 December 2016.

A Member of the Committee queried what the latest position was in relation to the devolving of responsibility for the Ollerton Car Park to Ollerton & Boughton Town Council. The Director – Communities advised that discussions had been held and that a formal response to the Council's offer was awaited. A Member of the Committee who also sits on the Town Council advised that he believed this to have been sent but would query the matter with the Town Clerk.

In relation to the increase in income for the Newark Lorry Park, a Member queried how this had occurred despite the predicted loss of spaces. The Director – Communities advised that the number of spaces lost had not been as many as initially thought and that coupled with the £1 increase in charges had enable the revenue stream to be maintained. He further advised that a report would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

AGREED that:

- (a) a review of fees and charges in accordance with the Corporate Charging Policy be undertaken;
- (b) the current draft Committee budget be incorporated into the overall service budget to be reported to the Policy & Finance Committee at its meeting to be held on 1 December 2016; and
- (c) the Business Manager & Chief Financial Officer – Financial Services continues to formulate budget proposals for formal consideration at the meeting of the Economic Development Committee to be held on 18 January 2017 for recommendation to the Policy & Finance Committee meeting to be held on 25 February 2017.

96. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Committee considered the report presented by the Business Manager – Planning Policy in relation to the proposal which sought delegated authority for making comments on future Neighbourhood Plans with the district.

The report set out that in addition to the recently made Southwell Neighbourhood Plan, there were another six parishes that were at various stages in the production of their plans. Three of the six: Fernwood; Thurgarton; and Farnsfield were at, or approaching, the pre-submission consultation stage, after which their plans would be submitted to the Council for examination. The report noted that the Council were required to submit their own comments on draft plans to the parishes as part of the pre-submission consultation and that following submission, the Council were then required to carry out a further public consultation, appoint an independent examiner and to submit the plan and all the consultation responses for examination.

The proposal for Members to consider was that due to the number of plans likely to be submitted over the forthcoming months and the potential for more to come forward, Officers be authorised to make comments at both the pre-submission stage and the post submission stage, for submission to the independent examiner. All comments would be agreed with the Chairman of the LDF Task Group, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Economic Development Committee and the local Ward Member(s). Should there be significant conflict with national or local policy, the Council's response would be reported to the next available Economic Development Committee for approval. The appointment of the independent examiner would continue to be arranged in conjunction with the relevant parish council.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- (a) the report be noted; and
- (b) the delegated authority proposed in paragraph 3.1 of the report be approved.

97. NOTTINGHAMSHIRE PRE-DEVELOPMENT FUND (NPDF)

The Committee considered the report presented by the Business Manager – Economic Growth in relation to the bids submitted to the Nottinghamshire Pre-Development Fund on behalf of the Council.

The report set out that there were a number of funding streams including the Local Growth Fund and European Funds that were available to contribute to major investment schemes in transport infrastructure, economic development and regeneration but that discussions held within the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership and the Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee had identified that the securing of funding would be easier if potential projects were at a more advanced stage when bidding rounds were opened. Project proposals would need to be more advanced, for example, by having robust business cases, technical surveys, design work and economic viability assessments.

The report set out that against the background of the above, the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee had established a fund drawn from surpluses in the Business Rates Pool to support the pre-development work of economic projects across the County with specific focus on feasibility studies and business case development.

Paragraph 3 set out that 13 projects had been submitted for funding that impacted on the district, some being county wide, that had been successful at stage 1 of the process and had progressed to a full application. It was reported that the process was oversubscribed but that it was hoped that the successful bids would be known by the end of November 2016.

Members of the Committee queried as to how the decision on what projects were put forward to apply for funding from the business rates pool had been taken and by who. In response, Members were advised that the timescale to consider which projects had merited submission had been extremely tight and this had not afforded sufficient time to consult with Members of the Committee. When considering the projects, Officers had taken into consideration the council's current priorities. Members expressed concern that they had not been able to take part in the process and requested that a report be brought to a future meeting of the Committee as to what projects had been successful in their funding bids.

AGREED (unanimously) that the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 6.55pm

Chairman

TOURISM STRATEGY

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide the draft Tourism Strategy for consideration by the Economic Development Committee, attached as **Appendix A** to the report.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 Following Council decisions regarding the structure and focus of Tourism related activity for Newark and Sherwood during 2016, this document provides a draft strategy for consideration by the Committee.

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 In order to ensure that the opportunity to maximise the promotion of Newark and Sherwood is focussed on effective use of resources available, the draft strategy identifies strategic objectives for the next three years and specific activities for the 2017/18 financial year. The Vision and Aims below also fit with the overall objectives for the Economic Development Strategy which are:

Objective 1: To develop and maintain an in-depth understanding of the Newark and Sherwood economies, business stock and sector strength.

Objective 2: To develop appropriate place marketing to visitors and investors.

Objective 3: To plan and support Growth for our district.

The opportunity to maximise the Sense of Place is crucial for both our Inward Investment and Business Growth activity as well as for growing our Tourism opportunities.

- 3.2 The Vision and strategic aims for the Tourism strategy are:

Our Vision

To champion Newark and Sherwood as a great place to holiday in a world class destination offering rich outdoor activities, civil war heritage and the great legend, Robin Hood

Our Strategic Aims

Strategic Aim 1: To actively promote Newark (including Southwell) for its civil war, heritage and cultural offer

Strategic Aim 2: To actively promote Sherwood for its legend Robin Hood and fantastic outdoor activities, biodiversity and rich history

Strategic Aim 3: To maximise the potential for growth through tactical marketing campaigns

Strategic Aim 4: To develop a successful thriving tourism industry

Strategic Aim 5: To develop consistent brands for the areas

3.3 Specific Activities over the period from January 2017 to March 2018

This is based on a budget of £98,000 – the original budget was £106.960, however £8960 was transferred to Heritage, Culture and Visitors for part funding of a post.

- a) **Creating a landing stage for Tourism** – To contract out the delivery of a new website (VisitNewarkandSherwood) through design and consultation processes (approx. £25k), from current year 16/17 Promotion of Tourism Budget. At present, there is no standalone website that provides information for the Visitor to the District. The website will be dynamic, managed and updated internally and will include an events calendar.
- b) **Media campaigns** – strategic media campaigns for both Inward Investment and Tourism (approx. £50k)
Campaigns to include targeted campaigns for example:
‘Love your Home Grown Heritage’ (a weekend of culture and heritage);
‘Cherish Your Family’ (Sherwood Forest options);
‘Three castles weekend getaway’ (Nottingham, Newark, Lincoln)
- c) **Traditional Media** - Direct print costs for targeted promotion through printed material for specific areas where we know from research that we already attract significant visitor numbers (e.g. S75, Doncaster, Peterborough, campaign costs (approx. £10k)
- d) Contribution to the targeted Campaign for **Siege Weekend in Newark** (May 2017) via social media, TV and Radio (£10k contribution as some budget available via NCWC
- e) Working with attractions which attract a similar demographic on specific Civil War Campaigns (e.g. Worcester) £10k
- f) Developing an online and printable brochure for the district tailored for the Coach Tours market £8k
- g) Coordination of Tourism activities across the district, liaison with partner organisations such as Marketing Nottingham and Nottinghamshire, liaison with Tourism Businesses, copy writing of articles, contributions to website (£10k – post transfer from Southwell TIC to Economic Growth and Tourism)

4.0 Equalities Implications

- 4.1 Any actions taken within the strategy will have due regard for inclusivity of all where this is possible. Information will be made available using different media and opportunities for translation will be made available where feasible.

5.0 Impact on Budget/Policy Framework

- 5.1 All of the activities identified within the strategy can be resourced from the existing revenue budget for 2016/17 and the proposed revenue budget for 2017/18.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS that the Economic Development Committee:

- a) agree the vision, aims and objectives for the Tourism Strategy**
- b) support the action plan for 2017/18 as identified within the strategy**

Reason for Recommendations

In order to promote growth in the Tourism and Tourism Related economy through an effective, focussed strategy and action plan

Background Papers

Nil

For further information please contact Julie Reader-Sullivan on Ext 5258

Andrew Statham
Director - Communities

DRAFT INTERIM TOURISM STRATEGY FOR NEWARK & SHERWOOD
2017 TO 2020

Our Vision

To champion Newark and Sherwood as a great place to holiday in a world class destination offering rich outdoor activities, civil war heritage and the great legend, Robin Hood.

Proposed Timeline

Action	By When	Who Responsible
Develop draft strategy and action plan	End Sept 2016	JRS/MC
Present to Economic Development Committee	By early 2017	JRS/MC
Produce final version of strategy and action plans	By March 2017	JRS/MC

This will enable NSDC to begin delivering against this plan for Summer 2017, assuming activities are underway by March 2017.

Overarching Aims

Strategic Aim 1: To actively promote Newark (including Southwell) for its civil war, heritage and cultural offer

Strategic Aim 2: To actively promote Sherwood for its legend Robin Hood and fantastic outdoor activities, biodiversity and rich history

Strategic Aim 3: To maximise the potential for growth through tactical marketing campaigns

Strategic Aim 4: To develop a successful thriving tourism industry

Strategic Aim 5: To develop consistent brands for the areas

OUTLINE FOR NEWARK & SHERWOOD GROWTH STRATEGY FOR THE VISITOR ECONOMY 2017 – 2020

Introduction

The Visitor Economy has been identified by the Local Enterprise Partnership (D2N2) as a key sector and has real potential for growth. Within Newark and Sherwood the sector offers short and long term investment opportunities to help economic prosperity, which are self-sustaining.

The plan for growth responds directly to the strategic aims and objectives highlighted in the D2N2 Economic Strategy and sets out an action plan that will achieve positive outcomes and contribute to the overarching target of creating 55,000 jobs by 2023.

By December 2012, tourism industries accounted for 2.7 million jobs in England (10% of the total). These included 1.2 million full time jobs and 1.1 million part time jobs. Domestic and inbound visitors spent over £84bn in 2012, a 10% increase on 2011. Since 2010, year on year growth has averaged 8.7% (Visit England Annual Progress report 2013).

A strong visitor economy plays a crucial role in Newark and Sherwood with two distinct offers – the Newark offer (incorporating Southwell) and the Sherwood offer. The actions associated with this plan will be appropriate to the distinct offers and will also help to address issues such as youth unemployment and upskilling prospects.

Following the Council decision to withdraw the service provided at Rufford Country Park (Sherwood TIC) and to no longer support Southwell TIC with the 10 hours per week, it is crucial that NSDC focus on maximising the budget available through the identification of appropriate marketing activities and support for Tourism related businesses and employees.

Tourism in Newark and Sherwood

With the opening in 2015 of the National Civil War Centre and the enhancement of this offer in April 2016 to incorporate Tourist Information and the Theatre Box Office within the new Visitor Hub, the Newark offer has been greatly enhanced. The newly formed Town Team has just produced a What's On in Newark guide for 2016 and the offer is clearly one that will appeal across a wide demographic. The offer is focused on heritage and culture and includes aspects such as The Castle, The Sconce, Museums, The Minster etc the independent retail offer, restaurants, places to see and stay

The opportunities in Sherwood include the opening of a new Sherwood Forest Visitor Centre (RSPB), the Major to Miner project, the potential of opening the Robin Hood Railway line, support for developments in Kings Clipstone and of course the expanding outdoor activity hubs of Center Parcs and Sherwood Pines. Our greatest legend Robin Hood has his home in Sherwood.

There are clear links between the NSDC Economic Development Strategy and the objectives for this strategy are below:

Objective 1 : To develop and maintain an in-depth understanding of the Newark and Sherwood economies, business stock and sector strength.

Objective 2: To develop appropriate place marketing to visitors and investors.

Objective 3: To plan and support Growth for our district.

These key objectives will be clearly supported through the Tourism Strategy and ensure that the opportunities to promote the district are maximised through both our Inward Investment Strategy and our Tourism Strategy.

Tourism Plans

There is a plan identified for Newark and Southwell and one for Sherwood. This allows for focus on those demographic groups most likely to enjoy our offer and to provide a clear direction for all actions.

Underneath the strategic aims will be actions which are SMART and ensure that the aims can be monitored and reviewed, as well as being flexible to meet changing economic factors post Brexit. The action plan will be provided in terms of activity streams. The Vision of course remains consistent in both plans, as do the strategic aims and streams of activity.

Newark and Southwell – Action Plan

Strategic Aim	Objectives	Strand	Activities	By when	By whom
1.To actively promote Newark for its civil war, heritage, green space and cultural offer	To bring together all Tourism related organisations so that a collaborative and joined up approach can be created	Collaboration and Communication	Consultation events, collect email addresses, regular forums to discuss, Define what Newark’s offer is and keep it consistent focus on relevant demographic		JRS/MC

			To ensure Schools are part of the target group for promoting the offer as well as coach tour opportunities		
	To maximise promotion of the offer and make best use of resources available and partnership opportunities	Media including Social Media	<p>connecting via Twitter, Facebook etc to ensure retweets, profile raising, supporting events etc</p> <p>To review existing websites and consider options</p> <p>To identify through research the online activities that will best promote the offer and encourage visitors to Newark and Southwell</p> <p>To consider production of Coach Tours Guide book</p>	Commence research in Dec 2016 and produce a campaign (making links as appropriate with Visit England and Marketing Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	JRS/MC
3. To maximise the potential for growth through tactical marketing campaigns	All organisations are 'on message' and campaigns are focussed on key themes and relevant demographics Identification of tactical marketing campaigns	Communication and Collaboration	<p>Once key messages agreed and shared, identify key campaigns with deliverables and action</p> <p>Consider traditional media, trade shows, train companies particularly Virgin and East Mids Trains</p>	Commence Feb 2017	JRS/MC

			Identify consultancy to deliver, produce tender, consider MN&N for delivery where appropriate		
4.To develop a successful thriving tourism industry	Focus projects on providing business and job opportunities	Communication and Collaboration; Media; Business Support	<p>Work with Tourism related businesses in all areas and use technology, advertising, contacts to develop awareness of our offer</p> <p>Provide learning opportunities surrounding use of technology, customer service, recruitment of Apprentices, retention of staff, flexible working, funding and business support that may assist.</p> <p>Ensure aspects such as the Newark Totally Locally offer and Southwell Traders are included in the promotion</p> <p>To identify possible opportunities for regeneration projects, placemaking, specific tourism related projects</p>	Commence April 17	JRS/MC

5. To develop consistent brands for the area	To create/adopt/revitalise brands that represent the area and it's themes	Brand recognition	Identify and work with a consultancy to ensure brand can deliver, is recognisable and is consulted upon	Jan 17	JRS/MC
--	---	-------------------	---	--------	--------

Sherwood Action Plan

Strategic Aim	Objectives	Strand	Activities	By when	By whom
2. To actively promote Sherwood for its legend Robin Hood and fantastic outdoor activities and rich history	To bring together all Tourism related organisations so that a collaborative and joined up approach can be created	Collaboration and Communication	<p>Consultation events, collect email addresses, regular forums to discuss,</p> <p>Define what the Sherwood offer is and keep it consistent focus on relevant demographic</p> <p>To ensure family groups are the prime focus for the campaign</p>		JRS/MC
	To maximise promotion of the offer and make best use of resources available and partnership opportunities	Social Media	<p>connecting via Twitter, Facebook etc to ensure retweets, profile raising, supporting events etc</p> <p>To review existing websites and consider options</p>	<p>ongoing with staffing resource within NSDC to support</p> <p>Commence research in Dec 2016 and produce a campaign (making links as appropriate</p>	JRS/MC

			To identify through research the online activities that will best promote the offer and encourage visitors to Sherwood	with Visit England and Marketing Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	
3. To maximise the potential for growth through tactical marketing campaigns	If all organisations are 'on message' and campaigns are focussed on key themes and relevant demographics	Communication and Collaboration	Once key messages agreed and shared, identify key campaigns with deliverables and action Consider traditional media, trade shows, train companies particularly Virgin and East Mids Trains Identify consultancy to deliver, produce tender, consider MN&N for delivery where appropriate	Commence Feb 2017	JRS/MC
4.To develop a successful thriving tourism industry	Focus projects on providing business and job opportunities	Communication and Collaboration; Media; Business Support	Work with Tourism related businesses in all areas and use technology, advertising, contacts to develop awareness of our offer Provide learning opportunities surrounding use of technology, customer service, recruitment of	Commence in March 2017	JRS/MC

			<p>Apprentices, retention of staff, flexible working, funding and business support that may assist</p> <p>To identify possible opportunities for regeneration projects, placemaking, specific tourism related projects.</p> <p>Bring together all partner organisations in Sherwood to create consistent and shared understanding</p> <p>Understand how best to work with Tourism related businesses in Sherwood</p>		
5. To develop consistent brands for the areas	To create/adopt/revitalise brands that represent the area and it's themes	Brand Recognition	Identify and work with a consultancy to ensure brand can deliver, is recognisable and is consulted upon	Commence Jan 17	JRS/MC

Performance Measures for Consultation

Performance Measures (for discussion) Can be measured through STEAM Data	Baseline STEAM Data 2014	Target for 2020
1. To maintain the number of day visitors at 88%	88% day visitors	
2. To increase the number of jobs supported by tourism	2455 Direct	
3. To increase staying visitor (including business visitors) from 12% to 16%	12% overnight visitors	
4. Number of businesses supported in terms of training and advice	15 (through facebook/social media training)	

STRUCTURES AND RESOURCES

Existing Resources

The resources that were deployed for Tourism consisted of:

£54,000 for the Experience Nottinghamshire Service Level Agreement

£6960 for Southwell staffing and £46,000 for Sherwood TIC

Total of £98,000 which was agreed to be ringfenced following the agreement to the Tourism recommendations at full council

Proposed Resources & Actions

Posts and contract management to sit within JRS team and cover the district for both strategies with close liaison with MC and PB

1. Part time Co-ordinator post – to filter/distribute marketing material, facilitate meetings/events with Tourism related businesses (approx. £10k)
 2. Social Media campaigns post or outsource to consultancy – strategic social media for both Inward Investment and Tourism (approx. £50k) – Campaigns to include targeted campaigns for example ‘Love your Home Grown Heritage’ (a weekend of culture and heritage); Cherish Your Family (Sherwood Forest options); Three castles (Nottingham, Newark, Lincoln) weekend getaway
 3. Contract out – delivery of new website (VisitNewarkandSherwood) through design and consultation processes (approx. £25k), from current year 16/17 Promotion of Tourism Budget
 4. Direct print costs for targeted promotion of What’s on in Newark to areas where we know we can attract visitors (e.g. S75, Doncaster, Peterborough, campaign costs (approx. £10k)
 5. Targeted Campaign for Seige weekend (social media, TV and Radio) £10k
 6. Working with attractions which attract a similar demographic on specific Civil War Campaigns (e.g. Worcester) £10k
 7. Developing an online and printable brochure for the district tailored for the Coach Tours market £8k
- All campaigns will have calls to action that will assist in measuring success of individual campaigns, although increase in Visitor numbers will be the main measurement - Total Calculated - £98,000 from 17/18 and £25,000 from 16/17

GROWTH INVESTMENT FUND (Think BIG) UPDATE REPORT

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides a progress update regarding the Loan Fund and details of the recommendations agreed by the Policy Monitoring Group on 28 November 2016. Report attached as **Appendix A**.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 14 loans have been drawn since the fund was established in December 2012 and at present 134 jobs have been created. The jobs created figure does vary as businesses re-structure and find new markets/products. Two businesses have received additional loans from the fund in order to support further growth although these have not been included in the calculation of loans drawn down as they were for the same business

3.0 Proposals

3.1 The proposals identify actions taken relating to the loan fund

4.0 Equalities Implications

4.1 There are no negative equality implications with applications being considered against a clear range of agreed criteria.

5.0 Impact on Budget/Policy Framework

5.1 Resources to support the proposals within the report are included within the Council's revenue budget.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS that the Committee supports the recommendations agreed through the Policy Monitoring Group on 28 November 2016 as follows:

- (a) the Think BIG Loan Fund continues to focus on gap funding, providing working capital for businesses that demonstrate growth potential and job creation and are unable to obtain the required bank support or other funding. The Fund can thereby make a difference in enabling investment and growth to happen;**
- (b) the Investment Panel to continue to help businesses be in a better position to access funding from Banks and other lenders;**
- (c) the Pathfinder element of the loan fund to continue to be promoted to encourage longer term entrepreneurial impact on the local business culture; and**
- (d) the impact and opportunity of the Midlands Engine Investment Fund to be assessed and reported to the next Policy Monitoring Group meeting.**

Reason for Recommendations

To provide continuing support for businesses in Newark & Sherwood.

Background Papers

Nil

For further information please contact Julie Reader-Sullivan on Ext 5258

Andrew Statham
Director - Communities

POLICY MONITORING GROUP – GROWTH INVESTMENT FUND
28 NOVEMBER 2016

THINK BIG LOAN FUND

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 To provide an update for the Policy Monitoring Group regarding the progress of the Growth Investment Fund (Think BIG) and to recommend the continuation of the Loan Fund and the Pathfinder fund.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 The loan fund was introduced in order to provide Growth businesses in the district that could not access lending from traditional sources, given the economic climate with another option. The loan has achieved this in terms of the loans approved and drawn down to date. Lending for businesses from traditional sources has improved, and uncertainty post-Brexit may impact on support available to businesses. The loan fund has been successful in job creation and in supporting some high profile businesses in Newark and Sherwood. There are 5 applications in the pipeline at present for the Loan Fund.

2.2 14 loans have been drawn since the fund was established in December 2012 and at present 134 jobs have been created. The jobs created figure does vary as businesses re-structure and find new markets/products. Two businesses have received additional loans from the fund in order to support further growth although these have not been included in the calculation of loans drawn down as they were for the same business.

2.3 To date £1.236m has been loaned to the businesses and the following details the financial situation as at 30 September 2016:

A12506 Growth Investment Fund		@ 30th Sept 2016					
		2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total
Think Big Fund Balance B/f		1,294,842.80	1,877,074.01	1,574,175.33	1,416,740.51	1,217,270.63	
Contribution to the fund							
	From other balances	705,157.20	12,766.88				
Costs							
	Professional Services	70,691.46	37,978.09	62,758.54	54,171.21	27,825.13	253,424.43
	Internal Charges	6,502.84	2,456.46	2,705.28	3,192.11	632.22	15,488.91
	Bank Charges from Streets		74.00	31.80	29.40	14.20	149.40
	Total running costs of the scheme	77,194.30	40,508.55	65,495.62	57,392.72	28,471.55	269,062.74
Income							
	Fees charged	-125.00	-6,575.00	-9,250.00	-10,464.00	-8,500.00	-34,914.00
	Interest	-799.88	-17,751.22	-33,207.38	-36,890.21	-16,915.67	-105,564.36
	Total Income	-924.88	-24,326.22	-42,457.38	-47,354.21	-25,415.67	-140,478.36
	NET Costs of the scheme	76,269.42	16,182.33	23,038.24	10,038.51	3,055.88	128,584.38
Loans							
	Amounts loaned out	50,500.00	370,000.00	297,500.00	368,762.53	150,000.00	1,236,762.53
	Principle Repaid	-3,843.43	-70,516.77	-163,103.42	-179,331.16	-92,416.53	-509,211.31
	NET Loan Balance	46,656.57	299,483.23	134,396.58	189,431.37	57,583.47	727,551.22
Balance c/f		1,877,074.01	1,574,175.33	1,416,740.51	1,217,270.63	1,156,631.28	

2.4 Summary of Risk Status

Status	No. of Loans	Amount of Capital Outstanding	Expected Loss	Net of Interest & Fees of:
RED	2	£68,762	£23,337	£12,665
AMBER	2	£243,794		
GREEN	8	£415,576		
Total		£728,132	£23,337	£12,665
Fully Repaid	2	£150,500		

RED Risk:

Case 1) Original loan £50,000 in 2013: the business has gone into liquidation with minimal assets. Personal guarantees are being pursued but are not likely to result in any further repayments. Interest on the loan has been suspended.

Case 2) Original Loan £40,000 in 2014: the business has faced difficult times. Pending reorganisation, repayments were suspended. It has recently shown signs of recovery and a new repayment programme is to be arranged. We have a good margin in security cover.

AMBER Risk:

Case 1) Original loan £50,000 in 2013: this business has experienced trading difficulties but has not missed a repayment and the loan is due to be fully repaid by the end of 2016.

Case 2) Original Loan £250,000 in 2014: this business has experienced difficult trading this year. Capital repayments have been suspended whilst the business is being reorganised and cash flow recovers; we are monitoring closely. We have a mortgage debenture alongside other funders and we have personal guarantees.

2.5 Monitoring Processes

Each business participates in a quarterly monitoring review meeting with the Business Analyst and this allows NSDC to identify any issues at an early stage. The Payment Services provider, Street UK advise the Economic Growth Team if any repayments are missed and contact is made with the business to determine the reason. Investment Panel members are advised and the Business Analyst will visit and report as necessary. On several occasions the panel has assessed the working capital position of the business and agreed to defer of repayments to help the business through cash flow issues.

In cases where the business is unable to survive we have a Recovery Process to work with the administrator or liquidator. The process includes the internal legal team and the Investment Panel in discussion as to the appropriate legal recovery action. Processes are reviewed for the whole monitoring process on a regular basis in the light of experience gained.

2.6 Table of Progress

Successful applicants	Turnover	Amount and Date Loaned	Jobs safeguarded	Actual jobs created to 30/11/13	Jobs Created 31/12/14	Jobs created 31/10/15	Jobs created 30/09/16
A Repaid	£250,000	£50,000 Dec 2012 Repaid	5	Now 7 staff so an increase of 2 (1 apprentice and 1 fte)	7 No change	7 No change	This business has a new loan and is also Letter K
B	£340,000	£50,000 April 2013 2 tranches of £25k and second tranche released in Oct 2013	6	Now 8 staff so an increase of 2. Total staff increased to 16 in the summer but these were temporary positions	8 No change	Now 5 Minus 3	In Liquidation Minus 6
C Has received two additional loans	£1,000,000 (now £1,300,000)	£85,000 April 2013 A further £40k was approved in October 2013, so now at £125,000	20	Now 38 staff, so an increase of 18 staff	51 Increase of 31	55 Increase of 35	Now 47 Decrease of 8 from 2015 but increase of 27 from 2013
D Repaid	£1,100,000 (now £2,000,000)	£100,000 May 2013	9	Now 12 staff so an increase of 3	18 Increase of 9	18 No change	At end of loan employed 21 Increase of 12
E	£800,000	£50,000 October 2013 for first tranche of £25,000	3	Forecast of 12 FTE/subcontract	2fte 15 sub contract	2FTE 18 sub contract	Now 20fte Increase of 17
F	£520,000	£45,000 awaiting final documents November 2013	8	10 Increase of 2	10 No change	10 No change	10 No change
G	£13.759m	£250,000 April 2014			75 start Dec 14 80 + 2 apprentices employed Increase of 7	84 Increase of 9	121 across all sites Increase of 46
H	£154,000	£40,000 October 2014			4 staff and no change	No change	Under review
I	£220,000	£7,500 May 2015				4 part time staff and 1 full time No change	
J	£3535,228	£250,000 June 2015				80 at start now 121 Increase of 41	Now 108 Decrease of 13 from 2015 But increase of 28 from start of loan
K 2 nd loan for Company A		£50,000 Feb 2016					Start 5 now 6 increase 1
L		£50,000 April 2016					16
M		£100,000 July 2016		26 now 27 Increase of 1			26 start Now 27 Increase 1
N		£25,000 Nov 2016		5 part time 1 full time			5 p/t 1f/t

Pending the outcome of a review of the Growth Investment Fund in 2015, the Fund was not actively promoted again until recently.

- 2.7 The Think BIG Loan Fund has performed exceptionally well to date in comparison to National Grant and Loan schemes. The current cost of the Fund per job created is £5,432 This calculation is based on actual net jobs created to date of 134 and not anticipated or expected jobs and is based on capital outstanding of £728k as at 30 September 2016. As loans are repaid, the cost per job reduces. The calculation does not include an estimate of potential positive impact on other businesses in the district as a result of supply chain or increased wealth.
- 2.8 The Regional Growth Fund (grant funding) National Audit Report for 2012 states that the expected cost per job varies considerably between projects, from under £4,000 per job to over £200,000 per job. If the Regional Growth Fund delivers the expected 41,000 extra jobs, then the average cost per job would be £33,000 which would be broadly similar to the average cost of jobs under past programmes with comparable objectives. It is notable that the businesses in the portfolio that had turnover in excess of £1m at the start of the loan have achieved the higher job creation.

3.0 Proposals

3.1 Marketing of the Loan Fund

The Report on the Growth Investment Loan Fund considered by the Policy Monitoring Group earlier this year (attached to this paper for reference) included extensive research on the local funding market with banks and other funding providers. It recommended that the focus of the Think BIG Fund should be on continuing to lend to businesses with a turnover of £1m+ and on providing gap funding, especially up to £100k, where other funders will not lend. The Fund can thereby make a difference in enabling investment, job creation and growth to happen.

This is now the theme of various promotion activities. The Business Analyst has recently commenced a programme of contacts with intermediaries, Banks and Accountants. Two Procurement and Business support events have been held recently where the fund has also been promoted (30 September with 44 delegates in Newark and 28 October 2016 with 32 delegates in Edwinstowe).

We have since seen an increase in expressions of interest in the fund, loans in the pipeline:

	No.	Amount
Loans approved – formalities being completed	2	£60,000
Expressions of interest/Loan Applications being discussed	3	

Introductions continue to come from banks and direct contact between the Economic Growth Team and business; we have received the first introduction from a parish council.

3.2 Pathfinder Loans

The Policy Monitoring Group have agreed that the Growth Investment Fund should be extended to include a new progressive model of incremental pathfinder investment of £5,000 to £25,000 for earlier stage businesses that have been declined by other lenders, and can demonstrate good growth prospects.

Small amounts of funding are made available, from £5,000 at the first stage, progressing to £25,000 for a business nearing revenue generation. These incremental (soft) loans are designed to support specific achievement of milestones to evidence progress, one stage at a time, to help a business start-up and in early trading. Common purposes include: product and market research, operational development of competitive capability of the business. Any business located in Newark and Sherwood District that demonstrates good prospects for growth can apply within the standard legal, moral and ethical grounds.

Bearing in mind the higher risk element of these loans, we are looking to identify the best prospects for business growth, not the self employed or lifestyle business that does not have an ambition to grow and create jobs. It is early days and we are beginning to spread the word about aiming to help those who aspire to become an ambitious entrepreneur. This is a cultural change that will take time to achieve, encouraging a positive longer term impact on the wider local economy.

Marketing of the new Pathfinder element of the fund is being undertaken in various local publications and via social media. A programme of themed workshops is being developed to follow the procurement events held recently.

3.3 Further Developments in the Regional Funding Market:

The Midlands Engine Investment Fund of £250m is currently being set up to fund businesses across the East and West Midlands and is expected to make new funding available from Spring 2017. This additional source of equity and debt funding for larger and smaller businesses will be accessed through regional fund managers. It will be important to make businesses in the district aware of the opportunity and how the Growth Investment Fund could be used to fill gaps and give support.

3.4 Business Support/Mentoring

There is a need for business support and mentoring in the district whilst ensuring that Newark and Sherwood District Council are not funding something that is provided through any other source of funding. In order to help businesses survive and thrive, a combination of one to one or small group business advice and support is critical.

NBV Enterprises is providing support for pre-start and start-up businesses via one to many events and up to 12 hours mentoring support for trading businesses is available for Newark and Sherwood businesses, as will access to a grant fund of up to £2,500.

4.0 Equalities Implications

4.1 There are no negative equality implications with applications being considered against a clear range of agreed criteria.

5.0 Impact on Budget/Policy Framework

5.1 Growth Investment Fund loans are provided through money set aside for that purpose, with capital repaid being “recycled” to provide future loans. The expected loss forecast in paragraph 2.4 will therefore have no impact on the Council’s revenue budget, but will instead be seen as a reduction to the overall funding pot.

6.0 Comments of Business Manager & Chief Financial Officer – Financial Services

6.1 When the Growth Investment Fund was first set up, Members were advised that losses could occur with a failure rate of up to 33% - a figure seen in other similar loans funds. The loss forecast at paragraph 2.4 is the first to be experienced with the fund. The projected loss of £23,337 amounts to approximately 1.9% of amounts loaned.

6.2 Pathfinder loans are considered to have a higher risk of failure, but none have yet been awarded.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is proposed that the Policy Monitoring Group support the following recommendations:

- (e) the Think BIG Loan Fund continues to focus on gap funding, providing working capital for businesses that demonstrate growth potential and job creation and are unable to obtain the required bank support or other funding. The Fund can thereby make a difference in enabling investment and growth to happen;**
- (f) the Investment Panel to continue to help businesses be in a better position to access funding from Banks and other lenders;**
- (g) the Pathfinder element of the loan fund to continue to be promoted to encourage longer term entrepreneurial impact on the local business culture; and**
- (h) the impact and opportunity of the Midlands Engine Investment Fund to be assessed and reported to the next Policy Monitoring Group meeting.**

Reason for Recommendations

To provide continuing support for businesses in Newark & Sherwood.

Background Papers

None

For further information please contact Julie Reader-Sullivan on ext 5258

Andy Statham
Director – Community

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE NEWARK TOWN CENTRE – MAPS AND SIGNAGE

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to request that the project to complete the road and pedestrian signage for Newark, and for the design and delivery of town centre maps in strategic locations, is added to the Council's Capital Programme.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 Road and Pedestrian Signage - Phase 1 of the Signage Project was completed in time for the Opening of NCWC in 2015 (project took place between Jan and May 2015) and a capital bid was completed for this major work. Many road signs around the inner and outer Town were renewed with new brown panels for Tourism related information. The project also included full replacement of the Fingerpost Pedestrian signs in the Town Centre. Consultation was undertaken prior to the commencement of this work with heritage and interested stakeholders within the Town and the Economic Development and Leisure Committees were also consulted.

2.2 Phase 1.5 is the snagging exercise and some additional finger post signs. All relevant parties have been consulted on these revisions/additions. The capital expenditure is forecast to be £34,100 (including project management costs of £9,100). A copy of the document which includes the revised signs will be available at the meeting.

2.3 Tourism Maps - All Heritage and Tourism related stakeholders have agreed on a map design and on locations within the Town Centre. The Map will vary from location to location with a 'You Are Here' position. The design and locations of the maps have been agreed with stakeholders. The capital expenditure will be £14,017.

3.0 Proposals

3.1 That the signage and maps are updated in line with the Economy section of the Council priorities and specifically:

- a) Improve the promotion of tourism including the development of online and printed media-merge
- b) Develop the role and impact of the National Civil War Centre
- c) Review our strategies to promote Tourism and the visitor economy so that they are integrated with heritage and landscape strategies and develop measures to retain and disperse visitors within the district

The proposal is to complete phase 1.5 of the pedestrian and road signage. All the signage and map details have been out to consultation with key stakeholder groups.

4.0 Equalities Implications

4.1 There are issues relating to accessibility in terms of condition of pavements that have been raised separately through the appropriate channels. However, the maps and pedestrian signage are in line with regulations and will enhance visitor and resident experiences in Newark Town Centre.

5.0 Impact on Budget/Policy Framework

5.1 The cost of the snagging exercise is part of the original scheme and not part of this new bid.

5.2 The total cost of the scheme will be dependent on actual costs relating to the road and pedestrian signage. These will be designed and installed by Highways Agency approved contractors, outside of the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and have been forecast to be £25,000. The project management costs and costs for the Tourism Maps are as per quotations received.

6.0 Comments of Director

6.1 The development of the improved signage project and the development of new maps to provide information to visitors is a very important element in the Council's overall Heritage and Visitor strategy. The development of these proposals has been carefully considered and the proposals have been widely consulted on with a range of stakeholders.

7.0 Comments of Business Manager & Chief Financial Officer – Financial Services

7.1 Funding for this scheme can be found from within reserves.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee recommend to Policy & Finance Committee that the scheme be added to the Council's Capital Programme in order to complete the signage and location maps for Newark Town Centre.

Reason for Recommendation

In order to complete the directional signage around Newark Town Centre

Background Papers

Nil

For further information please contact Julie Reader-Sullivan on Ext 5258

Andrew Statham
Director - Communities

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PROGRESS REPORT

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 To update members on the progress of the various elements of the Local Development Framework (LDF), including the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), contained within the Local Development Scheme (LDS) timetable, to propose amendments to the timetable and seek approval to prepare and consult on a CIL Draft Charging Schedule.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 The current LDS was adopted by Economic Development Committee on 31 March 2015, subsequently on 15th June Committee agreed to vary this programme by staggering the consultation on various aspects of the Preferred Approach.

3.0 Progress

3.1 Since 15 June progress on the Plan Review has been as follows;

- Consultation on Preferred Approach Strategy undertaken in June, July and August 2016
- Consultation currently underway on Preferred Approach – Sites & Settlements and Town Centre & Retail – consultation due to conclude 24 February 2017

3.2 It is proposed that following consideration of the consultation responses to the Preferred Approach that Draft Plan Amendments will be prepared ready for formal publication during Spring 2017.

3.3. The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was consulted upon in November and December 2017. In total 17 people responded to the consultation and the results are set out in a Report of Responses set out in **Appendix A**. In general there was broad support for the approach taken by the District Council. The main areas of concern which the consultation identified where:

- Prematurity of progressing the CIL Review ahead of the Plan Review
- Suitability of proposed amended charging zones
- Single charging rate for retail

3.4 Having reviewed the consultation, Officers have made draft responses to the various consultation comments raised. As noted in **Appendix A**, given the nature of both the plan review and the CIL Review Officers are satisfied that it can demonstrate to the Planning Inspectorate that it is appropriate to progress the CIL review as soon as is practicable. With regard to the geography of charging zones, in a diverse District such as ours whatever methods are used to divide it up there will always be anomalies created by the nature of administrative boundaries. Wards are the building blocks for much of the statistical information used to determine CIL levels and therefore represent the most appropriate way of dividing up the district. In terms of concerns over the single retail charge it is proposed to investigate the potential of splitting retail charging rates and consider any potential impact on small scale retail needs.

3.5 It is proposed that save for any changes relating to retail that the preliminary draft charging schedule should form the basis for the Draft Charging Schedule that is published to seek formal representations. This consultation will also propose changes to the Regulation 123 List of Projects to be funded by CIL. This list will continue to contain appropriate strategic highway schemes and secondary education provision identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is proposed that these additional elements are finalised and presented to the Local Development Framework Task Group for endorsement. It is proposed that delegated authority be given to the Deputy Chief Executive to carry out the formal representation period as soon as possible once Task Group and the Chairman and Vice Chairman have endorsed the contents.

4.0 Amendments to the Local Development Scheme

4.1 Attached at **Appendix B** is an amended LDS timetable to reflect the current anticipated timetable for the Plan Review and CIL Review. It is proposed to amend the LDS to reflect **Appendix B**.

5.0 Impact on Budget/Policy Framework

5.1 None identified.

6.0 Equalities

6.1 An Integrated Impact Assessment is being prepared alongside the Plan Review process to ensure that the impact on minority groups of the proposals are considered as part of the policy making process.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS that:

- (a) **Committee note progress towards meeting the timetable of the adopted Local Development Scheme;**
- (b) **Committee agree the proposed approach set out in Section 3;**
- (c) **delegated authority be given to the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with Local Development Framework Task Group and the Chairman and Vice Chairman to finalise and to formal seek representations on the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule and associated documentation.**
- (d) **Committee agree to amend the Local Development Scheme to reflect the proposed timetable in Appendix B; and**
- (e) **the amended Local Development Scheme comes into force on 19 January 2017;**

Reason for Recommendations

To comply with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and amending regulations.

Background Papers

Local Development Scheme March 2016.
Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule November 2016

For further information please contact Matthew Norton on Ext 5852

Kirstin H Cole
Deputy Chief Executive



**NEWARK &
SHERWOOD**
DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Community Infrastructure Levy
Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
Report of Responses**

January 2017

Overview

The District Council went out to consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) for a 6 week period that ended on Friday 9th December 2016. A wide range of consultees with an interest in the Newark and Sherwood District Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) were invited to comment on the PDCS. Comments received from seventeen sources (listed at the end of this document) are summarised below:

Question 1: Do you agree that the infrastructure funding assessment shows that there is sufficient justification for the proposed revisions to be made to the existing Newark and Sherwood Charging Schedule?

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

General support was received for the proposed revisions, comments/concerns included:

- The proposed provisions do not adequately contribute to meeting the requirements of the NPPF or business and developer requirements
- It is premature to review the CIL ahead of the Local Plan review, this is due to the likelihood that infrastructure requirements will be different from those identified on the current Regulation 123 List. It is considered that a review at this time is not properly evidenced and does not satisfy the requirements of Regulation 14 (5) of the CIL Regulations and s211 (7A) of the Planning Act 2008
- Concern raised over the need to zero rate apartments
- Concern raised that ward boundaries is the most appropriate way to assess charging areas in Newark

Officer Response

An assessment has been carried out of the ability of different categories of development within the Local Plan area to make contributions via CIL (having taken account of the cost impacts of affordable housing delivery and other relevant policies). This assessment identifies additional return beyond reasonable allowances this is then the margin available to make CIL contributions.

The CIL Regulations permit the review of a CIL Charging Schedule at any time provided the Development Plan is up to date, the Local Plan is currently being reviewed as part of this review infrastructure specialists have reviewed the infrastructure requirements of the District and produced the (Draft) Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will form part of the CIL evidence base. It is acknowledged that there have been changes to infrastructure provision since the original Regulation 123 list was prepared and that a number of projects have commenced. This is why it is considered a review is needed under the terms of CIL Reg 14(1) (a).

As previously identified when the Community Infrastructure Levy was first adopted by the Council in 2011, there is a very substantial Infrastructure Funding gap and CIL will only partially contribute to meet this gap with residual S106 contributions being sought to support CIL for infrastructure projects that are not identified by the Reg 123 List. This gap is highly unlikely to be bridged by changes identified by a review of the Local Plan to the extent that CIL charges would exceed the level of funding required to meet infrastructure needs.

It is a matter for the Authority to determine the appropriate balance in accordance with CIL Reg 14 (1) (a) of raising funds to support the infrastructure required to support development and the effects of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area. This is what the CIL review is seeking to achieve.

CIL Reg 14(5) states that for the purposes of section 211(7A) of PA 2008(1), a charging authority's draft infrastructure list is appropriate evidence to inform the preparation of their charging schedule. As such it is considered that the updated schedule of infrastructure requirements and costs prepared in July 2016 represents appropriate evidence to inform review of the CIL Charging Schedule.

In addition The Business Manager – Planning Policy contacted PINS with the following request:

“We are currently reviewing both our Community Infrastructure Levy and the two DPD's (Core Strategy and Allocations & DM Policies) which make up our development plan. Initially we had aimed to synchronise both reviews (as set out in our LDS) however for various reasons work on the Plan Review is delayed. The Council is keen that the delays in the Plan Review do not unnecessarily delay the CIL Review. I am mindful when I last spoke to PINS about this matter I was advised that it is best to run a CIL review alongside Plan Review with the CIL Examination following on afterwards. Do you think it would be at all possible that we could conclude the CIL Review first?

I say this in the knowledge that:

- We are not talking about a new Development Plan just a review of the existing policies and proposals
- Infrastructure requirements and provision is broadly similar both now and looking forward post review
- Our initial viability work for the Plan and CIL is suggesting that industrial development can no longer bear a charge and therefore we do not want to create a situation where development is delayed whilst developers wait for an amended CIL Charging Schedule”

Andy Gadsby from the PINS CIL team responded to the Business Manager – Planning Policy accordingly:

“Where possible, it is best for a CIL examination to be dealt with alongside or shortly after the Local Plan examination. However, I note that you are keen to progress your CIL review ahead of the other Plans because of delays to them.

This is a subject that has been raised a number of times by Local Authorities and our general advice is that we don't rule out progressing a CIL examination ahead of a Local Plan. Indeed, we have recently examined the CIL for South Downs NPA despite the fact that their Local Plan is not expected to be submitted for at least another year or so. In saying this, however, it is worth considering that the matters would need to be fairly straightforward, with CIL rates being reasonably simple and not dependant on any proposals in an emerging plan. There shouldn't be any big infrastructure projects that might be questioned later in the Local Plan examination and the CIL rates would also to be backed up by up to date evidence.

Provided the above criteria is met it should be possible to examine your CIL review ahead of your two Plan documents, particularly as this is a review rather than an all new Charging Schedule and that your current Plan dates back only 5 years.”

Considering the criteria in Mr Gadsby’s email in turn;

The matters would need to be fairly straightforward. In essence the recommendations of the National CIL Service have resulted in some simplifications to the charging zones and the only changes of significance relate to the zero rating of Bridge, Devon and Balderton South wards and apartment development and commercial development across the District.

CIL rates being reasonably simple and not dependant on any proposals in an emerging plan. The CIL rates are relatively simple and will be charged in the more viable areas of the District. CIL revenues will be driven primarily by development in the Strategic Urban Extensions at Land around Fernwood and Land East of Newark which of course are in existing Plans.

Shouldn’t be any big infrastructure projects that might be questioned later in the Local Plan examination. We will continue to ask for strategic infrastructure as we currently define it, namely strategic highway projects and secondary education provision. Given that the plan remains broadly the same accommodating the impacts of Thoresby Colliery will be the only major change. It is likely therefore that in terms of strategic infrastructure the Council will need to decide how best to fund improvements to Ollerton roundabout. Whilst this infrastructure project is not currently identified on the Regulation 123 list it is already known about and to some extent whether or not it is funded by the Thoresby Colliery redevelopment or CIL contributions it will still need to be delivered in the Plan period.

CIL rates would also to be backed up by up to date evidence. The National CIL Service has carried out an up-to-date assessment of the viability and valuation evidence as part of the process. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being updated as part of the Plan Review and is substantially completed.

It is concluded that on the tests set out by Mr Gadsby in his email, the Council is able to demonstrate that the CIL review can progress ahead of the Plan Review.

Based on the viability evidence, it would only be possible to justify charging for development of apartments in the highest zone. It is considered that this is a matter for each Authority, in setting CIL rates, to determine its approach and appropriate balance. The CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance do not require that viability appraisal evidence is specifically adhered to in setting CIL rates, only that the rate that is adopted does not threaten the viability or delivery of the relevant type of development.

The District Council has considered various charging zone options and in a diverse District such as ours whatever methods are used to divide it up there will always be anomalies created by the nature of administrative boundaries. Wards are the building blocks for much of the statistical information used to determine CIL levels and therefore represent the most appropriate method to split charging areas.

Question 2: Bearing in mind that CIL cannot be negotiated do you have any views on whether CIL receipts should continue to only be collected for specific highway improvements and secondary education and whether you consider funding for any additional infrastructure types should be collected from CIL receipts. Should Section 106 planning obligations be scaled back further?

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

It was generally considered that Section 106 should not be scaled back and that CIL should continue to be collected for secondary education and specific highway improvements, comments/concerns included:

- An increase in CIL levy will result in a further scaling back of S106 obligations as less planning gain will be available and as a consequence less provision of local infrastructure
- Some support for additional projects to be funded by CIL include: Flood mitigation, primary education, town centre management and some healthcare provision.
- An adequate mechanism should be introduced between the District and County Council to ensure that monies are forwarded in sufficient timescales and amounts for the funding of secondary education and highway projects as detailed on the Regulation 123 List.

Officer Response

Under CIL developers are still required to provide 'on-site' infrastructure through Section 106 contributions to mitigate direct impact of the development proposed.

Infrastructure to be funded by CIL will be assessed in more detail at Draft Charging Schedule Stage in accordance with infrastructure needs and funding gap identified in the Draft IDP. Any increase in the range of infrastructure types needs to be considered in the context of the existing infrastructure funding gap which CIL aims to help address, increasing the types of infrastructure will not increase the amount of CIL receipts; furthermore Town & Parish Council's receive a meaningful proportion of CIL from new development (where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place this is 25% of receipts) which they can spend on infrastructure as they see fit.

The District Council will ensure that the most appropriate mechanism for spending/transferring of CIL receipts is adopted which will be in accordance with the priority of projects detailed on the Regulation 123 List.

Question 3: Do you consider that the key assumptions that underlie the viability evidence are appropriate? If not what alternative assumptions would you suggest and why?

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

There was some support for the appropriateness of key assumptions comments/concerns included:

- Strong objection to the approach of a single retail charging zone was raised by consultees with a specific interest in retail development. Scale of development and type of retail e.g. convenience/comparison should be a factor when determining charging zones.
- Viability evidence has not taken into account the difference in costs of a full range of size of proposals and assumption made do not reflect local costs and prices.
- Concern with regard to a ward based approach for determining zones in Newark
- Viability assessments do not reflect the local market conditions, and should be open book to allow community audit

Officer Response

It is acknowledged that, based on the viability evidence, it might be possible to justify higher rates for food retail use but it is considered that this is a matter for each Authority, in setting CIL rates, to determine its approach and appropriate balance. The CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance do not require that viability appraisal evidence is specifically adhered to in setting CIL rates, only that the rate that is adopted does not threaten the viability or delivery of the relevant type of development. There is no evidence put forward to suggest the proposed rate of £100sqm is not viable for both food and non-food retail which is considered to be the key consideration.

An assessment has been carried out of the ability of different categories of development within the Local Plan area to make contributions via CIL (having taken account of the cost impacts of affordable housing delivery and other relevant policies). This assessment identifies additional return beyond reasonable allowances this is then the margin available to make CIL contributions.

Further work will be carried out to investigate the potential of different routes to consider the appropriateness of splitting retail charging rates and any potential impact of small scale retail needs.

Question 4: Do you agree that differential residential rates across the District are beneficial? If you disagree please give reasons?

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

There was general support for the appropriateness of the reduced number of Charging Zones and differential residential rates across the District comments/concerns included:

- Proposed rates are being set to promote development in some areas and discourage in other areas, with the outcome of less/more affordable housing being delivered in specific parts of the District
- Proposed Charging Zones do not reflect the policy areas or the housing market areas utilised in the current LDF or the emerging Local Plan Review.
- Concern that Ward boundaries do not reflect the actuality of land value, deprivation or housing need in Newark.
- Zones should be spread more equally across the district to encourage a variety of development and avoid over development in some areas.

Officer Response

An assessment has been carried out of the ability of different categories of development within the Local Plan area to make contributions via CIL (having taken account of the cost impacts of affordable housing delivery and other relevant policies). This assessment identifies additional return beyond reasonable allowances this is then the margin available to make CIL contributions.

The District Council considers that the proposed Charging Zones do reflect the policy areas of the emerging local plan review. Affordable Housing Target Areas are identified and set out in the Preferred Approach Strategy that was consulted on in September 2016.

The District Council has considered various charging zone options and in a diverse District such as ours whatever methods are used to divide it up there will always be anomalies created by the nature of administrative boundaries. Wards are the building blocks for much of the statistical information used to determine CIL levels and therefore represent the most appropriate method to split charging areas.

Question 5: Do you agree with the removal of a CIL charge for commercial development with the exception of retail (A1 to A5 use) and a single Districtwide rate for retail, if you disagree please give reasons?

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

There was some support for zero rating 'Industrial' commercial use and strong objection from interested parties in respect of a single retail Charging Zone. Comments/concerns included:

- There is a fundamental issue with a single retail rate that does not differentiate between size and scale of retail floorspace. There is a clear difference between the viability of supermarkets and smaller stores. Supermarkets should be charged at a higher rate than smaller convenience stores.
- Most towns are struggling with occupying retail space, national operators have the choice of where to operate and CIL can put Newark at a disadvantage when compared to other towns that do not operate a CIL.
- The County Council requested a forecast of CIL receipts utilising the proposed revised CIL rates and affordable housing policy in order to better understand any funding gap.
- Commercial development should contribute towards CIL as they will benefit from infrastructure improvements

Officer Response

It is acknowledged that, based on the viability evidence, it might be possible to justify higher rates for food retail use but it is considered that this is a matter for each Authority, in setting CIL rates, to determine its approach and appropriate balance. The CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance do not require that viability appraisal evidence is specifically adhered to in setting CIL rates, only that the rate that is adopted does not threaten the viability or delivery of the relevant type of development. There is no evidence put forward to suggest the proposed rate of £100sqm is not viable for both food and non-food retail which is considered to be the key consideration.

Further work will however be carried out to investigate the potential of different routes to consider the appropriateness of splitting retail charging rates and any potential impact of small scale retail needs.

The District Council will provide forecasts of CIL Receipts and a revised Regulation 123 List at Draft Stage that will inform the potential infrastructure delivery funding gap.

The viability appraisal evidence that has been prepared demonstrates that all non-residential uses tested, with the exception of retail use, cannot viably support CIL charges at this time. The suggestion that all uses should contribute to infrastructure costs is not supported by the CIL Regulations or statutory guidance. CIL charges must be based on an ability to for the relevant category of development to contribute whilst maintaining a competitive return to the developer and landowner.

Question 6: Do you support the proposed rates in the PDCS Tables? Please explain your reasoning

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

There was some support for the proposed revised rates concern was also raised that the proposed rates were too high; comments/concerns included:

- Increased rates will reduce the viability of some sites which will result in either less development or less affordable housing delivery
- Rates should be varied for retail development in accordance with size, scale and use. This is an approach taken by other charging authorities.
- Rates are too high when compared with neighbouring areas and similar economic markets
- The definition of 'Low Zone' should be amended to clarify the fact that it is 'Zero' rated
- The rural market is too buoyant and CIL should be increased even higher in these areas to alleviate pressures

Officer Response

An assessment has been carried out of the ability of different categories of development within the Local Plan area to make contributions via CIL (having taken account of the cost impacts of affordable housing delivery and other relevant policies). This assessment identifies additional return beyond reasonable allowances this is then the margin available to make CIL contributions.

It is acknowledged that, based on the viability evidence, it might be possible to justify higher rates for food retail use but it is considered that this is a matter for each Authority, in setting CIL rates, to determine its approach and appropriate balance. The CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance do not require that viability appraisal evidence is specifically adhered to in setting CIL rates, only that the rate that is adopted does not threaten the viability or delivery of the relevant type of development. There is no evidence put forward to suggest the proposed rate of £100sqm is not viable for both food and non-food retail which is considered to be the key consideration.

It is noted that the definition of 'Low Zone' should be amended to clarify the fact that it is 'Zero' rated.

Question 7: Do you agree that the existing Phased Payments Policy is suitable and if not what amendments would you suggest?

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

There was general agreement for the existing Phased Payment Policy comments/concerns included:

- Consideration should be given to a maximum payment period and incentive for early completion
- The trigger for payment should be occupation and not commencement as this is when value is created

Officer Response

The District Council operates a phasing policy for CIL payments, Government CIL regulations require that payment is triggered on commencement of development and not occupancy.

Additional Comments: Do you have any additional comments to make about the contents of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS)

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

A number of additional comments were raised that could not be categorised within the specific questions comments/concerns included:

- Notts County Council have raised concern with regard to the highways position stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that has not as yet been agreed by the County Council
- Notts County Council have raised concern that the District Council is treating the whole area as one planning area, and that secondary education places should actually be agreed on a site by site basis
- Concern over potential for payment in kind due to the District Council's current policy in actively seeking to devolve land ownership responsibility
- The Regulation 123 List should be updated to reflect the proposals for the A46

Officer Response

The Notts County Council concern with regard to the highways position stated in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is noted. The document that formed part of this consultation was the Draft IDP the Final IDP will inform the next stage.

The Notts County Council concern with regard to the District Council treating the whole area as one plan area and that secondary education should places should be agreed on a site by site basis is noted. On-going work will identify requirements for catchment areas.

'Payment in Kind' forms part of Government CIL legislation it is for each collecting authority to determine on a case by case basis whether it is appropriate. The Regulation 123 List will be updated to reflect infrastructure requirements as part of the review.

It is agreed that the Regulation 123 List should be updated to reflect the proposals for the A46 this will be actioned at Draft stage.

List of Respondents

Balderton Parish Council; Barnby in the Willows Parish Council; Barton Wilmore on behalf of Urban and Civic; Cerda Planning on behalf of Marston's Estates Ltd; Coddington Parish Council; Collingham Parish Council; Gusto Group; Harlaxton Estates; Highways England; Lincolnshire County Council; A. Northcote; Newark Town Council; Nottinghamshire County Council; Planning Potential on behalf of Aldi; Councillor Rouse; Southwell Town Council; Taylor Lindsey Limited;

Local Development Scheme Timetable

Year	2016												2017												2018											
Quarter	1 st			2 nd			3 rd			4 th			1 st			2 nd			3 rd			4 th														
Month	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
DPDs																																				
Adopted DPDs – Plan Review																																				
SPDs																																				
Review of SPD implementation																																				
Other Documents																																				
Community Infrastructure Levy Review																																				

Key

DPDs and NPs Bold text denotes a Key Milestone	Consultation period/following the Publication of the Submission Draft/Draft Charging Schedule, this would refer to the period for representations to be submitted		Pre-Hearing meeting period	
	Publish Draft DPD/CIL charging schedule/NP		Hearing and Reporting Period	
	Submit DPD/CIL/NP for Examination		Receipt of Final Inspector’s Report	
			Adoption	
			Review of DPD/SPD Implementation	
SPDs/SCI	Consultation Period		Adoption	

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18 - 2021/22

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To inform the Committee of the budget and scales of fees & charges for those areas falling under the remit of the Economic Development Committee for 2017/18 and future years.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 Business Managers and service budget officers have been working with officers from Financial Services to determine a first draft general fund budget and medium term financial plan. The budgets have been prepared in line with the strategy agreed by Policy & Finance Committee on 22 September 2016.

- 2.2 As part of the budget strategy it was agreed that the functional Committees be requested to look at opportunities for savings in 2017/18, and also any investment potentials which would increase and support revenue income levels, in order to reduce the projected burdens in future years. As part of the 2015/16 final accounts process a sum of £300,000 was identified from savings made during the year and it was recommended that this should be set aside to fund initiatives which would achieve future savings for the authority. Members of this Committee are asked to identify any 'spend to save' initiatives in order that these can be considered by the Policy and Finance Committee and funded from this reserve.

- 2.2 The Economic Development Committee met on 23 November 2016 to scrutinise the budget and continue to look for ways to achieve further savings in 2017/18 and future years. The budget proposals attached at **Appendix A** have been developed following consideration by the Committee.

- 2.3 It was agreed that Business Managers should continue to work with officers from Financial Services to formulate a final budget for submission to Policy & Finance Committee on 23 February 2017. The current budget proposals are attached at **Appendix A**. A schedule of fees and charges pertaining to Economic Development Committee are attached at **Appendix B**.

3.0 Revenue Budget Proposals

- 3.1 The current draft budget shows a decrease in 2017/18. Direct service expenditure including deferred and capital charges and all central services recharges currently shows an overall decrease of £113,790 against 2016/17 budget. When central recharges and capital are excluded this becomes a saving of £33,990. Capital charges have decreased by £37,570 and central support services by £42,230.

- 3.2 A budget briefing was presented to an informal meeting of this Committee on Thursday, 15 December 2016. At the briefing a number of savings were suggested by officers and these have been incorporated into the figures presented in this report. The potential savings comprise:

	£
Newark Castle – Marketing	1,000
Lincoln Road Sports Hall – R&R	1,000
Sconce and Devon Park – R&R	2,000
Community Infrastructure Levy – Income	10,000
Environmental Schemes – Grants	7,000
Newark BIC – Income	10,000
Burma Road Workshop	410
Economic Growth – Tractivity	4,000
Newark Car Parks – Advertising	4,500
Newark Car Parks – Additional Income	10,000
Newark Lorry Park – Income (£14.50)	40,000
Newark Lorry Park – Expenditure	(20,000)
	<hr/>
Net Saving (included in budget)	69,910

- 3.3 This budget figure includes an average of 2% inflation on expenditure and income, as approved by the Economic Development Committee at its meeting on 22 September 2016. It also assumes a 1% increase in salary and wages costs overall in 2017/18 and future years.
- 3.4 Staffing costs account for approximately 51% of the gross service budget (excluding capital and central recharges) and significant budget savings cannot be achieved without affecting staffing levels.
- 3.5 Major variances between 2016/17 and 2017/18 are shown below:
- 3.5.1 The budget for Heritage Culture & Visitors has increased by £100,650. It should be noted that there has been a large reduction in capital charges and an increase in central recharges which nets off to an increase of £116,240. A review of current income levels, footfall and visitor spend has resulted in a need to reduce income targets. The business manager continues to look at initiatives to attract more visitors to the National Civil War Centre – Newark Museum & the town as a whole.
- 3.5.2 The budgets for Sherwood TIC and Southwell TIC have been merged with the Promotion of Tourism budget generating an overall saving for the budget.
- 3.5.3 Development Management and Planning Policy show a slight increase in staffing costs, including the impact of the National Insurance changes which were included ‘below the line’ in the 2016/17 budget. The largest increase is as a result of the changes in the reallocation of the costs of Technical Administration.
- 3.5.4 The apparent ‘saving’ in the budget for Community Infrastructure Levy is mainly due to a reduction in the recharges from the Legal Section. This reduction will be met by an increase elsewhere in the overall budget. The increase in income of £10,000 referred to in paragraph 3.2 above is also reflected in this budget.
- 3.5.5 The Newark Business Innovation Centre net cost has been reduced as a result of recent improvements at the centre and increase in occupancy levels.

- 3.5.6 The approved budget for Economic Growth for 2016/17 included one off amounts for Inward Investment Marketing (£15,000) and Employment & Skills (£47,000) for that year only.
- 3.5.7 Southwell car parks & market operation have now been transferred to the Town Council under a devolution agreement.
- 3.5.8 The saving on Newark Lorry Park comes as a result of increased income, partly from the increase in the parking fee, but also as a result of less spaces being lost than anticipated from the new build.
- 3.5.9 A detailed copy of individual service budgets is available on the Members' Extranet.

4.0 Fees and Charges

- 4.1 The level of fees and charges has been considered by officers within the framework set out in the Corporate Charging Policy. Proposals for increases in fees and charges are attached at **Appendix B** for consideration and recommendation to Policy & Finance Committee on 23 February 2017 and Council on 9 March 2017.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1 It is important that the Committee continues to scrutinise and review its budget in order to achieve additional savings in future years at a time when the Council is facing reducing government grants and other financial pressures.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS that:

- (a) Members consider the savings set out in 3.2 and determine whether these should be included into the revenue budget; and**
- (b) the final Committee budget as shown at Appendix A (subject to (a) above) be recommended to Policy & Finance Committee at its meeting on 23 February 2017 for inclusion in the overall council budget; and**
- (c) the scales of fees and charges as shown at Appendix B be recommended to Policy & Finance Committee at its meeting on 23 February 2017 and Council on 9 March 2017.**

Reason for Recommendations

To ensure that the final budget proposals for 2017/18 to 2020/21 and level of fees and charges for 2017/18 are recommended to Policy & Finance Committee on 23 February 2017.

Background Papers - Detailed budget papers available on the Members' Extranet

For further information please contact Nicky Lovely on Extension 5317 or Amanda Wasilewski on Extension 5738.

Nicky Lovely
Business Manager and Chief Financial Officer – Financial Services

BUDGET SUMMARY
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CODE	DESCRIPTION	2016/17 INITIAL BUDGET	2017/18 BASE BUDGET	MORE/(LESS)	2018/19 BASE BUDGET	2019/20 BASE BUDGET	2020/21 BASE BUDGET	2021/22 BASE BUDGET
A10104	GILSTRAP INTERPRETATION CENTR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A10105	NEWARK CASTLE/CASTLE GROUNDS	77,500	78,580	1,080	79,990	81,390	82,310	83,510
A10108	RESOURCE CENTRE. MUSEUMS	52,270	49,530	(2,740)	50,350	51,190	51,880	52,660
A10109	HERITAGE, CULTURE & VISITORS	685,360	786,010	100,650	788,200	804,830	805,410	813,130
A10813	LAND CHARGES	0	(960)	(960)	(80)	(70)	(90)	(70)
A11314	LINCOLN ROAD SPORTS HALL	35,550	46,370	10,820	46,840	47,220	47,570	47,940
A11331	PARKS AND PLAYING FIELDS	165,950	154,600	(11,350)	171,300	177,810	179,560	188,140
A11334	PRIVATE ESTATES	47,730	51,670	3,940	61,110	62,700	63,450	65,750
A11335	CLOSED CHURCHYARDS	15,820	16,660	840	17,680	18,020	18,200	18,430
A11336	VICAR WATER PARK	94,070	102,310	8,240	104,000	104,860	105,520	106,260
A11337	COMMUNITY FACILITIES MGMT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A11338	SCONCE & DEVON PARK	170,550	173,920	3,370	183,970	187,430	188,960	191,390
A11570	SOUTHWELL TIC	6,900	0	(6,900)	0	0	0	0
A11571	SHERWOOD TIC	64,400	0	(64,400)	0	0	0	0
A11573	PROMOTION OF TOURISM	58,590	100,150	41,560	100,170	100,180	100,190	100,200
A11574	SHERWOOD YOUTH HOSTEL	(14,090)	(17,680)	(3,590)	(17,650)	(17,640)	(17,620)	(17,610)
A11601	GROWTH TECHNICAL SUPPORT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A11603	BUILDING CONTROL FEE EARNING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A11604	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT	228,750	305,640	76,890	334,300	347,640	360,210	373,620
A11605	PLANNING POLICY	302,630	327,330	24,700	321,130	325,200	327,960	331,480
A11606	BUILDING CONTROL	143,380	133,780	(9,600)	123,990	117,220	117,360	117,510
A11610	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK	55,950	57,820	1,870	57,370	58,510	59,650	60,830
A11611	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY	79,180	28,010	(51,170)	28,480	29,490	30,210	30,990
A11702	ENVIRONMENTAL SCHEMES	55,860	46,980	(8,880)	50,590	51,730	52,150	52,970
A11810	NEWARK BUSINESS INNOVATION CEN	118,800	84,350	(34,450)	85,520	86,580	87,670	88,750
A11813	SUTTON ON TRENT WORKSHOPS	(20,720)	(17,230)	3,490	(16,770)	(16,610)	(16,430)	(16,350)
A11814	BLIDWORTH WORKSHOPS	(30,570)	(25,780)	4,790	(25,330)	(25,140)	(24,950)	(24,860)
A11815	BOUGHTON WORKSHOPS	(19,780)	(24,310)	(4,530)	(24,090)	(23,970)	(23,850)	(23,790)
A11816	CHURCH FARM WORKSHOPS	(9,670)	(7,440)	2,230	(7,080)	(6,950)	(6,790)	(6,710)
A11817	BILSTHORPE WORKSHOPS	(20,110)	(23,390)	(3,280)	(23,200)	(23,100)	(23,000)	(22,950)
A11818	BURMA ROAD WORKSHOPS	(10,130)	(9,960)	170	(9,880)	(9,850)	(9,810)	(9,770)
A11820	BLIDWORTH INDUSTRIAL PARK	2,390	3,330	940	3,400	3,430	3,470	3,490
A11821	CLIPSTONE WORKSHOPS	(17,670)	(20,280)	(2,610)	(20,010)	(19,890)	(19,770)	(19,700)
A11822	BOUGHTON ADVANCE FACTORY	(31,940)	(30,660)	1,280	(30,620)	(30,600)	(30,580)	(30,550)
A11823	CLIPSTONE ADVANCED FACTORIES	(28,690)	(25,880)	2,810	(25,650)	(25,530)	(25,450)	(25,390)
A11824	SHERWOOD FOREST CRAFT CENTRE	33,030	31,710	(1,320)	33,950	34,820	35,640	36,050
A11826	CLIPSTONE HOLDING CENTRE	(1,040)	(3,000)	(1,960)	(2,910)	(2,850)	(2,810)	(2,780)
A11828	BLIDWORTH ADVANCE FACTORIES	(27,190)	(26,820)	370	(26,670)	(26,590)	(26,510)	(26,460)
A11829	KEEPERS COTTAGE	(6,390)	1,640	8,030	3,540	3,590	3,640	3,670
A11830	20 BALDERTONGATE	5,760	0	(5,760)	0	0	0	0
A11851	ECONOMIC GROWTH	356,130	298,530	(57,600)	301,380	303,740	305,920	308,300
A12001	CAR PARKS & MARKETS ADMIN	0	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)
A12011	SURFACE CAR PARKS NEWARK	(493,970)	(505,870)	(11,900)	(499,720)	(495,070)	(490,790)	(486,180)
A12012	SURFACE CAR PARKS SOUTHWELL	20,930	0	(20,930)	0	0	0	0
A12014	NEWARK LORRY PARK	(126,770)	(214,290)	(87,520)	(211,690)	(209,520)	(207,390)	(205,220)
A12019	SURFACE CAR PARK OLLERTON	11,590	9,960	(1,630)	10,090	10,230	10,330	10,440
A12211	RIVERSIDE ARENA MARKET	750	(1,450)	(2,200)	(2,280)	(2,200)	(2,100)	(2,010)
A12213	SOUTHWELL OPEN MARKET	15,490	0	(15,490)	0	0	0	0
A12401	OTHER PROPERTIES & WSHOP VOIDS	67,190	71,020	3,830	72,930	73,510	74,110	71,070
A12506	GROWTH INVESTMENT FUND	74,010	72,930	(1,080)	73,300	73,370	73,430	73,500
A15002	CREW LANE DEPOT	(15,260)	(14,600)	660	(14,480)	(14,430)	(14,390)	(14,350)
A15023	GROUND MAINTENANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		2,172,520	2,058,730	(113,790)	2,140,970	2,200,180	2,237,970	2,290,830

BUDGET SUMMARY
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUBJECTIVE SUMMARY

CODE	DESCRIPTION	2016/17 INITIAL BUDGET	2017/18 BASE BUDGET	More (Less)	2018/19 BASE BUDGET	2019/20 BASE BUDGET	2020/21 BASE BUDGET	2021/22 BASE BUDGET
111	SALARIES AND WAGES	2,303,670	2,112,050	(191,620)	2,131,500	2,153,030	2,174,560	2,196,410
113	NATIONAL INSURANCE	153,180	188,410	35,230	191,910	194,330	196,750	199,200
114	SUPERANNUATION	266,820	237,280	(29,540)	239,500	241,920	244,360	246,830
	EMPLOYEE SUB TOTAL	2,723,670	2,537,740	(185,930)	2,562,910	2,589,280	2,615,670	2,642,440
211	REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE	114,490	112,670	(1,820)	111,960	112,840	113,740	114,660
212	ENERGY COSTS	148,460	128,720	(19,740)	128,310	129,900	131,540	133,210
213	RENT	166,380	124,490	(41,890)	124,600	124,720	124,840	124,960
214	RATES	118,350	108,190	(10,160)	109,610	111,050	112,510	114,000
215	WATER SERVICES	26,930	21,180	(5,750)	21,410	21,640	21,870	22,110
216	FIXTURES AND FITTING	200	0	(200)	0	0	0	0
217	CLEANING AND DOMESTIC	1,150	1,170	20	1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170
219	CONTRIBUTION TO FUNDS	199,850	179,920	(19,930)	180,220	180,520	180,830	181,140
311	TRANSPORT	76,480	75,290	(1,190)	78,180	82,260	84,220	86,310
313	CONTRACT HIRE OP LEASE	350	0	(350)	0	0	0	0
315	CAR ALLOWANCES	34,120	18,350	(15,770)	18,590	18,840	19,070	19,330
316	INSURANCE	11,620	11,110	(510)	11,300	11,610	11,830	12,030
411	EQUIPMENT AND FURNITURE	17,490	16,080	(1,410)	16,180	16,280	16,380	16,480
412	MATERIALS	19,600	19,300	(300)	19,580	19,910	20,260	20,620
421	INTERNAL	77,040	59,030	(18,010)	59,030	59,030	59,030	59,030
431	CLOTHING AND UNIFORMS	7,830	6,790	(1,040)	6,890	6,990	7,090	7,190
441	GENERAL OFFICE EXPENSES	192,810	153,960	(38,850)	154,100	154,240	154,380	154,520
451	CONTRACTUAL	346,690	489,380	142,690	483,570	480,690	483,770	487,490
452	OTHER SERVICES	244,760	249,210	4,450	258,240	260,410	262,610	264,870
453	LEASING PREMIUMS	347,490	0	(347,490)	0	0	0	0
461	COMMUNICATIONS AND COMPUTING	67,800	53,240	(14,560)	53,610	53,970	54,340	54,720
471	STAFF	10,160	9,000	(1,160)	9,050	9,110	9,170	9,230
481	GRANTS	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	0	0
482	SUBSCRIPTIONS	8,230	5,540	(2,690)	5,610	5,680	5,750	5,830
491	INSURANCE	71,640	82,540	10,900	84,500	86,750	88,330	90,010
492	CONTRIBS TO FUNDS AND PROVISNS	70,910	23,990	(46,920)	24,070	24,150	24,230	24,310
493	OTHER	602,440	517,050	(85,390)	529,880	540,730	541,590	542,470
497	DISCOUNTS	8,360	11,360	3,000	10,160	8,960	7,730	6,490
711	ADMIN BUILDINGS	395,770	357,940	(37,830)	394,460	406,660	410,460	418,390
712	CENTRAL DEPARTMENT SUPPORT	921,280	900,710	(20,570)	925,830	936,150	943,830	952,550
713	CSS MONTHLY PERCENTAGE RECHGS	21,540	21,700	160	21,930	22,210	22,490	22,830
714	CENTRAL EXPENSES	0	900	900	900	900	900	900
715	DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	510,510	484,620	(25,890)	496,190	502,870	509,040	515,880
821	CAPITAL CHARGE	381,550	343,980	(37,570)	323,470	323,750	313,050	309,010
	RUNNING EXPENSES SUB TOTAL	5,232,280	4,597,410	(634,870)	4,662,600	4,713,990	4,736,050	4,771,740
922	Contributions From Other Las	(112,930)	(115,490)	(2,560)	(115,490)	(115,490)	(115,490)	(115,490)
924	Parish Council Contributions	(8,570)	0	8,570	0	0	0	0
928	Recharge Non Gf Accounts	(254,260)	(204,770)	49,490	(200,200)	(199,210)	(199,430)	(193,500)
931	Sales	(465,740)	(325,110)	140,630	(325,110)	(325,110)	(325,110)	(325,110)
932	Fees And Charges	(2,955,820)	(2,623,270)	332,550	(2,625,930)	(2,628,640)	(2,631,410)	(2,634,230)
933	Rents	(898,680)	(659,940)	238,740	(653,110)	(653,210)	(653,300)	(653,400)
938	Fees And Charges	(78,430)	(176,520)	(98,090)	(176,520)	(176,520)	(176,520)	(176,520)
939	Other Receipts	(139,190)	(150,970)	(11,780)	(150,970)	(150,970)	(150,970)	(150,970)
951	Recharge Gf Rev Accounts	(849,200)	(808,200)	41,000	(826,740)	(844,200)	(852,650)	(866,070)
961	Revenue Appropriation Adjust	(20,610)	(12,150)	8,460	(10,470)	(9,740)	(8,870)	(8,060)
	INCOME SUB TOTAL	(5,783,430)	(5,076,420)	707,010	(5,084,540)	(5,103,090)	(5,113,750)	(5,123,350)
	COMMITTEE TOTAL	2,172,520	2,058,730	(113,790)	2,140,970	2,200,180	2,237,970	2,290,830

PLANNING FEES & CHARGES – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Development Category	Previous charge	Proposed charge
<p>DO I NEED PLANNING PERMISSION REQUESTS</p> <p>EXEMPTION 1 – DOMESTIC DWELLINGS/ HOUSEHOLDER ENQUIRIES</p> <p>To obtain a view from the Authority as to whether planning permission is required for a an extension to a dwelling or the erection of a building or structure within the garden area (this could include but not be exclusive of a detached garage, erection of fencing, erection of decking, etc.)</p>	<p>Fixed Charge of £48</p> <p>This would cover one letter £40+VAT</p>	<p>£57 (£47.5+VAT)</p>
<p>EXEMPTION 2 – COMMERCIAL ENQUIRIES</p> <p>To obtain a view from the Authority as to whether planning permission is required for a development proposal (which could include an extension, alteration to an elevation, change in levels) or a change of use</p>	<p>Fixed Charge of £48</p> <p>This would cover one letter £40+VAT</p>	<p>£57 (£47.50+VAT)</p>
<p>PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE ON A DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL</p> <p>New floor-space or change of use of 10,000 square metres or more or where the site area is 2 hectares or more.</p> <p>Development subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).</p>	<p>Fixed charge of £1,200</p> <p>(£1,000+VAT)</p>	<p>Fixed charge of £1,380</p> <p>(£1,150+VAT). This would cover a site visit, up to 3 no. 1 hour meetings) with the case officer and one letter. Schemes requiring a larger Officer input to be agreed on a bespoke basis by the Business Manager, Growth and Development</p>
<p>CATEGORY A – LARGE SCALE MAJOR DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Residential development of 200 or more dwellings or where the site area is 4 hectares or more.</p>	<p>£1,500</p> <p>(£1,250+VAT)</p>	<p>£1,680</p> <p>(£1,400+VAT)</p>
<p>CATEGORY B – SMALL SCALE MAJOR DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Residential development of between 10 and 199 dwellings (inclusive)</p>	<p>£840</p> <p>(£700+VAT)</p>	<p>£900</p> <p>(£750+VAT)</p>
<p>CATEGORY C – SMALL SCALE OTHER DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <p>Residential development of between 2 and 9 dwellings or where the site area is below 0.5 hectares.</p>	<p>£480</p> <p>(£400+VAT)</p>	<p>£498</p> <p>(£415+VAT)</p>
<p>CATEGORY D – All OTHER DEVELOPMENT AND CONSENTS NOT WITHIN CATEGORIES A TO C BUT EXCLUDING HOUSEHOLDER DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <p>1 new dwelling.</p> <p>New floor space or change of use of less than 300 sqm</p> <p>Advert Consent.</p>	<p>£180</p> <p>(£150+VAT)</p>	<p>£192</p> <p>(£160+VAT)</p>

CATEGORY E – WIND TURBINES	£1,200 (£1,000+VAT)	£1,200 (£1,000+VAT)
NEW CATEGORY F – HOUSE HOLDER APPLICATIONS works to a house or within its garden. (NB. a fee DOES NOT apply to Listed Buildings in domestic use, for maintenance and repair advice (unless part of a redevelopment proposal – see pre-app categories above), or if the building represents heritage at risk (e.g. if on a risk register and/or in a Conservation Area at risk)	NIL	£57 (£47.50+VAT) unless an exemption has advised that planning permissions required. In which case advice on likely acceptability can be obtained for £24 (£20+VAT).

In instances where a development proposal may fall within 2 no. categories, for example it may also require an associated Listed Building Consent, the higher fee is payable as opposed to an aggregated payment.

Where it is requested and agreed that that a Senior Manager also attends a meeting with the case officer, an additional charge, based on an hourly rate, may be payable.

Where follow-up advice is required an hourly rate will be charged, which shall firstly be agreed by and paid to the Local Planning Authority

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

All of the above charges are inclusive of VAT.

Standard fees plus VAT must be paid on submission of the request for advice.

Payments can be made over the phone by telephoning 01636 650000. Alternatively payment can be made by cheque, which should be made payable to Newark and Sherwood District Council.

SERVICE STANDARDS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Exemptions (Do I need Planning Permission Requests)

Prospective applicants seeking advice as to whether planning permission is required for either a house extension or household development in a garden are required to complete an Exemption Form 1. Those seeking guidance for commercial proposals in terms of establishing whether planning permission is required should complete an Exemption Form 2. Both forms are available on our website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planning/pre-applicationadvice/ and at Kelham Hall. This form sets out the information that is expected from prospective applicants in order for the request to be valid.

All Exemption requests will be responded to wherever possible within 21 days. You will receive acknowledgement of your request for the advice within 1 week of a valid request, unless you are informed otherwise. The Council will advise you if your request is invalid, explaining the reasons why and allowing you time to submit any missing information. Please note that in circumstances where any missing information is not received within 4 weeks of the original submission, the fee will be returned but £25 will be deducted for administration costs.

Pre Application Advice

Prospective applicants seeking exemption or pre-application advice are required to complete either an 'Exemption' or a 'Request for Pre-application Advice' form which is available on our website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planning/pre-applicationadvice/ and at our reception at Kelham Hall. This form sets out the information that is expected from prospective applicants in order for the request to be valid.

Within 1 week of receiving a request for pre-application advice, the service will contact you to confirm:

- that your request for advice has been received;
- that the fee, if submitted with the form, is correct or if a fee has not been submitted with the form, what the fee is;
- any additional information that is required before pre-application advice is offered; and the name of the planning case officer who will be providing the advice.

Where a fee has been submitted for advice without all other necessary information and the additional information is not received within 4 weeks of the original submission, the fee will be returned but £25 will be deducted for administration costs.

The target date for responding to a valid request will be 5 weeks, although this cannot always be guaranteed for more complex schemes.

The case officer will:

- Research the history of the site;
- Undertake an unaccompanied site visit (sometimes we may ask you or a representative to attend to gain access and to fact find);
- Consult with key statutory and non-statutory consultees where applicable;
- Identify and assess the prospective application against Council policies and standards;
- Arrange to attend a meeting with the prospective applicant (normally at the Council Offices) where applicable. Where specialist advice is requested at a meeting, the necessary officers will attend subject to availability.
- Provide a detailed written response in the context of the plans/information provided and meeting discussions which will include a list of supporting documents that would need to be submitted with any application to ensure that it is valid on receipt, a list of possible conditions that could be attached to any similar proposal if submitted (providing that the proposal would not be unacceptable), and details of any responses received from statutory and other consultees through the pre-application process.

Where follow up advice is sought, this must be made in writing and must include the original planning reference given by the Council and clear details of the additional advice being requested. Any such requests will be acknowledged in writing within 1 week and will include an estimate of the cost for the additional advice. If you then wish to proceed the fee must be paid in full prior to any advice being issued.

QUALIFICATION

Any views or opinions expressed are in good faith, without prejudice to the formal consideration of any planning application, which will be subject to public consultation (which will include the relevant Town or Parish Council) and ultimately decided by the Council.

It should be noted that subsequent alterations to legislation or local, regional and national policies might affect the advice given.

Caution should be exercised in respect of pre-application advice for schemes that are not submitted within a short time of the Council's advice letter.

PROCESSING OF SUBSEQUENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The planning service will seek to process applications within the DCLG prescribed timescale. However, applications submitted following pre-application advice may take less time to determine. Applications that have been submitted in the absence of any pre-application discussions are likely to be refused without further negotiation where significant amendments are required to make the development acceptable.

CONTACT US

If you have any queries regarding the pre-application advice service please visit our website <http://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planning/pre-applicationadvice/> or contact us using planning@nsdc.info or telephone 01636 650000.

LAND CHARGES – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Type of Search	Relevant Act or Order	2016-17 Existing	2017-18 Proposed
<p>LLC1 NSDC</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£25.50 This is the area that will go to Land Registry in due course (assuming things do not change) but NSDC will remain responsible for the date and for providing it to Oland Registry</p>	<p>£26 (Note: cannot charge VAT on this search)</p>
<p>Con29 Residential NCC will have input</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£61.50 NCC charged for combined answer to Q5 (which now absorbed into Con 29) and the highway/drainage elements of the Con 29. Charge from NCC is £26 + VAT) See Appendix 1</p>	<p>£62.75 + £10 (difference between £16 NCC have always charged and the £26 NCC now charge) = £72.75 + VAT = £87.30</p>
<p>Con29 Commercial NCC will have input</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£87.00 NCC charged for combined answer to Q5 (which now absorbed into Con 29) and the highway/drainage elements of the Con 29. Charge now £26 + VAT (charge previously was £16 for Con 29 + £20.50 for Q5). See Appendix 1</p>	<p>£88.75 + £10 (difference between £16 NCC have always charged and the £26 NCC now charge) = £98.75 + VAT = 118.50</p>
<p>Con 29 Optional Question Q5. As of 1st July 2016 this question is no longer relevant as a separate charge given that it is part of the revised Con 29 (residential and commercial)</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£20.50</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Optional Question Q22.1(common land/commons green) & 22.2 (obtaining register and inspecting it)</p> <p>NCC only (rights of way)</p> <p>As of 1st July 2016 now a 22.1 (common land/commons green), 22.2 (info on maps and statements), and 22.3 (obtaining register and inspecting it) question.</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£20.50</p> <p>NCC fee prior to 1st July 2016 was £16.00 + NSDC admin charge of £4.50</p> <p>NCC fee now for all questions (you can't ask them individually) is £30.00.</p>	<p>£20.92</p> <p>= £14 (the difference between NCC original charge of £16 and new charge of £30) = £34.92</p> <p>+ VAT = £41.90</p>
<p>Optional Questions Remainder</p> <p>NSDC only deal with questions which relate to us. All other questions are answered by NSDC</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£10.50</p>	<p>£10.71 + VAT = £12.85</p>
<p>Written Enquiries</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£17.50</p>	<p>£17.83 + VAT = £21.40</p>
<p>Additional Parcels</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>£15.50</p>	<p>£16.00 (<i>Note: Additional parcels can only be charged for on LLC1 therefore no VAT added</i>)</p> <p><i>Additional parcels – No guidance available to customer, however advice provided is on the principle that if parcels are separated by a road, river or parcel land then they would be classed as additional parcels.</i></p>
<p>Personal Search</p>	<p>Local Land Charges Act 1975</p>	<p>NIL</p>	<p>NIL</p>

Light Obstruction Notice – Registration Fee for putting on local land charge	Rights of Light Act 1959	£69.00	£70.50 + VAT = £84.60
Expedited Search – Quick return search (3 day turnaround)	Local Land Charges Act 1975	Additional £17.00	£17.50 + VAT = £21.00 Can add VAT for Con 29 element

CON29 Individual requests	Residential Existing (excl. VAT)	Residential Proposed (excl. VAT)	Residential Proposed (incl. VAT)	Commercial Existing (excl. VAT)	Commercial Proposed (excl. VAT)	Commercial Proposed (incl. VAT)
1.1 a-i	14.29	14.50	17.40	23.69	24.21	29.05
1.1 j-l	9.70	10.00	12.00	15.80	16.08	19.30
1.2*	6.75	6.92	8.30	6.75	6.92	8.30
3.1	1.55	1.58	1.90	2.10	2.17	2.60
3.3	2.83	2.92	3.50	4.29	4.50	5.40
3.7	2.83	2.92	3.50	4.29	4.50	5.40
3.8	1.55	1.58	1.90	2.10	2.17	2.60
3.9	1.55	1.58	1.90	2.10	2.17	2.60
3.10**	8.45	8.58	10.30	8.45	8.63	10.35
3.11	1.55	1.58	1.90	2.10	2.17	2.60
3.12	4.28	4.42	5.30	6.24	6.42	7.70
3.13	2.83	2.92	3.50	4.29	4.50	5.40
3.14	2.83	2.92	3.50	4.29	4.50	5.40
3.15**	5.10	5.21	6.25	5.10	5.21	6.25

* New fee to be introduced

**New fee to be introduced as a result of revised CON29 and CON290

Type of Search	LLC1	Full search Residential	Full search Commercial	Con29 Residential	Con29 Commercial	Con290 (per question)	Q22 (Con290)	Expedited Search	Additional Parcel (per individual parcel)
Proposed fee for 2017-18	£26.00	£26.00 + £72.75 = £98.75 + VAT (CON29 only) £113.30	£26.00 + £98.75 = £124.75 + VAT (CON29 only) £144.50	£72.75 + VAT = £87.30	£98.75 + VAT = £118.50	£10.71 + VAT = £12.85	£34.92 + VAT = £41.90	£17.50 + VAT = £21.00	£16.00

CAR PARKS FEES AND CHARGES – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

NEWARK CAR PARKS	2016-17		2017-18	
	Existing		Proposed	
INNER TOWN	30 min	£0.50	30 min	£0.50
London Road	1 hour	£1.00	1 hour	£1.00
Balderton Gate	2 hours	£1.50	2 hours	£1.50
Town Wharf	2-3 hours	£2.50	2-3 hours	£2.50
Newark Market Place (Option)	3-4 hours	£4.50	3-4 hours	£4.50
Appletongate	Over 4 hours	£7.50	Over 4 hours	£7.50
	After 6pm (Evening Charge)	£1.00	After 6pm (Evening Charge)	£1.00
OUTER TOWN				
Riverside (former Tolney Lane)	1 hour	£1.00	1 hour	£1.00
Riverside Arena	2 hours	£1.50	2 hours	£1.50
Livestock Market	2-4 hours	£2.00	2-4 hours	£2.00
	4-5 hours	£2.50	4-5 hours	£2.50
	5 hours and above	£3.00	5 hours and above	£3.00
Dedicated Motorcycle Bay	<p>Motorcycles parking in general bays must purchase and place in the provided facility a pay and display ticket in accordance with the tariffs displayed at each car park. Motorcycles parking in general bays without following this requirement shall be liable to a Penalty Charge Notice.</p> <p>Motorcycles parked in the dedicated motorcycle bay or area will be able to park free but use of these dedicated bays and areas is limited to 8 hours in any 24hr period.</p>			
Newark:				
London Road				
Balderton Gate,				
Town Wharf				
Newark Market Place (Option)				
Appletongate				
Riverside (former Tolney Lane)				
Riverside Arena				
Livestock Market				

LORRY PARKING		
Lorry Parking – Fixed Charge	£13.50	£14.50
Lorry Parking (with meal voucher)	£16.50	£17.50
SEASON TICKETS		
INNER TOWN (Newark)	£84.00	£84.00
(limited issue)	£193	£193
	£700 *	£700 *
OUTER TOWN (Newark)	£47.00 per month	£47.00 per month
(limited issue)	£123 per quarter	£123 per quarter
	£450 per year *	£450 per year *
CONTRACT CAR PARK RATES	£208 per quarter	£208 per quarter
Fixed charge		
The Palace/Barmby Gate		
CONTRACT CAR PARK RATES	Nil	£500 per annum
Fixed charge		
Pelham Street		
Cashless parking is available at all Newark Car Parks with transaction costs to be paid to the transaction provider by customer.		

- *Where businesses/their employees buy more than 1 season ticket a 10% discount in annual cost will apply
- Where businesses/their employees buy, more than 1 contract car parking permit in any year, a 10% discount in annual cost will apply.
- The Business Manager responsible for car parking and markets shall have the discretion, subject to confirmation by the Section 151 Officer, to negotiate and agree a discounted parking charge for multiple lorry parking by the same haulier.
- Event parking fee at any Council Car or Lorry Park shall be £5

RIVERSIDE MARKET – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DAY	ITEM	2016-17 EXISTING	2017-18 PROPOSED
WEDNESDAY	MARKET STALL	£16	£16
	PITCH	£5.30 PER LINEAR METRE	£5.30 PER LINEAR METRE

HERITAGE, CULTURE & VISITORS – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

	2016-17 Existing	2017-18 Proposed
<p>1 <u>Theatre Hire (plus VAT):</u></p> <p><u>With Stage & Dressing Rooms as equipped</u></p> <p><u>Full Theatre : 602 Seats</u></p> <p>Per day with one performance – week days Commercial Hire</p> <p>Per day with one performance - weekends Commercial Hire</p> <p>Per day with two performances - weekdays Commercial Hire</p> <p>Per day with two performances - weekends Commercial Hire</p> <p>Week Hire: Monday-Saturday</p>	<p>£1,500</p> <p>£2,000</p> <p>£2,750</p> <p>£3,250</p> <p>£9,250</p>	<p>£1,500</p> <p>£2,000</p> <p>£2,750</p> <p>£3,250</p> <p>£9,250</p>
<p>2 <u>Non-Profit Making/ Charity/ Local</u></p> <p><u>Available all year Monday-Friday + off-peak weekends (at our discretion but excluding autumn)</u></p> <p><u>Current Stalls - only hirers to be phased into new pricing structure over two years</u></p> <p>There is also an element of flexibility built into the fees and charges for non-profit making bodies, allowing the Theatre’s discretion to offer a further reduction to community groups at a time when the Theatre may well be dark, but mindful that our costs and a profit must be covered.</p> <p>Per day with one performance – week days Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary</p> <p>Per day with one performance – weekends Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary</p> <p>Per day with two performances – week days Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary</p> <p>Per day with two performances – weekends Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary</p>	<p>£1,000</p> <p>£1,500</p> <p>£1,500</p> <p>£2,000</p>	<p>£1,000</p> <p>£1,500</p> <p>£1,500</p> <p>£2,000</p>

	Conference: Full Theatre (Staffing, technical equipment and catering costs on application)	£2,000	£2,000
3	<u>Theatre Hire : supplementary charges per hour (plus VAT) (not including staffing)</u> Technical/Dress: Commercial Hires Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary General Rehearsals: (No lights) Commercial Hires Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary Get In/Fit Up/ Get Out Commercial Hires Non Profit Making/Charity/Voluntary	£77.50 £65.50 £65.50 £55.00 £21.50 £18.50	£77.50 £65.50 £65.50 £55.00 £21.50 £18.50
4	<u>Staffing Recharges : per hour plus VAT</u> Technical Manager – week days* Technical Manager - weekends** Technical Officer – week days* Technical Officer - weekends** Technical Assistant – week days* Technical Assistant - weekends** * Plus 20% on all rates for hours worked between 2330 and 0600 hours ** Plus 20% on all rates for hours worked between 2330 and 0600 hours and plus 100% for all Bank Holiday working and 120% on all rates for hours worked on Bank Holidays between 2330 and 0600 hours	£33.50 £38.50 £25.50 £29.50 £17.50 £21.50	£34.00 £39.00 £26.00 £30.00 £18.00 £22.00
5	<u>Room Hire : per hour</u> The Workshop (VAT exempt) Non-Profit Making/Charity/Community	£15.50	£15.50
6	<u>Room Hire: Commercial (VAT exempt)</u> Byron Lounge: Meetings per day Byron Lounge: Meetings half day	£265.00 £159.00) £25 per hour)

	Flexibility to discount package deals on repeat bookings and block bookings or where a room hire is part of a theatre hire deal. Flexibility to offer rooms at a discounted rate to local and community users at times when the rooms would otherwise be unused, but being mindful that costs must be covered.		
7	<u>Ticket Handling Fee</u>		
	Per Ticket – applicable to all professional productions	£1.50	£1.50
	Per Ticket – applicable to all amateur productions, dependent on overall ticket price	£50p - £1.50	50p - £1.50
8	<u>Palace Membership Scheme (New Charges from 2016-17)</u>		
	Single membership	£11	£11
	Couple's membership	£18	£18
	Junior membership	£8	£8
	Family membership	£30	£30

National Civil War Centre – Newark Museum			
Proposed Ticket Types	2016-17 Charge including VAT	2017-18 Charge including VAT	Notes
Day Tickets			
Adult	£8	£8	To increase yield through a better upselling rate.
Concession	£7	£7	
Children 5-16	£3.50	£3.50	
Children under 5	Free	Free	
Annual Pass – Adult	£16	£15.75	
Annual Pass - Concession	£14	£13.75	
Annual Pass – Children	£6	£5.75	
Groups:	Flexibility to discount to large groups who expect a certain degree of discount		
Group Visit (10 or more paying)	10% discount	10% discount	
After-hours Evening Guided Visit: Minimum of 15 persons, must be booked <u>at least</u> four weeks in advance	£11/head £2 discount for all partner organisations (EH, Art Fund, etc.)	£15/head £2 discount for all partner organisations (EH, Art Fund, etc.)	
Curator Handling Session (on top of day group rate)	New product This is for the discerning group wishing to engage with us a little bit more than just a non-guided visit	£5/head, 20 people	
Large, commercial groups:			
Town Tour	New product	£6/head	All to NSDC
Castle Tour	New product	£6/head	£4 to go to the castle, £2 to NCWC
Church Tour	New product	£6/head	£4 to go to the church, £2 to NCWC
Coach Parking @ lorry park	New product	FOC	FOC

Miscellaneous Charges

	Existing	Proposed 2017-18	
After Dinner speaking	<p>£60 for Newark and Sherwood District</p> <p>£85 for Nottinghamshire/ equivalent area</p> <p>Any further distance = on consideration</p>	<p>£70 for Newark and Sherwood District</p> <p>£90 for Nottinghamshire/ equivalent area</p> <p>Any further distance = on consideration</p>	
Room Hire	<p>All ex VAT</p> <p>AV Equipment included (projector, screen and lectern). There is an element of flexibility built into the fees and charges for non-profit making, allowing the Museum's discretion to offer a further reduction to community groups at a time when the Museum may well be dark, but mindful that our costs and a profit must be covered.</p>		
	<p>Community Space</p> <p>Educational/Training/Meeting: <i>unless it strictly conforms to and progresses our Learning and Participation plans, then it will be discussed.</i></p> <p>Party/staffing intensive operation:</p>	<p>£20/hr</p> <p>£35/hr</p>	<p>£20/hr</p> <p>£35-50/hr</p>
	<p>Research Room</p> <p>Meeting: <i>unless it strictly conforms to and progresses our Learning and Participation plans, then it will be discussed.</i></p>	<p>£25/hr</p> <p>More booking competition with research work</p>	<p>£25/hr</p> <p>More booking competition with research work</p>
	<p>Tudor Hall</p> <p>Major Event:</p> <p>Charity Rate:</p> <p>Meeting:</p> <p>Currently advertised: http://nationalcivilwarcentre.com/roomhire/</p>	<p>£1,000 night or day</p> <p>£795 night or day</p>	<p>£1,000 night or day</p> <p>£795 night or day</p> <p>£375 per day</p>

	Hire a henchman/woman	£100/evening	£100/evening
	Shop beer	15% price reduction for over 30 beers bought in advance of room hire.	15% price reduction for over 30 beers bought in advance of room hire.

THE RESOURCE CENTRE & COLLECTIONS			
Hire Location	Existing Charge	Additional Information	Proposed 2017-18
Out of Hours – Guided tours	Out of hours £80 (£66.67 net) plus £1.00 (£0.83 net) per person	Charges do not include refreshments. Tea, Coffee, biscuits – £1 per person Occupancy : Max. 25 people	Out of hours £80 plus VAT plus £1.00 (£0.83 net) per person
In Hours – Guided tours	During working hours £50 (£41.67 net) plus £1.00 (£0.83 net) per person	Charges do not include refreshments. Tea, Coffee, biscuits – £1 per person Occupancy : Max. 25 people	During working hours £60 plus VAT plus £1.00 (£0.83 net) per person
Workshops	Price by request	To be paid in advance when booking	Price by request
Photocopying	£1 A4 £1.50 A3		No change (very rarely requested)
Scan Orders	£5.50 £6.50 £9.00	This price includes VAT. Postage is extra.	No change (very rarely requested)
Microfiche Copies	£5.00 plus £2.00 admin(very rarely requested)	£5.00 plus £2.00 admin(very rarely requested)	No change(very rarely requested)
Own Camera	£5.00 – reflects time processing charges	It is possible for researchers to use their own camera to take photos of documents and objects. Copyright limitations apply.	No change(very rarely requested)
Digital reprographics (on plain paper, glossy photo paper, CD or by e mail attachment – please specify	£10.00 – reflects time processing charges	Museum staff can take photos of documents or objects for visitors. Please note this service may not be available same day – orders will be processed ASAP. Copyright limitations apply.	No change (very rarely requested)

<p>Publication</p>	<p>Commercial Organisations (Newspapers, Journals, magazines, TV, etc.) £100.00 per image</p> <p>Local Authority/Vol./Charitable Organisations £20.00 per image</p> <p>Corporate Products (annual reports, TV) £100.00 per image</p> <p>Commercial products (cards, calendars, jigsaws etc.) £150.00 per image</p>	<p>There will be no charge for visitors taking photographs on the museum premises, so long as the images produced are for their own personal use and not intended for publication.</p> <p>Cost per image is based on <u>one</u> use only. Two uses will attract two charges per image. Three uses will attract three charges per image. For example, one use is display, two uses is display and publication (book), three uses is display, publication (book) and leaflet.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Long Term Archaeological Storage at Museum Resource Centre</p>		<p>£150 per box - Cost is based on English Heritage Calculations. One off fees.</p>	<p>£160 per box - Cost is based on English Heritage Calculations. One off fees.</p>

Learning Charges			
Other Income	Charge	Additional Information	Proposed 2017-18 including VAT
Loans Box Fines	£15	Late return of boxes	No change
Out of District Schools Travel Expenses	Price by request – It is not intended to promote outreach for schools for our first three academic years in order to concentrate visitor volume and income at the Centre. We will consider outreach for schools on a case by case basis and price accordingly.	Flat fee	No change
Discovery box – Cost per hire	£10 per box for two weeks	Loan period is 2 weeks – fines for late returns	No change
Education programme @ NCWC	£3.50 per head – Half day (2 – 2.5 hr) visit – one facilitated activity, one self-led activity £4.95 per head – Full day visit – one facilitated activity, two self-led activities. £5.95 per head – Full day visit – two facilitated activities, one self-led activity.	To be paid on day of visit by cash/cheque/card or by invoice	No change for KS1-KS5 students. New pricing for University/FE students to reflect bespoke nature of events and level of expertise required. £5.00 per head for half day visit £7.00 per head for full day visit

PARKS & AMENITIES – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Facility	Purpose		2016-17 Existing	2017-18 Proposed	
Parks & Playing Fields	Football Season (13 matches or more)	Seniors	£490	£500	
		Juniors	£264	£270	
		Mini Soccer	£140	£143	
	Football Pitch (per match)	Seniors	£48	£49	
		Juniors	£28	£29	
		Mini Soccer	£16	£17	
	Hire of Park – commercial use		£400 per day or 5% of ticket sales	£410 per day or 5% of ticket sales	
	Hire of Park – charities		£95 but waived at the discretion of CMT	£97 but waived at the discretion of CMT	
	Circuses		£340 per day	£347 per day	
	Fun Fairs	Large Fair		£330 per day	£337 per day
		Small Fair		£250 per day	£255 per day
	Sponsorship	Bedding Displays		£720 pa	£730 pa
Outdoor Fitness Camps			£6.20 per session	£6.30 per session	
Newark Castle & Gardens	Guided Tours	Adult		£5.00	£5.50
		Child		£2.50	£2.75
		Family		£12.50	£13.50
		Ghost Tour – commercial hire		£400 per event	£410 per event
	Hire of Gardens – charity		£95 but waived at the discretion of CMT	£97 but waived at the discretion of CMT	
	Hire of Gardens – commercial		£400 per day or 5% of ticket sales	£410 per day or 5% of ticket sales	
	Hire of Gardens for weddings	Bandstand		£350	£360
		Undercroft		£350	£360
	Education programme	Half day visit		£2.92 per head	£2.95 per head
		Full day visit		£4.13 per head	£4.15 per head
	Use of Castle for commercial photography/filming			£30 per hour	£30 per hour
Use of Castle Gardens for wedding photographs – professional photographers only			£20 flat fee	£20 flat fee	
Lincoln Road Pavilion	Hire of Pavilion		£9.00 per hour	£9.20 per hour	

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE PRE-DEVELOPMENT FUND (NPDF)

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To inform Members of the outcomes of bids submitted to the Nottinghamshire Pre-Development Fund on behalf of Newark & Sherwood District Council.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 At the November 2016 Economic Development Committee, a paper was presented relating to bids submitted to the above fund. In terms of background, a number of funding streams including the Local Growth Fund and European Funds are available to contribute to major investment schemes in transport infrastructure, economic development and regeneration. Discussions within the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee have identified that it would be easier to secure funding if potential projects were at a more advanced stage when bidding rounds were opened. Project proposals need to be more advanced, for example, by having robust business cases, technical surveys, design work and economic viability assessments.

However, many proposals have not undertaken the necessary pre-development work to ensure that good quality and well-justified projects are submitted.

It is against this background that the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee has established a fund drawn from surpluses in the Business Rates Pool to support the pre-development work of economic projects across the County with a specific focus on feasibility studies and business case development.

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 Following a Chief Executives meeting held on 11 December, it was agreed to recommend to the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Joint Economic Prosperity Committee that each district should receive funding for three priority projects. The projects identified for Newark and Sherwood are as follows:
- a. Ollerton Hall - Ollerton Hall is Grade II* Listed, making it nationally significant (only 5.5% of buildings are this grade). The Hall also sits within a Conservation Area. It has been subject to unauthorised and harmful works by previous owners. Following negotiation and proceedings the hall is back within the ownership of NSDC. NSDC and Heritage England (HE) are keen to see the hall retained and re-developed sensitively. Feasibility/viability work is required to establish the current state of the hall and any viable options for re-use. NSDC and HE are willing to provide resource in the form of expertise, alongside any grant funding secured.

- b. Newark Central Project. (Physical Regeneration and Site Development/Strategic Site) N2 priority Growth Sector Visitor Economy. A feasibility study relating to the Newark Town Hall and Buttermarket (Newark Town Council lease). The Buttermarket is an under-utilised shopping centre and in desperate need of regeneration. It is part of the central visitor corridor between National Civil War Centre, the Parish Church and Newark Castle and fronts the market place. A once thriving indoor market, the whole site has fantastic potential to expand the current Town Hall Museum and provide opportunities for the International Newark School of Violin Making to create a cultural hub for a wide variety of arts. These opportunities need to be explored through a feasibility study into how to maximise this additional resource and enhance the visitor experience
- c. Newark Gateway - A feasibility study into the options for the redevelopment of these strategic sites as a key gateway which defines Newark. This would underpin future development plans for this Gateway location. The study will look at short, medium and long term development potential including interaction with key transport infrastructure (A46 and Castle line) as well as looking at the scope to further enhance plans already in development to ease traffic congestion in and around Newark. The study will consider an overall masterplan which will consider the scope for encouraging technology and digital sector growth. Assessment of the potential needs to take into account flood risk and future infrastructure improvements. The profile of Newark could be significantly impacted depending on the decision made regarding this site.

Appendix One provides detail of the paper presented to the Chief Executives' meeting on 9 December. Nottinghamshire County Council will be taking forward feasibility studies relating to Kelham Bypass, Ollerton Roundabout and County wide Broadband projects.

4.0 Equalities Implications

4.1 Any feasibility studies undertaken will meet or exceed our equalities obligations.

5.0 Impact on Budget/Policy Framework

5.1 No additional financial contribution is required from NSDC to fund these studies. There is an officer time implication in managing the bidding, tendering, study and evaluation stages.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the contents of the report be noted.

Reason for Recommendation

To update Members on the outcomes of the NPDF process

Background Papers - Nil

For further information please contact Julie Reader-Sullivan on Ext 5258

Andrew Muter
Chief Executive

**Notts Pre-Development Fund
N2 EPC - Chief Executives' Meeting 9 December 2016**

1. The N2 EPC agreed a process whereby the applications submitted via the Notts. Pre-Development Fund (NPDF) be assessed. The conclusions of that process are available under an accompanying paper but in summary, the assessment process attempted to offer a process whereby the applications would be considered against a set of criteria, as follows:
 - Clear and concise business case;
 - Key milestones – realistic and deliverable;
 - Clarity on the services to be procured – alongside management and monitoring arrangements;
 - Evidence of need;
 - Relationship with existing / planned activities;
 - Links to N2 stated priority themes and key sectors;
 - Impact – informing the pipeline for future development, speeding up implementation, leveraging additional investment;
 - Costs, outcomes and a forward strategy on completion of the feasibility work.

2. While this is a strategic process, aligned to the N2 EPC's stated ambitions, it clearly is a competitive one and there would be winners and losers as a consequence. The Chief Executives had their views on this issue and while initially this related to the process and the time required to undertake it, concerns were also expressed about achieving a reasonably equitable distribution of the resources between the Councils. There a number of ways this might be addressed:
 - One way of doing this would be to simply split the total resources available equally between the partners. With the former, that's £125,000 each authority plus an agreed amount from the £0.5M town centre contribution (see later in this note but say, £0.25M) that equates to £156,250 each. A consideration here is how joint submissions are handled (para 5 below relates) and the fact that some Councils' total bids were less than this figure.
 - Alternatively, the re-distribution back to the partners could be based upon the proportional amounts the partners originally paid into / benefited from the Pool. There would again be winners and losers and perhaps this might negate joint and also perfectly good applications coming through in certain parts of the county.

3. In an attempt to pull together an alternative/parallel assessment process for the NPDF, the Districts and County Councils were invited to prioritise their own bids. The logic here being that all partners would receive some share and they would receive resources for their respective priority schemes in order of deemed importance. The resources would be shared against the priority lists until the pot was exhausted. The request to do so generated some reflections and while the partners' requested prioritisations are offered in full on the attached spreadsheet, it is not an immediately perfect solution given a number of issues reflected upon below.

4. While most applications seek resources in the range of £5,000 - £50,000, there are a number higher than that and indeed two which are considerably higher. These do skew the prioritisation process somewhat. Views are sought on how to respond to this. One option would be to use the result of the assessment process to review the listings of these higher value submissions; alternatively the higher value requests could be open to challenge or perhaps preferably, a ceiling could be placed on the requested amounts.

5. Clearly all bids will be subject to the respective Council's procurement process which will firm up the costs but in order to explore the prioritisation solution further at this meeting, the attached Appendix is a version assumes a ceiling amount for all individual projects of £70,000. Two other issues merit reference:
 - **Joint submissions.** A number of joint submissions were made. Via this process, there was a possibility of them being marginalised. Some included them in their prioritisation, others didn't or made separate representations. An attempt has been made here to include some of them, separately referenced as being projects impacting on 3 or more districts.
 - **An allocation from the N2 Town Centre pot.** When approving the £0.5M, the EPC recognised that this was for both developmental costs (ie feasibility) and actual capital costs, related to the success of the N2 Town Centre Programme, the subject of the recent Growth Deal submission. While that remains an unknown at this stage, as referenced in para 2 above, it is suggested that the feasibility element takes no more than 50% of this £0.5M and is generally allocated to those in the first phase of the N2 Town Centre Programme as submitted to D2N2. This can be reviewed when more is known about the Growth Deal.

6. Given the above, it is suggested that the priority ranking has credibility when guided by a set of underlying principles as follows:
 - The key **drivers** for the prioritising of the projects (and thus the respective rankings) are:
 - those which appear to have the best potential to lead to the development of credible bids to future capital funding pots, largely those held by the D2N2 LEP which have an overtly economic development impact;
 - those which will ultimately make a real contribution towards increasing business rate contributions, likely to be vital to Councils' financial settlements in future years.
 - Through the prioritisation, the **guiding total amount** per authority (depending on a Council's total bid) is to be in the region of c. £140,000, reflecting the need to review joint projects and how best to utilise a proportion of the N2 Town Centre allocation. Tolerances of between + / - 15% may be applied.
 - On actual **procurement**, should the costs fall, that will be reflected in the finalised grant. Should it prove more expensive, then the maximum grant would be that referenced in application, with the Council finding the remainder or withdrawing the application.
 - The **maximum individual project costs** are set at £70,000.
 - A number of projects may be deemed as **first reserve projects** should some later fall out or additional resources become available.
 - The **strategic assessment** may be utilised to review any particular projects about which concerns may be expressed at this stage.

7. If the above principles are adopted, **Appendix A** offers a possible share and spread of projects. In considering **Appendix A**, the following items merit consideration:

- While applications have been shared via the assessment pairings, Chief Executives may wish to see copies of all the full applications made before making a decision. Views are requested.
- If the set of projects or version thereof at **Appendix A** is accepted, there might usefully be a brief “standstill” period where they are quickly reviewed by all, to explore any practical or potentially sensitive issues with those proposed to go forward, including any assumptions made as to capital contributions from partners for the actual projects. As part of the process, the summary details have already been shared between our authorities and some initial comments have been made.
- Finally, more recently, a suggestion has been made that the D2N2 LEP may wish to support or cross-fund NPDF. It is suggested that this be explored, further justifying the identification of reserve projects.

If the above approach merits consideration, the prioritisation process offers the conclusions at **Appendix A**.

Geoff George
Economic Development
Nottinghamshire CC

Prioritisation Process – Suggested Allocations

ADC	BaDC	BrBC	GBC	MDC	N&SDC	NCC	RBC	Joint										
67	21,750	7/8	41,800	3	70,000	30	25,000	85	30,000	19	25,000	59	15,000	40	50,000	1	24,950	
68	20,000	5	20,000	45	70,000	29	30,000	87	16,250	25	60,000	58	29,960	43	29,000	13	30,000	
69	30,000	6	25,000			34	35,000	81	17,750	21	40,000	46	30,000	42	11,000	17	20,000	
71	30,000	9	20,000			37	10,000	80	6,500			49	60,000	44	11,000	36	20,000	
72	25,000	15	28,000			31	30,000	86	2,750							77	30,000	
73	30,000							83	5,000									
								84	5,000									
								79	4,250									
								82	14,500									
	156,750		134,800		140,000		130,000		102,000		125,000		134,960		101,000		129,450	Total
																		1,153,960

Notes:

The total can be met via the £1M from the NPfS allocation and £153,960 from the N2 TC allocation.

Suggested Reserve Projects:

- Project(s) 53, 16 & 54 – NCC’s range of BdB projects to be integrated into a single proposal, having a pan-County impact (£50,000)
- Project 35 – GBC’s Netherfield TC as a potential N2 TC project (£20,000)
- Project 24 – N&SDC’s Newark Riverside as a potential N2 TC Project (£35,000)
- Projects 10 and 62 appear to have the potential to be reviewed as a joint N2 TC project and may be included subject to further discussions between the parties (BaDC and NCC)

Two Additional Documents:

- Spreadsheet – supportive information
- Word Doc – Strategic Assessment