
Report To:	Environment and Regeneration Committee	Date:	5t October 2017
Report By:	Corporate Director Environment, Regeneration and Resources	Report No:	ENV/026/17/SA
Contact Officer:	Scott Allan	Contact No:	Ext. 2762
Subject:	Town and Village Centres – Environmental Improvements		

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Members of the Committee with progress made on the environmental improvements within Town & Village Centres across Inverclyde and to consider the distribution of Community Spend Funds across the town/village centres.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 Members will be aware that the Council approved the total allocation of £500,000 (£300,000 agreed February 2015 Budget Meeting and £200,000 agreed March 2016 Budget Meeting) for environmental improvements throughout Inverclyde. A further allocation of £2.5m was awarded in March 2017.

- 2.2 The original £500,000 allocation was made up of the following:-

Environmental Improvements	£271,000
Community Spend	£90,000
Shop Front Improvements	£75,000
Street Improvements	£10,000
Building Illumination	£15,000
Signage	£25,000
Study of Redundant Buildings	£14,000

- 2.3 Riverside Inverclyde (Ri) were engaged as delivery agent as approved at Committee to deliver all of the above works except shop fronts. The tenders for the Environmental Improvement works have been compiled and released for pricing. A full spend is anticipated this financial year.
- 2.4 Of the £90,000 Community Spend, £50,000 is to be spent by the 3 Regeneration Forums in Gourock (£15,000), Greenock (£20,000) and Port Glasgow (£15,000) and the remaining £40,000 to be spent by the 2 Community Councils (Inverkip & Weymss Bay Community Council and Kilmacolm Community Council) for each of the 4 villages (ie £10,000 each). With regard to the Community Councils, there is an aspiration for some of the allocation to be awarded as grant as opposed to projects being delivered directly by Ri. This approach reflects the nature of some of the smaller scale projects where it is not cost effective to incur the overheads of Ri with respect to delivery. Approval is therefore sought for grant awards to be made by the Council (or by Ri on the Council's behalf) direct to Community Councils, subject to appropriate governance and procurement, where direct delivery by Ri is, in the reasonable professional opinion of officers, not cost effective due to the scale of the project.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Committee:

- a. approve the direct award of grant funding by the Council (or by Ri on the Council's behalf) to Community Councils in respect of Community spend as referred to above and subject to the projects being of a scale where it is not cost effective for delivery to be through Ri.

Scott Allan

Corporate Director – Environment, Regeneration & Resources

4.0 IMPLICATIONS

Finance

4.1 Financial Implications:

One off Costs

Cost Centre	Budget Heading	Budget Years	Proposed Spend this Report £000	Virement From	Other Comments
Towns & Village Centres Earmarked Reserve		2016/17 onwards	3,000		

Annually Recurring Costs/ (Savings)

Cost Centre	Budget Heading	With Effect from	Annual Net Impact £000	Virement From (if Applicable)	Other Comments

Legal

4.2 There are no specific legal implications arising from this report.

Human Resources

4.3 There are no specific human resources implications arising from this report.

Equalities

4.4 There are no specific equalities implications arising from this report.

Repopulation

4.5 There are no specific repopulation implications arising from this report.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Riverside Inverclyde was consulted in the preparation of this report.

6.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 None.