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SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

Introduction

1. The SRB Challenge Fund is now in its fifth year and has been one of the major forms of support for local area regeneration in England over this period. Certain key features of its design and delivery have remained throughout. Central to the whole programme has been the emphasis on a partnership led approach to regeneration whereby interested parties can come together at the local level to devise regeneration schemes and seek financial support through an annual bidding round organised and run by the Government Offices for the Regions, although responsibility for this passed to the newly formed RDA’s in April 1999 (with the exception of London). The number and range of partners represented in the partnership can vary considerably and the lead partner can be drawn from the private, public or voluntary/community sector.

2. In recognition of the need to assess the contribution which SRB was making to local area regeneration the DETR commissioned an evaluation study based in the Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge. In 1998 the team produced a Report which sought to summarise the findings of the research team at the Interim stage and this was published by DETR (An Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund; A Partnership for Regeneration). Since the publication of the Interim Evaluation the research team have been able to undertake final evaluations for three of the twenty case study Partnerships. These were Brent and Harrow, the Limes Farm estate and Northumbria Community Safety all small projects of short duration which were completed in 1997/98.

3. This report presents findings from the evaluation of the three case studies whose regeneration scheme has now closed. In so doing it also comments on issues relating to research method and the use of research in SRB schemes. This evidence is presented in the Annex to this Report. The report concludes by describing how the evaluation programme will progress in the future in order to increase our understanding as to how SRB is working to secure the regeneration of local areas.

4. The three case studies described in this report are Brent and Harrow, Limes Farm and Northumbria Community Safety. The Brent and Harrow scheme was a three year programme concerned with increasing the start-up rate and quality of new businesses within the London Boroughs of Brent and Harrow to help create a small firm enterprise culture in the area. The Limes Farm Partnership undertook a regeneration scheme to tackle the physical and social decline of the Limes Farm estate in Chigwell, Essex through a housing improvement programme and linked environmental and community/social initiatives. The Northumbria Community Safety Strategy was a drugs initiative which was part of a wider strategic approach to crime prevention and safety issues across Northumbria.
Lessons from the three case studies in relation to emerging regeneration issues

5. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 of this Report contain the final evaluation of the three case studies separately. The three schemes are quite different in their objectives, geographical coverage, delivery arrangements and content and caution is needed in claiming conclusions of a general nature. Our confidence will increase as we are able to examine more of the evidence from the other case studies that underpin our research approach.

6. Nevertheless, the three case studies were similar in some respects. They were all Round 1 schemes of short duration (two or three years) and were relatively small in terms of SRB expenditure. This allows us to highlight some of the strengths and weaknesses of small schemes in achieving regeneration. Moreover, the three case studies can be used to add to other accumulating evidence on emerging regeneration issues such as the bending of mainstream programmes, targeting to deprived communities, community involvement and the role of the private sector in securing regeneration.

7. In interpreting results, the circumstances prevailing when the three case study bids were being prepared and approved in 1994/95 should be borne in mind. The SRB Challenge Fund had only just been formed by bringing together 22 existing smaller programmes, some of which involved thematic rather than small area, comprehensive regeneration. The Round 1 bidding timetable was extremely tight and schemes had to be prepared quickly when bidding guidance had not been fully developed. Against this background, small schemes in particular could be designed to enhance what was already intended and planned rather than to independently and systematically tackle newly identified regeneration problems.

Partnership working

8. One of the conclusions of the interim evaluation report last year was that the enhancement of Partnership working at the local level was an early but real achievement of SRB as a whole. This is also the case in these three case studies but their Partnership experience is varied and this may reflect in part that there was little time to think through and develop the Partnership arrangements before the bid was prepared. In Limes Farm and Brent and Harrow the Partnerships were dominated by the lead partners who were enhancing their own expenditures by SRB, respectively a local authority and Training and Enterprise Council. Other partners played a relatively minor role and were informed and consulted rather than being genuinely involved in decision making, although with Limes Farm the involvement of the London and Quadrant Housing Trust provided an opportunity to diversify tenure on the estate which formed an important part of the overall Limes Farm Housing Improvement Programme. There is a danger, when schemes are heavily “lead partner driven” that Partnership working fades away when the scheme ends.
9. By contrast in the Northumbria Community Safety scheme, the Partnership was newly created prior to the SRB scheme and was not lead partner dominated. Here good Partnership arrangements were designed and have survived the ending of this particular scheme, by raising new funding from later rounds of SRB and elsewhere.

10. Brent and Harrow was split into three separate components and three separate existing Partnerships delivered one component each. They were all led by different departments of the North West London TEC but the three Partnerships met together only once annually to review the arrangements for the scheme as a whole. Effectively, the co-ordination between the three Partnerships was undertaken by officers of the TEC rather than through Partnership channels.

## Links with mainstream programmes

11. One of the principles of effective Partnership working is that Partnerships cannot work in isolation. They must have the ability to influence other mainstream policies and programmes so that their work is supported and enhanced by other service providers. Part of this support may take the form of contributions into Partnership projects from mainstream funders – hopefully over and above the mainstream funding which the area might expect in the absence of an SRB scheme.

12. Our interim evaluation concluded that a small amount of mainstream “bending” had occurred in the 20 case studies. Only a very small amount of mainstream funding had been attracted from outside the District or County Council area but rather more “bending” locally had taken place within the County or District – to the SRB target area.

13. Limes Farm followed this general pattern. There was some main programme bending towards the estate by the Metropolitan Police and the Essex and Herts NHS Trust. Bending was entirely limited to sources within the wider local area. In the Northumbria Community Safety scheme the participating local authorities diverted some funding to support the SRB scheme which would otherwise have been spent in the SRB area but on other council services. Local authorities did not spend more overall as a consequence of SRB but more expenditure was devoted to tackling drug abuse than would otherwise have been the case.

14. In Brent and Harrow 33 pence of mainstream expenditure was incurred for every £1 of SRB funding and this was contributed from the mainstream funding of the lead partner, NW London TEC. Again these funds would have been spent in the TEC area, even in the absence of SRB, so that arguably no significant amount of mainstream programme bending occurred.
Going only on the indicative evidence of these three case studies, there is a suggestion – to be followed up in further evaluations – that mainstream programme bending in small schemes may be lower than average. Even so SRB may be influencing the amount of spending on particular aspects of regeneration or types of project, within the SRB area. There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that small Partnership schemes may be relatively more effective in attracting mainstream programme expenditure than large schemes.

Private sector leverage and participation

The private sector contribution in Limes Farm constituted expenditure on the social housing renovation scheme from the London and Quadrant Housing Trust, this represented a leverage of £1.13 for every £1 of SRB money. While the housing improvements were planned to go ahead in any case under mainstream housing funding they were included in the SRB scheme so that an element of social, economic and community safety regeneration could also go ahead.

The Northumbria Community Safety scheme secured only a low level of private sector leverage. For every £1 of public sector spending the private sector contributed 10 pence. Much of this was provided by a large company for the purpose of producing a parents fact file to help prevent drug abuse amongst young people. There was no private sector partner on the Partnership.

In Brent and Harrow private sector leverage was a little higher at 15 pence per £1 of public expenditure but was very much lower than the average for all SRB schemes. This was mainly made up of personal funds and bank loans in the new business start-ups advised and assisted by the scheme. There were no private sector partners other than local enterprise agencies.

Taking the three case studies together the extent of private sector leverage and private sector participation, was well below average for all SRB schemes, as measured for all schemes in the Interim Evaluation of SRB. This is not unexpected to the extent that small schemes do not embark on large capital regeneration projects where the opportunities for substantial private sector investment are greatest.

In Brent and Harrow, however, there was evidence of extensive private sector participation in that part of the scheme concerned with the individual mentoring of under achieving pupils, and in providing seminars with highly achieving pupils on technical skills and employment opportunities which were available in the Borough. In subsequent interviews participating pupils claimed that these schemes had raised their motivation and school performance. Some 200 firms each year had made staff available for this work and had made no charge. The evaluation team considered this to be
good practice example of how the private sector can make an important contribution to "people-related" aspects of local regeneration at very little cost to the public sector or to the firms themselves.

### Community involvement and capacity building

21. The interim evaluation noted that whilst case study Round 1 schemes had made arrangements which would permit the community and voluntary sector to be involved in the Partnership and in the regeneration scheme – the degree of actual involvement achieved had varied widely and in many cases had proved disappointing to the community/voluntary groups themselves.

22. This general conclusion remains applicable to Limes Farm as it closes down. The Limes Farm Community Association (LFCA) were represented on the Partnership Board and were consulted and informed about the regeneration scheme. But they did not consider themselves to be an equal partner in terms of key decision-making about regeneration priorities and the allocation of resources. The capacity of community groups was not significantly enhanced during the three years of the scheme - remaining in essence a tenants association with only a small number of active members.

23. With thematic schemes such as Brent and Harrow and the Northumbria Community Safety scheme there is always a question of what constitutes the relevant community. The first covers two London Boroughs, the second covers two large counties – and both contain a very large number of neighbourhood communities and community groups. Consequently the Partnership Board itself was constituted mainly by local authorities, the police and other agencies. However, the anti-drug abuse programme was implemented through the schools and through community forums in each locality and these organisations were supported through the provision of advice, videos, fact files and other materials as well as a telephone helpline. In this way the scheme made a contribution towards building the capacities of local communities and schools to tackle one aspect of regeneration – namely the prevention of the use of drugs and the high proportion of crimes associated with it.

24. In Brent and Harrow the new business start-ups component of the scheme had no community representation other than two local enterprise agencies. The education/businesses links component included representation from local schools and colleges. The Community Works strand of the scheme included members of the Equal Opportunities Group which had a strong representation from voluntary and community groups, many of which represented ethnic minority communities. Thus the community representation was strong in a part of the scheme which was allocated about 10% of the SRB budget which represented a significant proportion to devote to community capacity building.
Nevertheless this small budget was devoted entirely to building the capacities of local community and voluntary groups and mainly those from ethnic minority neighbourhoods in the most deprived parts of south and east Brent. Some 14 ethnic minority community businesses were established, 90 residents from ethnic communities were provided with vocational/business skills training and 205 ethnic minority voluntary groups were supported. An additional 73 residents were provided with training in voluntary work. Overall this was evidence of a significant contribution to capacity building in the ethnic minority communities of Brent.

**Impact, short term cost-effectiveness, and value for money**

In Brent and Harrow and Northumbria, but less so in Limes Farm, the impact on local area outcomes was small, reflecting the limited scale, scope, duration, and expenditure in relation to the size of the geographical areas covered. In Brent and Harrow the number of small firms was increased but by less than 1% and the incidence of crime was reduced in Northumbria. Limes Farm saw the turning round of a run down difficult to let estate along with a reduction in crime. These limited contributions to improved area outcomes do not have sufficient critical mass, by themselves, to provide a catalyst for widespread dynamic change which could transform economic and social circumstances in the target areas as a whole in the medium and longer term. The problems of multiple deprivation in the most needy areas are much more deep seated as to be satisfactorily resolved by small regeneration schemes of two or three years duration some of which address a single regeneration theme.

The fact that small schemes have small overall impacts on neighbourhood outcomes does not mean that they are not cost effective in the sense in which cost effectiveness is usually measured in evaluation studies. Conventionally cost-effectiveness has been defined as the ratio of public sector cost to the net additional outputs generated in the target area. In the Brent and Harrow case, where cost effectiveness can be measured in this way, the cost per net new firm start-up and per net additional job in surviving firms was at least comparable with that of other similar schemes which have been evaluated. Although the extent of deadweight was high in the sense that most firms would have started up without the SRB scheme and additionality was low at about 26%, small amounts of net benefit were generated by small amounts of public money. Area impact was small but cost-effectiveness, as conventionally measured was quite favourable. There was also evidence that cost effectiveness was better than average in Limes Farm and Northumbria Community Safety although, because of the nature of the multiple benefits generated and the fact that some benefits could only be qualitatively assessed, the evidence is not so clear cut.

Although the conventional way of measuring cost effectiveness is useful in assessing area regeneration schemes, short term cost effectiveness is only one
factor to take account of in considering overall value for money. Account must also be taken of the durability and sustainability of the benefits generated, and whether a dynamic process of positive dynamic change is set in motion which ultimately will remove multiple deprivation and inequalities. Small schemes, and particularly small thematic schemes cannot do this and cannot realistically be expected to. Only schemes which are sufficiently large and effective as to set in motion a dynamic process of cumulative improvement across a broad front factors improving quality of life on run down estates will offer genuine value for money in the longer term.

29. This raises the question of whether there remains a valid rationale for continuing to operate small schemes within the SRB regime. Two possible roles for small schemes are:-

- that they can be used to tackle small pockets of deprivation or prevent deprivation occurring
- that they can be a useful vehicle for developing and testing innovative approaches to aspects of regeneration

Small schemes as a source of innovation

30. The evidence from the three case studies is that small schemes tend to develop innovative approaches to regeneration and can be an important source of developing good practice. All three identified gaps in mainstream provision and developed initiatives to help fill them. Effective targeting to disadvantaged and socially excluded groups was partly responsible for the innovations e.g. drug users in Northumbria and ethnic community groups and under achieving pupils in Brent and Harrow. In Northumbria a wide range of agencies were successfully encouraged to work with each other. In Brent and Harrow schools, private firms and community groups were encouraged to work together and in Limes Farm the formation of the partnership was successful in encouraging mainstream departments to direct funding onto the estate. The Brent and Harrow approach to building the capacity of ethnic minority community groups and the voluntary sector was very innovative, although in the event not wholly successful.

31. The research indicates that relatively small SRB schemes can be effective in working-up innovative approaches to local area regeneration problems. The innovation can occur through new institutional delivery vehicles as in the case of the Northumbria Community Safety Scheme, or through devising effective ways of delivering regeneration benefits to specific disadvantaged groups.
Targeting on particular groups, including ethnic minority communities

32. The evidence from the three case studies is that small schemes can effectively target their regeneration activities to particular deprived groups. Northumbria Community Safety targeted effectively to young people in general and drug users in particular, Limes Farm’s activities were limited to a small housing estate. Only Brent and Harrow contained large numbers of residents from ethnic minority communities and part of the SRB scheme was directed solely at the development of these communities. The project set up a “Community Works” Partnership which included representatives from Harrow Council for Racial Equality, Brent Indian Association, Harlesden City Challenge Community Forum, Harrow Community Trust, the Peabody Trust, the Prince’s Business Youth Trust, BACES Refugee Liaison Group and the Harrow Association of Afro-Caribbeans. The aims of the Community Works scheme were

- to assist and support the development of community businesses amongst ethnic minority community groups
- to assist and support the voluntary sector in these communities
- to develop the business skills of disadvantaged community groups

33. The project activities included information workshops, advice, business skills training, financial support for community business and training for the voluntary sector. Groups assisted included the Black Women Mental Health Project, the Afghan Association, Somalilink, Asian Women’s Resource Centre, Bosnian Arts Association, Harrow Iranian Community, Afro-Caribbean People’s Organisation, Harrow Young Nigerian Group, London Indian Elders Group, Pakistani Workers’ Association, British Women Muslim Welfare Association and Islamic Cultural Centre.

34. To a large part the successful targeting to ethnic minority groups was secured by the dedication of the project manager to work at the grass roots level amongst the communities. There was also a very effective publicity campaign to inform communities about the scheme.

35. In its third and final year the project secured additional financial support from the European Social Fund. Since the end of the SRB scheme the project funding and momentum have been lost and it proved difficult to set up successor arrangements through the local Chambers of Commerce which were agreeable to the community groups themselves, which remained fragmented and independent from each other.
Successor arrangements

36. Small schemes of short duration are in danger of not having the time and resources to build up a regeneration momentum which can secure sustainable dynamic change unless very sound successor arrangements are put in place to take on and expand the work of the Partnership when it closes. On this issue, the evidence from the three case studies is mixed.

37. On Limes Farm, the SRB scheme, with only £1 million of SRB funding was responsible for bringing together a variety of partners who delivered a further £9 million of funding some of which would not have come to Limes Farm in the absence of SRB. The partners developed a new joint commitment to the estate which had not existed before. Several partners have stated, notably the Health Authority and Police Authority, that the enhanced commitment will continue into the future. Some improvement in outcomes were achieved within the three year duration of the scheme particularly in the reduction of crime and there is a chance that further improvements in outcomes will be secured.

38. The work of the Northumbria Community Safety Scheme has been able to continue in a modified form due to the partnership’s success in attracting later rounds of SRB funding. Moreover the useful inter-agency work set up and developed by the round 1 scheme will be invaluable in implementing the recent Crime and Disorder Act in which local authorities, in partnership with the police and other agencies, will be required to develop and implement a strategy to reduce crime and the fear of crime in each local neighbourhood. This new legislation will ensure, perhaps by good fortune, that effective successor arrangements are in place in this case.

39. The exit arrangements for Brent and Harrow are less robust. The business support services for start-ups will revert to Business Link and Enterprise Agencies but the focus will also move back to supporting existing SMEs and funding for new start-up support will be reduced. The continuing work on developing education/business links will revert back to the mainstream programme of visits organised by the TEC and is likely to lose momentum as a result.

40. The TEC will attempt to continue to build the capacity of ethnic minority community groups but on a much reduced funding basis. Thus in spite of the development of innovative approaches to changing the business culture in Brent and Harrow, the small scale and short duration of this scheme, without robust successor arrangements, will not have achieved a dynamic and sustainable enhancement of the business culture.
Strengths and weaknesses of small schemes of short duration

41. The evidence from the final evaluation of the three case studies highlights some strengths and weaknesses which may be common amongst such schemes.

**Strengths**

- The small amount of resources available to smaller schemes provides an incentive to target their activities closely to small geographical pockets of deprivation or to particular thematic activities to specific client groups. There was evidence that these early Round 1 schemes had had some success in reaching their target client groups.

- Small schemes offer an opportunity to develop and try out new types of regeneration initiative. Two of the three case studies had been innovative in particular parts of their scheme – Northumbria Community Safety with respect to developing an inter-agency and inter local authority strategy to counter drug abuse and Brent and Harrow in respect of the mentoring of underachieving pupils and in attempting to build the capacity of ethnic minority community groups.

- Partly because of these two strengths small schemes tend to be cost-effective as measured in the conventional way as the public sector cost per unit of net additional output. In many such schemes small benefits were associated with low costs resulting in a favourable cost/benefit ratio relative to larger schemes. This could not be maintained if the scheme were greatly extended in scale.

**Weaknesses**

- In two of the three case studies the lead partners were dominant. Use was made of some existing Partnerships and some partners were marginalised and did not consider themselves to be involved in decision making.

- The small scheme case studies had made genuine attempts to involve the community in their activities but had not been wholly successful – partly because of the short duration of the schemes.

- Private sector leverage of funding was below the average for all SRB schemes in these small schemes partly because of the absence of larger capital projects.

- The extent of mainstream programme bending into the three case study areas was below that for all SRB schemes and was limited almost entirely to short distance diversion within the District Council area. Other parts of the District would lose expenditure to the benefit of the SRB area.

- Successor arrangements were hit and miss depending on whether further regeneration funding was secured. In two cases where further
regeneration funding was not secured the durability of the benefit is at risk.

- The impact of the schemes on area regeneration outcomes was small – almost by definition. Small schemes do not in themselves reach the threshold required to develop the momentum to secure dynamic improvements in neighbourhood outcomes, which will be sustainable in the longer term. In this sense they may only offer good value for money when closely targeted to small needy client groups in an innovative way and applying the lessons learnt to larger urban areas where regeneration needs are greatest.

42. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 5 is very successful) we have given a score to each of the three case studies overall as to how successful we believe they have been in achieving a) Value for Money, b) bringing about wider achievements and c) securing the benefits to local area regeneration from effective Partnership working. Our view reflects the balance of judgement across the team emerging from the final evaluation work. The table below indicates the scores.

### Achievements of the three case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limes farm</th>
<th>Brent &amp; Harrow</th>
<th>Northumbria Community Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider achievements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. It is of interest to note that although all three schemes were Round one of short duration and relatively small in terms of expenditure there were significant differences in their achievements. Clearly, such a ranking exercise has many limitations but as the overall research programme progresses we will be seeking to correlate scores with other characteristics of the scheme and which influenced the selection of the case studies. (e.g. objectives, geographical coverage and partnership arrangements).

### Lessons from the three case studies in relation to research method and the use of research in SRB schemes

44. An Annex to this Report provides evidence relating to research method and the use of evidence based research in designed SRB schemes. The team describe in some detail problems which have emerged in deploying their research approach in the three case studies and general lessons which have been learned.
45. The Annex also points to the extent to which the individual Partnerships used relevant research evidence in developing and implementing their regeneration schemes. In some cases the Partnerships obtained evidence in relation to the nature and scale of the problems they were addressing through local social surveys. This can provide an opportunity for the community to be informed and consulted at an early stage of a regeneration programme which could be a key issue for future programmes such as New Deal for Communities. In other cases Partnerships have sought to identify how well they are meeting regeneration needs and how effective their Partnerships have been in bringing about collaboration, co-ordination and synergy of effect.
PREFACE

The Single Regeneration Budget Evaluation Unit

This Report is a final evaluation of three round one Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) Challenge Fund schemes which are now completed. This forms the basis of the third year of work undertaken by the evaluation team located in the Department of Land Economy in the University of Cambridge. It is led by Dr Peter Tyler and John Rhodes assisted by Angela Brennan. The evaluation team are tracking the progress and achievements of 20 SRB case studies over a period of eight years. The three case studies examined here are the first schemes from the 20 to complete.

The evaluation team also includes Steve Stevens based in the Department of Land Economy and Roger Tarling from Cambridge Policy Consultants.

The research team would also like to acknowledge the extensive assistance given by the Government Offices for the Regions and also the following case study partnerships without whose co-operation and help this research would not have been possible.

Northumbria Community Safety
Limes Farm Partnership
Brent & Harrow
1. THE POLICY CONTEXT

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. The SRB Challenge Fund is now in its fifth year and has been one of the major forms of support for local area regeneration in England. Certain key features of its design and delivery have remained throughout. Central to the whole programme has been the emphasis on a partnership led approach to regeneration whereby interested parties can come together at the local level to devise a regeneration scheme and seek financial support through an annual bidding round organised and run by the Government Offices for the Regions (GORs), although responsibility for this has now passed to the newly formed RDAs (with the exception of London). The number and range of partners represented in the partnership can vary considerably and the lead partner can be drawn from the private, public or voluntary/community sector.

1.1.2. The regeneration scheme can be broadly based in that it seeks to tackle a very large range of issues of relevance to local regeneration or it can be thematic with an emphasis on a particular component of the problem. The size of the regeneration scheme can vary from a total cost of less than £1 million to sums of £100 million. A further feature is that its duration can range from one to seven years. Proposals for funding can be made for any area in England since there are no formal geographic boundaries.

1.1.3. A further feature of the programme is that once regeneration partners have secured funding they are responsible for the management and operation of the scheme, reporting on a sixth monthly basis to GORs through an established monitoring system.

1.1.4. Through the successive rounds of SRB there have been some changes to the basic framework within which it operates. Thus, in the fourth round GORs issued strategic guidance which allowed Partnerships to gain insight into the broader regional context for regeneration within which they might seek to make a bid. Supplementary guidance was also issued which set in context how measures to encourage regeneration might be considered in relation to
crime (The Crime and Disorder Bill), drugs (Drugs Action Teams), ethnic minorities, public health and the needs of vulnerable groups. In Round Five strategic guidance was issued which indicated that it was the intention to allocate SRB funding according to a two tier approach whereby approximately 80% of new SRB resources will go to support large, comprehensive schemes in the most deprived areas and the remaining 20% of resources will be available for other areas of need and smaller pockets of deprivation including rural and coalfield areas.

1.1.5. In recognition of the need to assess the contribution which SRB is making to local area regeneration the DETR commissioned a research team based in the Department of Land Economy in the University of Cambridge to study the programme. This study had three objectives, the first was to design a methodology with which to evaluate the process by which economic, social and physical regeneration was achieved through the activities of SRB. The second was to undertake an evaluation of the first and second phase of the partnership programmes funded under SRB and thus establish the impact and cost effectiveness of the regeneration package. The third objective was to undertake an analysis of those bids and partnerships which sought funding under the auspices of the Single Regeneration Budget but which were unsuccessful.

1.1.6. Over the last two years the evaluation team have produced a number of reports in line with the study requirements. The key reports have been:

1. The Evaluation Framework
2. An Examination of Ten Unsuccessful Bids
4. Key Results from the Residents’ Baseline Social Surveys
5. New Findings on the Nature of Economic and Social Exclusion in England and the Implications for New Policy Initiatives
6. An Examination of Baseline Issues (forthcoming)

1.1.7. Details of these publications are given in Annex 2
1.1.8. Since the publication of the Interim Report the research team have been able to undertake final evaluations for three of the twenty SRB Partnerships which were chosen at the beginning of the study to be case studies.

1.1.9. This Report seeks to build on the findings of three of the original twenty selected SRB case studies to discover what have been the achievements of SRB at the final evaluation stage.

1.1.10. Besides reporting on the achievements of SRB in the three case study areas the Report also comments on issues relating to research method and the use of research in SRB schemes. Thus, the research team describe the difficulties they have experienced in seeking to deploy the research method they used. They have also examined during the course of their studies how, and to what extent, partnerships and individual members base their deliberations and formulation of policy on a sound evidence base. The results of this work are presented in an Annex to this Report.

1.2. The SRB evaluation framework

1.2.1. The evaluation framework which underpins the evaluation of the SRB programme is described in considerable detail in the first discussion paper produced by the team (‘Evaluation of Regeneration Activities Funded under the Single Regeneration Budget Bidding Round – The Evaluation Framework’, Department of Land Economy Discussion paper 83, 1996). In summary, the framework identifies three main research areas where evaluation evidence is required so that the overall achievements of SRB can be assessed. These are shown in diagram 1.1. The first concerns the costs and benefits and thus the value for money attributes of the programme. The second relates to what we term ‘wider achievements’ which are crucial for understanding how well the SRB programme is able to bring about longer term change and sustainable outcomes. The third refers to partnership effects and thus the impact of SRB on the ability of local players to deliver regeneration.
Diagram 1.1  The key elements in the SRB evaluation framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs and benefits; Value for Money</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Additional Costs</strong> £m</td>
<td><strong>Net Additional Benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Partnership</td>
<td>Direct jobs created in Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public sector project expenditure</td>
<td>Indirect jobs created from non-wage project expenditure in Partnership areas as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on Partnership projects by the private sector (including voluntary sector)</td>
<td>Number of training places provided (1 year duration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net additional costs</td>
<td>Number of enterprises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of sites subject to environmental improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of residents receiving direct community/benefits from Partnership etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wider achievements

- targeting of policy to disadvantaged groups
- innovation and demonstration effects
- involvement of the private sector
- capacity building
- sensitising the public sector to the needs of the area

Partnership achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ordination</th>
<th>• avoidance duplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• indivisibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• competitive advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clustering</th>
<th>• demonstration effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• scale economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• critical mass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synergy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.3.  Research Area 1; Impact, short term cost-effectiveness, and value for money

1.3.1.  In order to assess cost effectiveness and the value for money aspects of the case study partnerships we have used a cost benefit framework. The broad
The elements of the framework have been designed to follow closely the recommendations of EGRUP\(^1\) (HM Treasury 1995) and are summarised in diagram 1.1. The SRB programme gives equal weight to the economic, physical and social aspects of regeneration and in line with this it has been necessary to recognise the diverse range of benefit streams that can arise from a SRB regeneration scheme and these are shown in figure 1.1. We have produced a cost benefit account and VFM calculation from each of the three SRB partnerships which form the basis of the final evaluations described in this Report.

**Figure 1.1** A cost-benefit framework with which to evaluate SRB Partnerships

---


---

\(^1\) The Evaluation Group on Regional and Urban Programmes which was chaired by the Treasury. Its main audience is officials in central government who are concerned with the appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of regeneration programmes and projects.
1.4. Research Area 2; Wider achievements

1.4.1. A central component of the evaluation framework being used to assess the achievements of SRB relates to wider achievements. These can take a number of forms and we have examined the following during the course of the final evaluation of the three case studies;

1.4.2. Reducing social exclusion; bending the mainstream. A central component of the wider achievements of the SRB programme relates to its ability to ‘bend’ mainstream spending in the areas concerned such that the problems of individual areas and the people are addressed more effectively.

1.4.3. Private sector leverage and participation. The private sector can take several different roles in regeneration depending on the nature of the scheme and the extent to which they can be involved effectively is an important part of regeneration. The private sector can make financial commitments or provide labour ands property inputs as well as goodwill.

1.4.4. Community involvement and capacity building. Building the capability of the community and voluntary sector to be involved in regeneration is a very important wider achievement and the ways in which this can be achieved on the ground can take a variety of forms. These were discussed in the Interim Evaluation Report (DETR Evaluation of the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund – A Partnership for Regeneration; An Interim Evaluation).

1.4.5. Targeting to ethnic minorities. The SRB programme has placed considerable emphasis from its beginning on promoting initiatives of benefit to ethnic minorities. The form of the involvement of ethnic minorities can vary. It can relate to ensuring that the groups concerned receive their share of the relevant outputs. Perhaps even more importantly it can refer to the extent to which ethnic minority communities are involved as partners in drawing-up bids and running Partnerships.

1.4.6. Innovation in project design. To bring about regeneration will often involve trying out new ideas and thinking about local problems in different ways relative to what may have become the conventional wisdom.
1.5. **Research Area 3; Partnership working**

1.5.1. The Partnership approach to the design and delivery of local regeneration has been a central feature of the SRB programme from the outset and the evaluation framework has recognised this. In order to assess the extent to which true partnership working has been achieved the research team have analysed the workings of the three case study Partnerships to assess the extent to which they have been able;

- to draw on expertise from different backgrounds and experience in understanding the variety and depth of the problems of the local area
- to increase the overall resources available for the regeneration initiative concerned by drawing in partners including the private sector
- to achieve economies of scale through clustering projects/programmes within a local area and secure economies in project management
- to gain synergistic effects whereby partners modify their own activities in order to bring them more in line with the objectives of the partnerships as a whole
- to co-ordinate effects which enable the avoidance of duplication of activity, permit large-scale indivisible projects to go ahead and allow partners to specialise in areas where they have a comparative advantage

1.6. **Research methodology**

1.6.1. The research objectives have been achieved by undertaking work over the last twelve months of two main sorts. The first, has been to conduct full final evaluations of the three case study Partnerships whose activities under the original SRB round one funding have now come to an end. The three case study Partnership schemes are; Northumbria Community Safety, Limes Farm Partnership and Brent and Harrow.

1.6.2. In order to undertake these evaluations it has been necessary to talk to the relevant key players involved in the design and delivery of the regeneration schemes concerned. We have also in the case of Limes Farm and Brent and Harrow undertaken surveys of final participants in the schemes concerned. Where possible the work has drawn on the results of other evaluation studies which have been commissioned by the partnerships, as well as surveys conducted during the life of each partnership.
1.6.3. In order to understand the broader context of change within which the three local area partnerships have been working it was also been necessary to conduct a series of interviews conducted with the relevant officers in the remaining seventeen case study partnerships which form the basis of the overall SRB evaluation research methodology and which were reported on extensively at the interim stage. This programme of interviews in the case study Partnerships has been complemented by interviews held with officers responsible for the management and operation of SRB in the respective GORs for the regions.

1.7. The three case studies selected for final evaluation

1.7.1. At the start of the evaluation some twenty case studies were selected on the basis of a number of criteria that were felt apriori to influence the achievements of SRB. The key criteria were type of Partnership (in terms of partners represented and the lead partner), the type of area (i.e. urban, rural, near accessible etc), the type and mix of outputs provided by the Partnership, the scale of the Partnership activity and the duration of the regeneration effect envisaged. The first three of these case studies that have now completed their SRB programme are the subject of this final evaluation. They are Brent and Harrow, Limes Farm and Northumbria Community Safety.

1.7.2. Brent and Harrow was a three year Round one programme. The area targeted by the partnership was the London boroughs of Brent and Harrow which comprise a total population of around 451,000. Over the three year programme £1.6 million of SRB Challenge Funds was dedicated to the scheme. The lead partner was North West London TEC. There were three strands to the Partnership:

- **Understanding Industry**; an Education Strategic Forum involving London Boroughs of Brent & Harrow, Careers Service Partnership, Education Business Partnership, schools, FE colleges, private sector and the TEC.

- **New Business Development**; Enterprise Strategy Group involving Brent Business Venture, Harrow in Business, Business Connection and the TEC, with some input from the London Boroughs of Brent & Harrow.

- **Community Works**; Equal Opportunities Sub Group involving the TEC, representatives from voluntary and community groups. Geared to the
support of community/ethnic minority enterprises as an integral part of
the economic regeneration of the area; 45% and 26% of the respective
populations of Brent and Harrow belong to an ethnic minority.

1.7.3. The **Limes Farm** scheme focused on the regeneration of the Limes Farm
housing estate located in Chigwell, Essex. The estate situated in the Epping
Forest District has a total population of around 2,500. This Round one
programme of three years duration received £1 million from the SRB
Challenge Fund. While primarily a housing programme through the
improvement of public sector (Epping Forest District) housing and
development of Housing Association housing, it also focused on the
enhancement of the local physical environment, improvement of community
health and safety, development of a community identity and the provision of
training, education and personal development opportunities. It was led by
Epping Forest District Council. Other partners included Essex County
Council, the Metropolitan Police, Limes Farm Residents Association (now
Community Association), Essex & Herts Community NHS Trust the London
and Quadrant Housing Trust, Essex Probation Service and Essex TEC.

1.7.4. The **Northumbria Community Safety** scheme encouraged the bringing
together of organisations and individuals to achieve sustainable local
regeneration through increased community safety (through the Community
Safety Strategy) and to supplement and expand multi-agency work on drug
misuse (through Drugs Accord). Its Strategic Objectives relate to crime,
employment and ethnicity. The Community Safety Strategy and Drugs
Accord apply to the whole of Northumbria embracing a population of
approximately 1.4 million. It received £0.9 million from the SRB Challenge
Fund in Round one for its two year programme. The lead partner was
Gateshead MBC. Other partners were Northumbria Police Authority,
Newcastle City Council, North Tyneside MBC, Northumberland County
Council, South Tyneside MBC, Sunderland City Council and the
Northumbria Coalition Against Crime.

1.8. **The structure of the report**

1.8.1. The report is structured in the following way. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 examine
the achievements of the SRB Initiative in each of the three case study areas
using the evaluation framework described in section 1.2. Chapter 5 then identifies lessons from the three case studies in relation to key evaluation issues. Section 6 describes where the evaluation is moving next, the key research areas it is seeking to address and how the research programme intends to do this.
2. BRENT & HARROW BUSINESS SUPPORT SRB SCHEME

2.1. Introduction

2.1.1. Brent and Harrow was a first round SRB scheme which ran for three years, 1995 to 1998. It was a thematic scheme concerned with increasing the start up rate and quality of new businesses and creating a small firm enterprise culture in the North West London TEC area. The TEC area covers the whole of the two London Boroughs of Harrow and Brent which have a combined population of 450,000.

2.1.2. Harrow is a largely residential and relatively affluent Borough with good transport links to surrounding areas, Heathrow and the M4 corridor. A high percentage of the working population is employed in managerial, technical, professional and skilled occupations. Brent, like Harrow, is an ethnically diverse Borough and while the north is similar to Harrow, the south and east of Brent suffers from a range of economic and social problems including high rates of unemployment. Part of the SRB scheme aimed to establish community enterprises in the deprived ethnic community of Brent.

2.1.3. The SRB scheme complemented and supported the “London New Business Programme” as it applied in Brent and Harrow. SRB expenditure on the scheme totalled about £1.5 million over a three year period. A scheme of this size, covering a large area, could not be strategic. Rather the scheme was used to top-up and enhance the expenditures and activities of two existing local partnerships through which the North West London TEC was already delivering part of its training and enterprise strategy for Brent and Harrow.

2.1.4. Although the SRB scheme played rather a minor supporting role in relation to the TEC activities as a whole, it introduced two innovative features. The first related to school/business links in which underachieving secondary school pupils were provided with an advisor/mentor from the staff of private sector companies. The second was the targeting of appropriate business advice and support to strengthen organisations and community development in Brent and Harrow which included the start-up of community businesses in the most
deprived ethnic minority neighbourhoods. Both of these innovative features met with some success – but on a relatively small scale.

2.2. Objectives of the scheme

2.2.1. The aim of the scheme was “to help create a dynamic local economy in North West London through:-

- improving the quality and growth rates of new businesses
- enhancing education/industry links to ensure that young people can benefit from the job opportunities locally
- to enable the participation of voluntary groups through the development of successful community enterprises”

2.3. Overall Partnership arrangements

2.3.1. In identifying these three objectives, which remained distinct and separate throughout, the scheme built on three strategic partnership groups two of which had already been developed by North West London TEC. The three partnership groups were known as:-

- New Business Development
- Understanding Industry
- Community Works

2.3.2. The partners for the New Business Development initiative were the TEC Enterprise Director, two enterprise agencies namely Brent Business Venture and Harrow in Business and the Midland Bank. For “Understanding Industry” the partnership consisted of the London Boroughs of Brent and Harrow, the Careers Service Partnership, the existing Education/Business Partnership, individual schools, FE colleges, the private sector and the TEC.

2.3.3. For the “Community Works” strand of the SRB scheme the Partnership Board consisted of the Equal Opportunities Sub-Group which was chaired by a member of the TEC Board and included representation from national and local voluntary and community groups and the Princes Trust.

2.3.4. Two of these Partnerships had been set up by North West London TEC to take forward its contribution to the then London “New Business Programme”
Brent & Harrow Business Support Scheme

which had been set up jointly by all London TECs in order to reconcile, harmonise and co-ordinate their contributions to a London-wide business growth strategy (the Pan London Strategic Framework). The third Partnership was set up as a direct consequence of the SRB scheme and aimed to encourage the setting up of community enterprises in deprived ethnic neighbourhoods. However, this strand of the scheme accounted for only 10% of SRB expenditure. The allocation of resources to the three strands of the scheme was based on TEC managers expectations of the likely take up of the various initiatives. The 10% allocated to Community Works was arrived at partly by undertaking a survey of the ethnic communities in Brent – and in particular the numbers wanting to set up community businesses.

2.3.5. The three Partnership groups met together in an annual meeting to promote harmonisation of the three SRB programme elements of the scheme under the auspices of the North West London TEC who acted as lead partner in all three elements and for the scheme as a whole.

2.3.6. The idea of developing a three pronged approach to creating a more dynamic local enterprise culture by supporting small business start-ups, creating closer links between schools and businesses and helping to set up community businesses in deprived neighbourhoods is attractive. However, SRB funding in total was quite small and splitting it three ways spread resources thinly on the ground and an opportunity was missed to administer and co-ordinate the three elements under a single SRB Partnership which the TEC has subsequently done. Rather the TEC used some but not all SRB to top-up the funding of separate activities which it was already undertaking.

2.4. Overall scheme costs/expenditures

2.4.1. The expenditure on the three strands of the scheme, which was spread over three years, is shown in table 2.1
Table 2.1 Expenditure in the Brent and Harrow SRB scheme 1995-98 (£000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SRB</th>
<th>Other public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Business Development</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Business</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Works</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1561</strong></td>
<td><strong>459</strong></td>
<td><strong>295</strong></td>
<td><strong>2315</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2. Total expenditures associated with the three strands of the scheme was £2.3 million of which £1.6 million (67%) was SRB, £0.5 million other public expenditure (22%), and £0.3 million (11%) was from private sector sources. Expenditure on each of the three strands was £1.2 million (52%) on new business development, £0.9 million (40%) on education/business links and £0.2 million (8%) on community enterprises in deprived estates.

2.5. Overall private sector leverage

2.5.1. The total public to private expenditure leverage ratio was 6.8:1 and the SRB to private expenditure ratio was 5.3:1. Leverage was higher for the New Business Development component of the scheme in which the private sector contributed £1 for every £4.3 of SRB expenditure. However, much of this private sector contribution would consist of start-up funding supplied by the new businesses themselves or their banks rather than private sector contributions to regeneration of a non profit making kind.

2.6. New Business Development

Outputs

2.6.1. That part of the scheme dealing with new business start-ups achieved more in terms of gross outputs than was originally expected when the SRB bid was first approved. The three year target gross outputs were revised upwards after one year of operation and the actual achievements after three years broadly matched or exceeded these enhanced targets. Performance was particularly favourable in targeting to ethnic minorities (see table 2.2). Both as regards start up of new SMEs and the formation of community businesses within the Community Works element of the scheme. It was not uncommon for round 1
schemes to raise one or more of their target gross outputs after the first year. This was mainly because some managers, under time pressures to submit delivery plans erred on the side of caution in making forecasts of their gross outputs.

2.6.2. The scheme was effectively monitored in terms of measuring expenditures and gross outputs. However, the monitoring database was subject to frequent up-date and revision – even for previous periods so that the figures returned to GOL were not always wholly consistent with figures currently being used internally within the scheme. End scheme totals could, however, be reconciled satisfactorily.

2.6.3. Whilst many of the gross output achievements exceeded both the original and revised targets this was not the case with indicators which reflected more the outcomes of the scheme – as for example in the rate of new firm survivals. Original targets over-estimated the actual survival rates achieved. One reason for this was that more and more marginal and potentially vulnerable start-ups were being advised by the scheme some of which would be displaced by other local firms (given a fixed local market) before they became fully established.

Table 2.2 New Business start-up gross outputs: actual and expected (1995 to 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original target</th>
<th>Revised target</th>
<th>Actual achieved</th>
<th>Actual as % of revised target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No jobs created/safeguarded total</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: ethnic minority</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of business start-ups total</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: ethnic minority</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No businesses surviving</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate (%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pre-start counselling &amp; planning days delivered</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No businesses receiving management support</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management support days delivered (av 1 day/month x 10)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No soft loans issued (2 yrs only)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No business skills audits carried out</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector gross cost per surviving business start-up (£s)</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Project monitoring records submitted to the Government Office for London

The Business Survey

2.6.4. The evaluation team conducted a business survey amongst small firms which had been assisted/advised under the SRB start-up scheme. This survey was undertaken primarily to assess what proportion of the gross outputs were considered to be additional to the area as a direct consequence of the SRB scheme after allowing for deadweight and displacement and what the quality and durability of the achievements were likely to be. Some 50 (13%) of the surviving firms were interviewed by telephone. In addition we benefited from an internal evaluation based on 15 case studies.

2.6.5. Only about 60% of respondent firms could recall receiving any support until they were reminded - but this is not an unusual response for business advisory services because the amount of advice might have been limited to one meeting up to two years previously. About 8% had received information, 2% had been referred elsewhere, 23% had advice on raising finance, and 57% had been assisted in the preparation of a business plan. Some 15% were advised on IT hardware and software and 80% on marketing. Over one third had received useful help with training and 40% with accounting advice. None had received support for exporting and only 4% on technology (other than IT).

2.6.6. 70% of firms had met with Managers/Advisers provided by the SRB scheme on less than 6 separate occasions, but one firm had met on 14 occasions. Most firms had less than 6 contact hours of assistance the maximum being 46 hours for one firm. Over 80% of companies had implemented the advice/support and 83% of the companies had found the support “useful” or

---

2 A 13% sample of the surviving population of new start-ups is adequate for the purpose of establishing additionality estimates. The results will be subject to a margin of sampling error of +/- 10%. The evaluation results indicate an estimated net additionality ratio of 26.1%. This point estimate thus represents a range of 23.5% to 28.7%.

The central estimate of the Exchequer cost per net additional job in surviving firms of £5,300 per job represents a range of possibilities between £4,800 and £5,900. The cost implied in substantially increasing the sample to reduce this range would not be warranted in an exercise such as this – since the value for money assessment would not be different whether you adopted either end of the range as the true value.
“very useful”. About three quarters of firms had sought help and advice from elsewhere before or after their support from this programme with roughly equal proportions seeking advice from TECs, Business Link, private sector (accountants/banks) and Local Enterprise Agencies. 30% considered the advice from the SRB programme to be better than they received elsewhere, 25% considered it to be much the same and only 13% thought it was of poorer quality. What was better with the SRB programme was mainly the skill and experience of the business advisers and the way in which they could tailor their advice to the particular circumstances of individual companies.

2.6.7. On the issue of additionality the results indicate that 83% of the firms would definitely have started up anyway, in the absence of the SRB scheme and a further 9% would probably have started up in any case. At the start-up stage deadweight is therefore very high at about 87% or 88%. Additionality in terms of number of start-ups is as low as 12 to 13%. The main source of additionality was claimed to be on the subsequent survival of the companies. Some 23% said that the firm would definitely not have survived without the scheme and a further 20% said that it might not have survived without the scheme. On this evidence the evaluation indicates that 55% of the start-up activity assisted by the scheme is deadweight and 45% of the activity is additional (i.e. 12% + 23% + 10%). Local area product market displacement within NW London as indicated in the company survey was 42%, the remaining 58% being additional to the local area.

2.6.8. Overall net additionally of the scheme therefore is estimated to be 26.1% (58% of 45%). This additionality ratio can be applied to the gross output figures on new start-ups and employment for the programme as a whole as shown in table 2 after first applying the actual survival rate of 62% to the 1116 gross jobs created/safeguarded which leaves 692 gross jobs.

Value for money

2.6.9. The additional number of surviving start-ups, generated as a direct consequence of the SRB scheme is about 100 firms. Additional employment to Brent and Harrow is estimated at 181 jobs (26% of 692). The Exchequer cost of the business support part of the scheme was £960,000. Two key value for money ratios are:-
2.6.10. The results of the VFM analysis are that the public sector cost of establishing each net additional surviving start-up is £9600 and the public sector cost per net additional job in those start-ups is £5300. These results are not dissimilar to the results of other evaluations of previous initiatives designed to encourage business start-ups and to assist the expansion of small firms. Despite the undoubted high levels of deadweight and displacement which are found to be associated with advice and assistance to new start-ups and existing SMEs, the cost effectiveness of such measures tends to be relatively favourable because the cost of funding such programmes is relatively low. The equivalent cost per job for programmes attracting larger companies into an area – such as Regional Selective Assistance (RSA) – would be much higher at around £15,000 per job (DTI Evaluation Reports for RSA) – although in the latter case the quality of the benefits in terms of additional local value-added is likely to be higher than in the start-up scheme in Brent and Harrow.

Reasons for favourable cost effectiveness

2.6.11. One factor contributing to cost effectiveness in Brent and Harrow was that the scheme was well designed and managed. The evidence for this conclusion emerged from the company survey. Most firms were able to compare the advice and assistance received under this programme with advice/assistance sought from the private sector (banks, accountants) and from Business Link which is a locally delivered national advisory programme mainly for existing SMEs. Most firms said that the SRB funded local initiative had been more useful to them than other sources of advice. The main reasons given for this were:-

- the accessibility of the advice
- the number of contact hours available at various stages
- the high quality of the business advisers
- the fact that advice continued to be available up to 18 months after start-up
- the flexibility and wide coverage of types of advice available
• the fact that the advice was not charged for
• the high participation in a newly formed Business Self help Group
• the availability of sales development grants

Targeting to ethnic communities

2.6.12. Another strong feature of the programme was the success achieved in targeting the programme towards members of the ethnic communities. Of the gross business start-ups supported some 226 were by members of the ethnic communities which was three times larger than the number expected and constituted 37% of the total. However, there is some evidence that businesses started by members of the ethnic communities had a higher than average propensity to close within a three year period. Amongst surviving businesses at 1998 some 30% were run by members of the ethnic communities. Even so this ratio is above the proportion of ethnic communities within the total population. There is evidence therefore of effective targeting towards ethnic communities.

Small contribution to change in outcomes

2.6.13. Whilst cost effectiveness of the start-up programme was favourable the overall contribution to changed outcomes in Brent and Harrow was quite small. At the baseline there were a total of 10,243 firms in the area. After 3 years and approx £1 million of public expenditure the scheme contributed an additional 100 firms to this total- a net contribution of 1%.

2.6.14. Similarly at the baseline there were 26800 unemployed people in the two Boroughs. The scheme created/safeguarded some 181 net jobs. If all these would have been unemployed without the scheme, then the scheme has reduced the numbers unemployed by only 0.7%. The scheme has reduced the rate of unemployment by less than 1/10th of 1 percentage point.

2.6.15. These contributions to a change in outcomes for the area are quite small - they do not have the critical mass to provide the catalyst for dynamic change which could transform the local economy in the medium and longer term.
Factors limiting the impact on final outcomes

2.6.16. There are two main factors limiting the impact of business start-up schemes - even when, as in this case, they are well designed, managed and targeted and are innovative in terms of good practice. These are:-

- few, if any, new firm start-ups grow into medium-sized or larger companies
- support schemes operate at the margin of the potential stock of candidates for starting up businesses and at the margin deadweight, closure rates and displacement rates are high and would probably go higher still if the programme became larger and more proactive to capture even more marginal candidates. Diminishing returns would raise costs more than it raised net contribution to outcomes. Business start-up programmes are cost effective only when conducted on a relatively small scale – as in Brent and Harrow – with little overall impact.

2.6.17. We have examined the types of activities assisted by this scheme and the subsequent performance of the surviving firms. Very few supported firms were in manufacturing and those that were, such as a manufacturer of hatpins, had all remained very small.

2.6.18. Almost 10% of firms were importers of specialist products. The largest group of firms were in business services, such as graphics, computer software, and specialist corporate services such as organising conferences and chauffeurs for executives. Most of the remainder supplied personal and professional services such as counselling. Most sold into a North West London market and some into a wider London market but few had national or international markets. Local supplier linkages and income multiplier effects in the target area were relatively small and limited to retail margins because the extent of manufacturing and exporting services in the area is quite small.

2.6.19. Few surviving firms had expanded beyond the point of employing 10 people. The average employment in surviving firms was 1.8. When asked what they expected employment to be in 5 years time some replied that they would deliberately limit expansion. Some would cope with expansion, not by increasing direct employment, but by sub-contracting and licensing. A minority expected to, or hoped to expand and a handful of companies stated
that they might employ up to 25 people by 2003. None expected to expand beyond that to grow into medium-sized businesses.

2.6.20. If, in addition to the absence of growth potential, in assisted new business start-ups, the stock of potentially successful entrepreneurs is limited because of an absence of a widespread business culture then the scope for business start-up schemes for having a large impact on the local economy will remain limited. This may have been the reason for the second strand of this SRB scheme, namely to interest young people in a business career by developing school/business links.

2.7. **Understanding Business**

2.7.1. This was the second major theme of the NW London TEC SRB scheme and it focused on enhancing the knowledge of business amongst school children in the two Boroughs. There were three main areas of action under this theme:-

- all pupils in secondary school stages 1-4 would have the opportunity to learn something about local employers in particular and the business world in general
- the importance of key growth sectors as a source of job opportunities were highlighted, principally in information technology, food processing, engineering and manufacturing
- there would be school based initiatives with a local employer input to enhance the personal development of young people who were at a disadvantage in the labour market - and to raise their confidence, aspirations and educational attainment.

2.7.2. Taking the latter first disadvantaged pupils were subjected to a mentoring programme where mentors from local businesses/organisations gave their time freely to work with individual disadvantaged pupils (or small groups) on a regular basis. There were five projects:-

- Harrow Black Mentoring 3 schools
- Windsor Fellowship Mentoring 8 schools
- Student tutoring 5 schools
- Work experience for refugee students
- Young compact (extended to year 7) 5 schools
2.7.3. With respect to the first theme “Business Education Entitlement” much of the project consisted in preparing training documents for teachers with a view to integrating business education into the regular curriculum. The results were very patchy with many teachers being too busy to do this. Few schools proceeded beyond irregular one-off visits to industry which had traditionally taken place under the mainstream business/education links programmes.

2.7.4. The project funded a young enterprise management conference and a 10 week 1 hour programme of lectures to year 10 students by local employers.

2.7.5. Within the second theme there was a Food Technology Project for science students encouraging them to pursue further training and a career in local food processing firms experiencing skills shortages. There was also an Internet Project for 6 special schools.

2.7.6. We show below that the level of school performance in Brent and Harrow secondary schools has improved, relative to the England average during the period of operation of this SRB scheme. Whilst there is some evidence that the mentoring component of the scheme had a beneficial effect on the motivation and aspirations of some underachieving pupils, the overall improvements in school performance will have been caused by other general factors in addition to the scheme itself.

**Gross outputs**

2.7.7. The main gross outputs associated with business/education projects were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. disadvantaged pupils in difficulties given one-to-one mentoring or mentoring courses</td>
<td>3,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. pupils involved in school/business visits/lectures</td>
<td>43,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. employers involved in collaborative projects</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. short duration teacher placements in companies</td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.8. There is almost certainly substantial double counting in these gross output returns made by the Partnership to the Government Office to the extent that the number of pupils involved in school/business visits will include many pupils three times - because pupils made such a visit three times, one in each
of the school years in which the scheme operated. The correct interpretation is that 50-60% of all secondary school children obtained some benefit from this SRB scheme in each of three years but for most pupils this represented only from 1 to 4 hours of activity directed at understanding business each year. This small number of contact hours may have been too short to significantly change the business aspirations of school leavers. However, the number of contact hours were higher at both ends of the ability spectrum where the scheme was at its most successful. Brighter senior school leavers worked on enterprise initiatives and attended management conferences whilst disadvantaged children were given mentoring courses or individual mentors from local firms. The assessment of these activities, both by teachers and pupils, was very favourable.

2.7.9. The scheme was very effective in enlisting the active participation in the school/business programme of private firms and other local organisations based in Brent and Harrow. In all some 650 firms participated in lecture programmes, company visits and mentoring schemes and some of these firms gave their services in all three years. Historically this is a high rate of private sector participation representing as it does between 5% and 10% of all business located with the two Boroughs. This willingness of firms to permit staff to mentor disadvantaged pupils, without charge and often in company time, may highlight a hitherto untapped source of private sector involvement in regeneration which could be developed further.

Outcomes

2.7.10. In a business education links scheme costing only £0.5 million of SRB funding, the effect of the scheme in changing outcomes can be expected to be relatively modest.
Table 2.3  GCSE Improvement Measures % of pupils aged 15 at the start of the year gaining 5 or more GCSEs at grades A-C³.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrow schools</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent schools</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England average</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.11. In terms of school attainment for brighter pupils, Harrow schools on average started out with a proportion gaining 5 or more GCSEs grades A-C which was 5 percentage points above the England average in 1994 (see table 2.3). By 1997 the gap was even wider at 8 percentage points. Brent schools started out 9 percentage points below the England average but there was a relative convergence of 2 percentage points towards the English average by 1997.

2.7.12. On performance measures which focus more on disadvantaged pupils the comparison for 1997 is shown in table 2.4, as follows;

**Table 2.4  Performance measures 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harrow</th>
<th>Brent</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% pupils gaining 5 or more GCSEs grades A-G</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% pupils gaining 1 or more GCSE grades A-G</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% half days missed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorised absence</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unauthorised absence</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.13. Both Brent and Harrow secondary schools had better school attendance figures than the average for England and also had a lower percentage of pupils gaining no GCSE qualifications whatsoever. For Brent which contains substantial deprivation the school performance is also above average for less able pupils.

2.7.14. The extent to which the high or improved school performance figures were caused by the SRB scheme is impossible to disentangle. More than 10% of

---

³ Clearly, exam results provide only one measure of enhanced school performance. There are many difficult problems in making too precise a link between the success of the regeneration project and the overall outcomes for students using such measures.
pupils received mentoring support through the scheme and interviews with a small sample of underachieving pupils indicated that the mentoring scheme had made a contribution to raising their aspirations, motivation and performance. But the scheme itself is unlikely to have caused the whole or even a large part of the improved examination performance of Brent and Harrow secondary schools compared with England as a whole.

2.8. Community Works

2.8.1. The third strand of the Brent and Harrow regeneration scheme, and the smallest in terms of expenditure, was to encourage community groups and individuals to set up community businesses and to develop community enterprise.

2.8.2. Community enterprise was defined widely to include a variety of community owned and controlled trading, bartering, semi-voluntary and non-trading activities which addressed the needs of a local community. A community business was defined as a community enterprise that traded on a more or less commercial basis, was of benefit to the local community, was controlled locally and designated any profits for community use.

Rationale

2.8.3. The rationale for this strand of the scheme was:-

• that community businesses would strengthen the management capacities of local residents
• community businesses would have a good understanding of the need for specific local services and local market opportunities
• community businesses may have access to new sources of funding
• NWLTEC was keen to develop mechanisms and initiatives which would involve the experience and energy of ethnic minority communities
• Community Works was to be the vehicle which would help the Black Voluntary Sector and community groups in Brent and Harrow to build its capacity to deliver expertise and advice to local residents.
Programme activities

2.8.4. Under the Community Works initiative, start-up grants and allowances could be offered to community businesses. Courses in business skills training were put on for potential managers of businesses and voluntary sector organisations. Business support and advice was available from experienced business advisors. The scheme promoted information and vocational training for ethnic minority representatives and supported voluntary organisations active in the local community. The scheme was heavily targeted towards community groups and voluntary sector organisations working in ethnic minority communities. There was a successful publicity initiative for the scheme based on a newsletter, leaflets and direct media advertisement.

Costs

2.8.5. Table 2.1 showed that the total costs of this strand of the scheme, spread over three years, was £215,000 of which £140,000 was funded by SRB and £60,000 from the TEC and ESF.

Gross outputs

2.8.6. The scheme has broadly met or exceeded its gross output targets

Table 2.5  Community Works gross outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. community enterprise start ups</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. new businesses started by ethnic minority residents (included in above)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time paid employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority residents provided with information on community businesses</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority residents provided with vocational training/business skills training</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority organisations supported</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional residents taking up voluntary work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals from voluntary organisations provided with training</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The basket of project outputs is extensive given the small project expenditure (see table 2.5). Every £20,000 of public expenditure has produced, on average, outputs of 1 community enterprise, 0.5 of a job, business skills training for 4 ethnic minority residents, support for 20 community groups, and training for 7 voluntary workers. These outputs were generated by a total public expenditure of £215,000 of which £140,000 was funded directly by SRB.

**Additionality**

The managers of the project conducted a survey of participants as the scheme approached the end of SRB funding. The survey revealed that an overwhelming majority of participants had been attracted to the scheme by the hypothecated publicity material which related directly to the scheme. The availability of grants, allowances and business skills training had proved particularly attractive. The survey also revealed that participants would not have joined other schemes if this scheme had not existed. Consequently deadweight was low and additionality was high - mainly as a consequence of very close targeting to ethnic minority communities.

Local area displacement was also low, due to the nature of the local activities undertaken by the community businesses. These included childcare businesses, swimming lessons, a performing arts agency, miniature furniture, community videos and advice services to disadvantaged groups. One such group advised Asian women on health, youth work, employment, training, marital problems, asylum and work with children.

Our overall assessment is that the additionality of Community Works is of the order of 70 to 80%. This additionality, applied to the scheme gross outputs represents the contribution to area outcomes.

**Cost effectiveness**

The scheme has shown that it is feasible to target training and enterprise initiatives to ethnic minority communities successfully. There was a substantial and positive response to this scheme. Additionality of outputs is
high which means that improved outcomes have been achieved for the area. These outcomes are modest because the initiative was small in expenditure terms and of short duration. But the value for money of the scheme is favourable given that the initiative focused entirely on disadvantaged ethnic minority communities.

Durability of benefits

2.8.12. The short duration of the scheme may be partly to blame for the fact that not all the measured outputs are secure. Some of the community businesses are secure, but about half are fragile and vulnerable and have become dependent on public sector grant aid rather than developing as self financing community businesses.

2.9. Successor arrangements for the Brent and Harrow scheme as a whole

2.9.1. As the SRB scheme ends the support services for new business start-ups will revert back to the two large Enterprise Agencies in Brent and Harrow and general assistance to SMEs will revert back to mainstream Business Link Provision. Although Business Link is now charged with helping all SMEs there may be funding shortages for encouraging and training new business start-ups and the number of contact hours with each is likely to be reduced. Potential entrepreneurs from more disadvantaged communities may not find so accessible the high quality support services available under the SRB funded scheme because they will be least able to make a payment contribution for the Business Link services provided.

2.9.2. The good work of the SRB scheme in linking schools with businesses will revert back to the mainstream business/education links arrangements which involves largely routine school visits to larger companies. Much of the work with able pupils seeking a career in technical jobs with local companies will be lost because of the relatively high unit costs of provision, as will the very valuable mentoring work with disadvantaged, under achieving pupils.
2.9.3. There are no viable successor arrangements for the Community Works activity of the SRB scheme. A serious attempt was made by the NWLTEC along with Chambers of Commerce, to recruit the community enterprises into the Chamber and use that as a source of assistance and support, but take-up of the businesses has been most disappointing.
3. LIMES FARM ESTATE

3.1. Description of the scheme

3.1.1. The Limes Farm scheme was designed to address the problems on the Limes Farm housing estate in Chigwell, Essex. The estate, situated on the edge of Epping Forest District, has a population of around 2,500 comprising nearly 1200 households. The housing stock predominantly dates from the late 1960’s and is built to poor design and construction standards with a block of high-density council properties centrally located in three courtyards within the estate. This central area proved to be unpopular under the Right to Buy scheme (where only 3 out of 3300 properties sold across the district were in the central courtyards) and also had severe re-letting problems giving the estate the highest void rates in the district. As a result, the estate fell into general decline typified by high unemployment (15% of 16-24 year old males were unemployed compared to 12% for the district in 1991) and the highest crime levels in the district. A high proportion of households were single parent families (13.2% on the estate compared to 2.3% in the district in 1991), and transfer requests came from 25% of Limes Farm households compared to only 8% for the rest of the district.

3.1.2. To tackle both the physical and social decline on the estate Epping Forest District Council recognised that many issues had to be addressed and the involvement of a wide range of partners was sought to maximise their combined resources into an Integrated Regeneration Scheme. The aims of the scheme were to;

- regenerate the public sector housing in the central courtyard area through physical improvements to 321 properties in the central courtyard area
- develop social housing through the development of 72 dwellings in conjunction with the London and Quadrant Housing Trust
- enhance the local physical environment including improved public lighting, footpaths and traffic calming measures and a play area
- improve community/social conditions including improved health facilities, amenities for the young and a Community Development Worker
- reduce the victims of crime and improve community safety through a beat officer and an estate-based police office
- provide employment and training opportunities for residents including business start-up, construction training, women returners and IT.
3.1.3. The Limes Farm Regeneration Partnership was formed in 1994 to bid for the SRB Challenge Fund. It was instigated and led by Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) who saw the funding as an opportunity to expand their regeneration programme and achieve the wider objectives of an Integrated Regeneration Scheme. The Council was aware of a number of agencies with an involvement on the estate and contacted them regarding the bid. From this the Partnership was developed and Epping Forest District Council were appointed the accountable body.

3.1.4. A Co-ordinating Committee was established and, together with the lead partner it comprised Essex County Council (Highways & Transportation, Social Services and Education Depts), the Metropolitan Police Service, Limes Farm Community (formerly Residents) Association and the Essex & Herts Community NHS Trust. Additional partners included London & Quadrant Housing Trust, Essex Probation Service, Essex TEC, West Essex Business Education Partnership, Essex Careers and Business partnership, Loughton & District Citizens Advice Bureau local schools and the Church.

3.1.5. The full partnership of all partners met twice a year being chaired by the District Council’s Chief Executive. Financial and performance monitoring was carried out by the Co-ordinating Committee which met quarterly. There were initially four sub-groups for Housing, Employment, Community Safety and Leisure, where membership was drawn from the full Partnership reflecting partner involvement in the specific issues of the scheme. Early on a Management Committee was appointed to run the leisure facilities and the Leisure Sub group was subsequently merged with the Community Safety Sub group. The Sub groups met every three months to discuss progress on their specific projects and the lead from each group reported back to the Co-ordinating Committee. This facilitated a good deal of networking between the groups and encouraged greater involvement by some partners e.g. the police estate office became involved in youth leisure programmes and some employment initiatives were developed by the main housing contractor.

3.1.6. The Limes Farm SRB scheme was of three years duration and commenced in 1995. Actual SRB expenditure was £1m, with £7.9m other public expenditure and a further £1.1m from the private sector, making a total of £10m. Some expenditure pre-dated the SRB period and continued for a further year when
all housing improvement works were completed. For the 5 year period, total expenditure was of the order of £13.2m.

3.2. Projects and activities

3.2.1. Within the Council’s Limes Farm Housing Improvement Programme, five projects received SRB funding. The first two of these were targeted on the maisonettes in the three central courtyards. They were to install Mechanical Ventilation Heating Systems in the kitchens and to undertake over-cladding of all properties. The third SRB funded project was the establishment of a local authority estate Management Office. Due to an under-spend at the end of year one, two further projects in the pilot block received SRB funding, these were a door entry system and the installation of lifts. In addition to these SRB-funded projects it should be noted that within the Housing Improvement Programme the Council undertook a number of other projects. These included security improvements to doors and windows, door entry systems, garden areas for ground level properties, porch enclosures and roof alterations. Table 3.1 presents all SRB funded projects.

Table 3.1 SRB funded projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total SRB £ (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing (3)</td>
<td>Mechanical Ventilation Heating Systems</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing (3)</td>
<td>Overcladding/insulation of maisonettes</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing (3)</td>
<td>Estate Management office</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing (3)</td>
<td>Door Entry System</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing (3)</td>
<td>Lifts</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing (3)</td>
<td>Training &amp; Employment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance employment prospects &amp; encourage sustainable economic growth (1, 2)</td>
<td>Community Development Officer</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance quality of life &amp; harness community/voluntary sector talents/resources (7 &amp; 8)</td>
<td>Multi Games Area Project (MUGA)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harness community/voluntary sector talents &amp; resources (7)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2. The training and employment element of the scheme was steered by the Employment and Training Sub Group. The work of this group was coordinated by the Council’s Economic Development Unit who saw the need to get a number of key players involved including the Employment Service, Essex TEC, Epping Forest College and local businesses. A number of
courses were run including returner’s courses and IT training. Collaboration with the local schools also resulted in a number of half-day events being offered by the Construction & Industrial Training Board on Construction Safety to highlight the dangers of the works being carried out. To supplement this the building contractor also did a lot of safety work with teachers and children throughout the year. Business courses were also run, although they did not yield as much interest as expected.

3.2.3. The final project falling within SRB funding was the Social Development Project that comprised a number of initiatives to address the needs of the community. The key to this project was the appointment of a Community Development Officer who was SRB funded for 3 years. The project was managed by the Leisure Services Dept of EFDC. Its aim was to involve the people on the estate in community activity programmes. Following some initial recruitment problems (which delayed the implementation of some projects in the first year) a variety of activities were developed and links forged with the Community Association, local schools etc. As a partial response the EFDC, in conjunction with the parish council, are seeking to fund a Community Development Officer for a further three years. The person has yet to start, but will only work in the Chigwell/Limes Farm area for three days per week, so their activities will be limited.

3.2.4. Within the Social Development Project the Multi-Games Area Project (MUGA) provides an all weather sports surface. This is used by people on the estate, particularly for out-of-school activities. This facility also links in with the work of the Community Development Officer. Fundays and other events have been held at the MUGA sports pitch. This project also received additional funding from EFDC. Currently general maintenance is carried out by a caretaker funded by the Council, although it may be that maintenance will eventually be passed on to the Parish Council as it is a local amenity. This has been a useful resource that will offer recreational facilities for young people on the estate.

3.2.5. In conjunction with MUGA the Limes Farm Drop-In Centre (funded by EFDC) has been set up to address the needs of the younger generation from the estate. While the Youth Service uses this facility 4 nights a week, the Centre also links with other Social Development Projects set up by the
Community Development Officer. The Centre has proved to be a well used resource and there is a possibility that vacant shop premises could be developed to expand this facility.

3.2.6. In addition to the SRB funded projects there were a number of other initiatives, which ran within the scheme. The first of these was the provision of social sector housing on the estate through the conversion of garages and ground floor flats to 72 dwellings with garden space, where 46 were completed during the SRB scheme period. This project was funded by the London and Quadrant Housing Trust and a local authority Housing Association Grant. It formed an important part of the overall Limes Farm Housing Improvement Programme funded largely by EFDC.

3.2.7. The Health Clinic Project funded by the Essex and Herts Community NHS Trust provided a much improved facility for the estate fitting in with the socio-economic objectives of the SRB programme to improve community amenities for residents. A Clinic on the estate had been in operation prior to the scheme on a limited scale from a rented flat on the estate. This service was improved in 1995 with the creation of a new Health Clinic from two old buildings on the estate (public toilet and launderette). The new clinic provides a fuller more accessible service for the community all under one roof. In the future it is hoped that the hours of the Clinic can be extended and that the service improved further by offering a drop-in service as well as improved health promotion generally and more preventative medical services.

3.2.8. The Community Safety Project funded by the Metropolitan Police was another important part of the overall scheme being concerned with the reduction in crime levels and the fear of crime. The main elements of this project were the provision of a beat office and officer for the estate. In addition a number of crime prevention initiatives were started including involvement with local schools, the Community Association and the Scope initiative for the elderly. Most of the original aims of the project have been achieved, although the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme has still to be set up and it is hoped that this will happen with the new beat officer who has recently taken over the estate beat.
3.2.9. Finally, enhancement of the local physical environment on Limes Farm was achieved through a number of pedestrian improvement projects undertaken by Essex County Council’s Highways and Transportation Department. The projects involved improvements to the lighting and footpaths on the estate. In addition the subway which suffered from vandalism was filled in and traffic-calming measures were installed, being completed early in 1999.

3.2.10. The achievements of these non-SRB funded projects played an important part in the overall success of the scheme by contributing to the wider objectives including crime prevention, improvement of social/community amenities and the environmental appearance of the estate.

3.3. Expenditures

3.3.1. Table 3.2 below sets out the expenditure details for the three years of the SRB programme. It shows a total spend of just under £10m. This represents an SRB leverage figure of 1:7.9 from other public and 1:1.13 from private sector expenditure. The largest public sector contributor is EFDC providing almost 90% of other public expenditure. Private sector expenditure is £1.1m from the London and Quadrant Housing Trust. Due to an underspend in year one, SRB expenditure was less than expected. In year 3 most of this was reclaimed which brought the actual SRB figure up to £996K.

Table 3.2 Actual Expenditure totals for the three years of SRB (£000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>1995/6</th>
<th>1996/7</th>
<th>1997/8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFDC</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td>4947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County Council</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex &amp; Herts</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Servs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Housing Assoc Grant</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other public</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>7869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; Quadrant Housing</td>
<td>-242</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private sector</td>
<td>-242</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>5099</td>
<td>9992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Derived from Limes Farm Regeneration Partnership Exit Report. GO East
3.3.2. Table 3.3 compares actual expenditure with what had been expected at the first Delivery Plan stage. While the overall total expenditure figures for the SRB part of the scheme only marginally changed, there was a drop in other public expenditure with an increase in the amount of LA Housing Association Grant. These changes emerged due to early teething troubles with the housing improvement scheme at the pilot stage when additional unforeseen works had to be carried out. The subsequent delays were further exacerbated by delays on the part of the original contractor in completing the works. This had a knock-on effect on parts of the main building and improvement programmes. As a result more EFDC money was spent in the final year of the overall programme (after the SRB scheme had been completed), this can also be seen in table 3.3 which indicates the expenditure position at the end of the five year improvement scheme. Overall funding was at £13.16m with EFDC contributing £7.9m representing an increase on overall intended spend. The LA Housing Association Grant figure went up to reflect the increased costs of property to the London and Housing Quadrant Trust, who also increased their own contribution to the scheme by some 10% to £1.7m over the 5 year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DP1 SRB</th>
<th>Actual SRB</th>
<th>DP1 all (five) yrs</th>
<th>Actual all (five) yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public</td>
<td>6018</td>
<td>5588</td>
<td>7455</td>
<td>7867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA HAG</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>2602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10281</td>
<td>9992</td>
<td>12231</td>
<td>13161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Limes Farm Regeneration partnership Delivery Plan 1 and Exit Report. GO East

3.4. Actual and expected outputs

3.4.1. Table 3.4 below sets out the actual and expected outputs for the Limes Farm scheme. It is clear from the table that in almost all cases outputs were achieved as expected and in more than half the cases outputs were exceeded. Out of the 38 outputs measured there were only three that were not fully achieved. Of these one reached over 98% and the other two achieved over 83%.
3.4.2. Throughout the lifetime of the scheme there were a few adjustments to the output estimates. The number of construction jobs was altered in year two to amend an error in the previous estimate that was based on “man weeks” instead of “man days”.

3.4.3. In year three an adjustment was made which related to the improvement of the number of properties in the scheme over the SRB programme (reduced from 274 to 180). This was changed because original estimates, shown in early Delivery Plans, were based on the total number of properties to be improved within the five year improvement programme, rather than those to be renovated during the period of SRB funding. Thus the change does not reflect any failure on the part of Partnership in securing the SRB targets. The number of Housing Association dwellings completed was also reduced (from 72 to 46) for the same reason. This revision also affected the number of houses where security was upgraded from 274 to 180 by the end of year three.

3.4.4. Due to the timing of qualification attainment in relation to the end of the third year, the estimates for those obtaining qualifications by that time was reduced from 20 to 10, with the expectation that the 20 would be achieved by June 1998. The number of anticipated new businesses also was reduced down from 12 to 6 due to a lower level of interest than expected. The counselling they had received, however, led to a greater likelihood of survival, infact only 1 business did not survive beyond 52 weeks.

3.4.5. The final area of adjustment was to the number using improved cultural facilities. This was affected by the initial recruitment of the Community Development Officer that affected the number of programmes implemented. The anticipated output was reduced from 450 to 272. It is noticeable that despite this reduction, the original target was almost achieved where 395 people had benefited from improved cultural facilities by the end of year 3, a 45% increase on the new target set.
Table 3.4  Actual and Expected outputs for the three SRB years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>DP1</th>
<th>DP2</th>
<th>DP3</th>
<th>Actual as % of expected in DP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs created</td>
<td>1A1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction jobs</td>
<td>1A3</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils benefiting projects to enhance/imp attainment</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>172.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No people trained obtg quals</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No residents accessing emp</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training weeks</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trained people obtg quals</td>
<td>1F1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- of whom formerly unemployed</td>
<td>1F2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No unemployed into self-emp</td>
<td>1G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No young persons benefiting projects promoting pers/soc dev</td>
<td>1J</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>220.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new businesses</td>
<td>2C1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- surviving 52 weeks</td>
<td>2C2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- surviving 78 weeks</td>
<td>2C3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No businesses advised</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No LA dwellings improved</td>
<td>3A4</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HA dwellings completed</td>
<td>3A5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No persons benefiting Comm Safety Initiatives</td>
<td>5A1</td>
<td>4002</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>3195</td>
<td>125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Initiatives</td>
<td>5A2</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>145.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of whom are 60+</td>
<td>5A3</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>119.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dwellings security upgraded</td>
<td>5B1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Comm Safety Initiatives</td>
<td>5C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No youth crime prev initiatives</td>
<td>5D1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>290.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No attending 5D1</td>
<td>5D2</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>283.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No buildings impd</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic calming schemes</td>
<td>6E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No waste man/recycling schemes</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local people access new sports</td>
<td>7A2</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local people access new cultural facs</td>
<td>7A3</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>163.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new health facs</td>
<td>7A4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new sports facs</td>
<td>7A5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new cultural facs</td>
<td>7A6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No using improved sports facs</td>
<td>7B2</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>107.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No using improved cult facs</td>
<td>7B3</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>145.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comm facs improved</td>
<td>7B4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sports facs improved</td>
<td>7B5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cultural facs improved</td>
<td>7B6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vol orgs supported</td>
<td>8A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No individuals emp in vol work</td>
<td>8C</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>127.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Limes Farm Partnership Delivery Plans & Government Office Monitoring Returns.
NB These gross outputs were generated by aggregate scheme public expenditure of £8,679,000 of which SRB funding was only £996,000.
3.5. **Additionality and Displacement**

3.5.1. A key element of the Limes Farm SRB programme was the regeneration of old housing stock, although the major part of the funding for physical improvements, came from local authority budgets allocated in advance of SRB. However, there were some physical improvements using SRB funding which were carried out over and above the local authority’s original programme, though the overall programme was implemented as an integrated regeneration initiative.

3.5.2. Despite this situation there were a number of socio-economic projects that would not have gone ahead to the same extent without the opportunity for partnership working under the SRB initiative. The Health Trust, Metropolitan Police, EFDC Highways Department, EFDC Leisure Services and Essex County Youth Services have developed estate-based programmes, funded outside SRB expenditure, that have enhanced the impact of this regeneration initiative.

3.5.3. The Health Trust originally rented a Council flat from which to operate a clinic, but has subsequently expanded its operations using old estate buildings. There is some indication that the further development of the clinic and its services may not have taken place without the Limes Farm Programme and has possibly displaced initiatives in other local areas.

3.5.4. Although the Safer Community Partnership (SCP) has been in operation for some 6 years, the Metropolitan Police have been encouraged to fund a beat officer for Limes Farm which has seen a significant decline in crime levels. This has, in part, been linked to the work of the SCP and Scope, but should also be understood in the context of the need on the part of the Metropolitan Police for crime prevention initiatives that could be linked to the SRB programme. The advent of a beat officer was seen as an integral part of the measures to improve residents’ quality of life and is now being implemented on other estates.

3.5.5. The Essex County Council and Epping Forest District Council’s Highways Department projects were developed as part of both the physical regeneration
of the estate and crime prevention measures within SRB (e.g. lighting, removal of subways, footpaths and traffic calming). There has been clear additionality as no SRB funding was sought and there are indications that some of this work would not have gone ahead or would have been delayed without the wider physical regeneration of the estate. There is also evidence that some displacement has occurred from schemes in other neighbourhoods within the District, which is desirable only to the extent that the Limes Farm estate experienced more deprivation than adjacent areas.

3.5.6. The employment of a Community Development Officer, partially funded by SRB and EFDC, was linked to the creation of the Multi Games Area, the Drop-in-Centre for young people and a range of social development projects/activities across the age spectrum. The Youth Service also makes use of the Centre as part of their estate-based provision. The need for increased facilities for young people has been identified as a key factor in the regeneration of Limes Farm and resulted in a multi-agency approach through partnership working.

3.5.7. Of all partners interviewed, the lead partner had the most comprehensive view of the additionality of the scheme. Based in part on the lead partner’s experience, our assessment of output additionality was that housing regeneration would have been 7% lower and the other socio-economic initiatives would have been about 50% lower scale without SRB. While the housing regeneration element was already part of EFDC policy, the input of a relatively modest amount of SRB funding did enable a broader scope of physical improvements to be undertaken, thus enhancing the overall initiative. With respect to the other socio-economic projects the assessment of additionality was significantly higher, as some of the projects were expanded on the back of the physical regeneration of the estate. While socio-economic projects were not SRB funded, organisations such as the Metropolitan Police, Essex and Herts NHS Trust and Essex County Council were drawn into the development of estate services and facilities by virtue of being partners in the SRB programme. In consequence they developed their estate-based initiatives beyond what would have been present within a stand alone physical housing improvement scheme.
3.5.8. It should also be understood that some socio-economic initiatives within the programme did engender an element of displacement within the wider local economy but have nonetheless impacted positively on target area net additionality. For example, the Highways Dept, EFDC Leisure Services and the Health Trust have developed projects on the Limes Farm Estate which have seen funding diverted from other neighbourhoods in the local area and this resulted in a lower net additionality assessment for the wider local economy in the District as a whole. In considering the Limes Farm programme, the output additionality for the target area has been assessed at 45% with the District-wide local economy additionality at 35%.

3.6. Value for Money

3.6.1. SRB expenditure of nearly £1m was linked to £9m of other public and private sector funding. While £5m of ‘other public’ funding was EFDC ‘earmarked’ finance for the refurbishment of Limes Farm, SRB did increase the scope of the physical regeneration of the housing stock.

3.6.2. The SRB programme also facilitated the development of a number of social development projects, focusing on a Youth Drop-in-Centre, games areas, training/employment measures, community safety and health provision. These projects have encouraged other agencies, including EFDC Leisure Services, the Police and Health Trust, to widen the scope of their operations on Limes Farm which has resulted in some bending of main programmes in the provision of enhanced services and facilities. This can be identified in terms of the expansion of the Health Centre, the provision of a beat officer and the provision of the Youth Drop-in Centre.

3.6.3. Given the relatively modest SRB expenditure involved, the scope of this estate-based programme was very encouraging. While the programme has enhanced the overall physical appearance of the estate, the socio-economic projects have gone some way to capacity building within the local community and provided increased facilities for local residents. However, there remains a requirement to further involve the community in decision-making and the development of much needed local services such as health care, facilities for young people, Neighbourhood Watch and play areas.
3.6.4. The involvement of the Limes Farm Community Association (LFCA) in the programme did not move beyond the level of consultation. The Association felt that they had not been consulted sufficiently or drawn into the decision-making process regarding development of the various initiatives, giving little opportunity to develop the capacity/resources of the local community. The future role of the LFCA depends upon local residents’ increased involvement in the community. This could be encouraged through the socio-economic initiatives started within the SRB programme, rather than by relying on a few key members.

3.6.5. There will be a number of organisations and improvements left in place as part of the legacy of the SRB Programme and will therefore represent value for money against the level of SRB spend. Apart from the EFDC maintaining its role as landlord and providing an estate housing office, a beat officer will continue to work on the estate and the Health Clinic will continue its operations. It is anticipated that the Drop-in Centre could expand its operations using redundant shop premises that will hopefully see the continuation of Leisure Services and the Essex Youth Service initiatives.

3.6.6. While the CDO will not be based full time on Limes Farm, they will work more closely with the LFCA in developing its profile and capacity building across the community. The Employment and Training Sub Group will continue to work with the Employment Service.

3.6.7. In terms of value for money, SRB has laid the foundations for further opportunities to capacity build across the Limes Farm community and more specifically within the LFCA.

3.6.8. In making an overall assessment of value for money regarding outputs, calculations have been based on a £100,000 unit of total public expenditure. The number of dwellings improved per unit of expenditure was 2.1, with 0.53 Housing Association dwellings newly built. Those attending crime prevention initiatives amounted to 21 per £100,000 of public spend with 46 people benefiting from Community Safety Initiatives and nearly 15 using new sports and cultural facilities.
3.6.9. It should be borne in mind that given the modest SRB total expenditure, the impact of complimentary publicly funded projects has made a significant contribution to the quality of life for Limes Farm residents. It should be recognised that the continuation of the Health Centre, an expansion of the Drop-in Centre and the operation of a beat officer have provided much needed services that directly impact on residents’ lives. While they do have a direct bearing on the quality of life, such projects also provide a focus and networking opportunities for the local community and offer practical strategies for dealing with key local issues.

3.7. Outcomes in relation to baseline

3.7.1. The baseline indicators for Limes Farm covered the full range of Strategic Objectives, although the housing element was the major part of the scheme. Table 3.5 below presents the main outcomes, and where available compares this with the target set for the end of the scheme period.

3.7.2. There has been a considerable drop in the rate of unemployment in the Grange Hill ward down to 4.2% compared with 4.7% in the country as a whole, although it would be difficult to attribute this improvement to the SRB scheme, given the small impact of such projects on existing travel to work areas and patterns of employment in the wider geographical area. This fall is also reflected in the long-term unemployed figures where the percentages out of work for over 6 and 12 months have fallen in a similar proportion to the nation. Construction employment also exceeded its target and 2 resident caretakers are employed on the estate. There were also 5 new businesses that set up and have survived for more than 18 months.

3.7.3. In terms of the physical improvements to the estate most of the targets were met with the exception of the number of houses improved and the number of Housing Association properties created which did not reach their original targets by the end of the scheme. This was due to delays in the early part of the programme and was amended in Delivery Plan 3 with targets subsequently being achieved during the following year.
3.7.4. Evidence of the impact on security and environmental factors has been drawn from two local area based surveys carried out by EFDC in the base year and 1998. Table 3.5 shows the considerable improvements perceived by residents as a direct result of the programme. In terms of security 62% of residents felt it was now adequate on the estate compared with only 22% in the base year. Residents experiencing unwelcome visitors was also more than halved from 51% to only 20% by the end of the programme and those who felt unsafe in staircase towers has reduced dramatically from 74% to 16%. Crime also shows a significant reduction at 26.5% for all crime with a dramatic 65% reduction in car related crime.

3.7.5. There are similar improvements to environmental factors most notably where refuse storage was problematic. Originally 72% of residents suffered in this respect. This has now reduced to 21%. In addition convenience of access via communal staircases and problems with the distance between vehicle and front door have both been halved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SO</th>
<th>Baseline Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline position</th>
<th>Target for end of scheme</th>
<th>Actual at end of scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unemployment rate (England)</td>
<td>15% (8.4%)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>4.2% (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long term unemployed in Grange Hill as % of all unemployed claimants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- over 6 months</td>
<td>60% (57%)</td>
<td>51% (45%)</td>
<td>23% (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- over 12 months</td>
<td>40% (38%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction related employment (man days)</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>2993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resident caretaker posts</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of new businesses established &amp; running 18 months +</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number LA dwellings in need of improvement</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of empty flats &amp; maisonettes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20% reduction</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of ground floor LA dwellings in need of clearance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of LA garages in need of clearance</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of Housing Association properties</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Estate Management Office</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Housing tenure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- local authority</td>
<td>311 (99%)</td>
<td>269 (84%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- private sector</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46 (14%)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reported crimes within the ring road encompassing the Limes Farm Estate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>114 (26.5% reduction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- burglary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15 (28.6% reduction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- car crime</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27 (65% reduction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Police Office and Beat Officer on Estate</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>% residents viewing estate lighting adequate</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>% residents considering security adequate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>% residents experiencing unwelcome visitors</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>% residents who feel unsafe in staircase towers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>% residents considering refuse storage problematic</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>% residents considering distance between vehicle and front door problematic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>% residents considering convenience of access via staircases problematic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Development Worker</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Organised residents representation</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Limes Farm Partnership, NOMIS, Metropolitan Police. *A further 26 HA properties completed by end Nov 1998. **Total crimes excludes non crime domestic incidents (not recorded in '95). NB. With new Home Office counting rules figures are per victim rather than per location, giving a small % inflation of figures.
3.8. Limes Farm resident survey

3.8.1. As a supplement to the Council baseline surveys that focused heavily on the physical improvements of the scheme and was carried out in the three improved courtyard areas only, the Cambridge evaluation team undertook a further survey of residents. The Cambridge survey covered residents in the three improved courtyards and surrounding environs, to gauge the effectiveness of the overall SRB programme (see endnote). The survey looked at general impressions regarding the estate, community, housing, access to local services and shops, health, children & schools and crime and safety and thus gave an insight into the outcomes of some of the wider aspects of the SRB programme.

**Impressions of Limes Farm as a place to live**

**Table 3.6** How satisfied households are with Limes Farm estate as a place to live (base all households, 184)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.*

3.8.2. All households were asked how satisfied they were with Limes Farm as a place to live (see table 3.6). Some 70% indicated they were either satisfied or very satisfied. In terms of improvements over the three years of the SRB programme, households that were on the estate over this period (69% of the total sample) were asked whether they felt the estate had improved as a place to live, significantly 50% said it had. This group was then asked to comment on factors that had either improved or remained a problem over this time. The most notable improvements were the following:

- 86% had noticed improvements to the visual appearance of the housing stock,
- 58% indicated improvements in street lighting
- 48% recorded a decrease in the general level of crime
• 38% suggested graffiti was less of a problem.
• 37% said problems with neighbours had reduced.

3.8.3. These results show some similarities with the EFDC 1998 results where 69% of residents felt street lighting was adequate compared with only 49% in the baseline survey in identifying street lighting and crime related issues as important improvements. Not surprisingly the visual appearance to the housing stock registered the highest degree of improvement. The main factors remaining a problem were:

• 56% litter and rubbish in the streets
• 51% verges and footpaths
• 52% street parking/traffic
• 48% troublesome teenagers
• 44% pollution air/noise/dogs
• 43% vandalism

Community

3.8.4. An important aspect to the Limes Farm programme is the evidence of capacity building within the estate. In this respect the survey focused on community involvement. Some 27% of all households said they felt closely involved in the local community. Only 7% of households were active members of any local community groups or clubs on or around the estate which would suggest that capacity building was still a key issues on Limes Farm.

3.8.5. However, direct involvement with the Limes Farm Community Association (LFCA) was only 15%. Of those actively participating, only 26% held any office within the LFCA, though there was an indication that a small minority of residents did “help out” and attend meetings. In terms of the LFCA safeguarding the interests of all households, only 28% gave a positive response while 36% suggested this had not been the case and 36% either made no response or did not know. This result is mirrored in the EFDC 1998 results where when asked whether it was felt that the community had been brought together by the improvements made to the estate, 33% said it had 34% felt it had not and 31% did not know.
Housing

3.8.6. The survey sought to determine residents’ satisfaction both with their accommodation and its management. All households were asked whether their home had been newly built or improved within the last three years. 57% were in an improved home with a further 11% being in newly built accommodation.

Table 3.7 Changes to house/flat in the last three years (base all households, 184)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newly built</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.

3.8.7. Households were also asked whether they were content with their home. 30% indicated they were very satisfied, 46% were satisfied, with just 8% expressing any dissatisfaction. Table 3.8 which looks at housing tenure by satisfaction with accommodation shows that over three-quarters of local authority and Housing Association tenants are satisfied with their accommodation which compares favourably with the 81% of residents in owner occupied housing.

Table 3.8 Tenure for all households by satisfaction with accommodation (base all households 184)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>v satisfied</th>
<th>satisfied</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>dis-satisfied</th>
<th>v dis-satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Association</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.

*Results for private landlord tenants are not included as the population was very small.

3.8.8. To establish the extent to which Limes Farm residents are content with the estate and accommodation, they were all asked if they wished to move. Some 57% said they wanted to stay on Limes Farm, and a further 5% wanted to move to other accommodation on the estate. The main reason given for
wishing to move off the estate was to live in a different type of accommodation, only 17% of all residents indicated that they wished to move out of Limes Farm because they wanted to live in a different neighbourhood/environment. This shows a considerable change from the position prior to the scheme where Limes Farm had “severe re-letting problems” with only the “most desperate applicants” being prepared to move into the courtyards.

Access to local services and shops

3.8.9. With respect to the accessibility of local services, as presented in table 3.9, 81% of all households surveyed indicated that the health centre was easily accessible, with 62% and 56% respectively suggesting a similar level of access regarding the community centre and the library. Sports and leisure facilities were not considered as accessible (39%) though this may indicate that there was a need to travel some distance from the estate for certain activities that could be relatively expensive. Between 3% and 19% of households indicated that local services were either difficult to get to, or very inaccessible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health Centre</th>
<th>Community Centre</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Leisure/ sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easily accessible</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably accessible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to get to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very inaccessible – feel cut off</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.

3.8.10. More specifically, satisfaction with shopping facilities drew an 85% positive response rate from all households, though only 32% were very satisfied. However, shopping centres are only a few miles away and can be reached by public transport, so there are a number of options for Limes Farm residents. When invited to comment on possible improvements to shopping facilities, only 26% made suggestions. The main comments indicated the need for a post office, more shops and improvements to premises.
Health

3.8.11. Questions regarding improvements to the Health Centre were asked within a separate section of the questionnaire as this had been a specific project aimed at providing a much improved resource for the estate. In light of this it was somewhat surprising that only 21% of residents, who had been on the estate for three years or more, had noticed any improvements. However, table 3.10 indicates that around 40% of households expressed satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of the Health Centre now with only 10% expressing any dissatisfaction. While almost a third did not respond, it is important to note, however, that currently there is no doctor’s surgery at the clinic, and therefore it does not offer a full range of medical services for all residents.

Table 3.10 Satisfaction with Health Care Facilities (base all households 184)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Children

3.8.12. In order to gauge the impact of the SRB improvements on the quality of life/environment of the estate, the survey asked whether Limes Farm was considered a better place to bring up children than it was three years ago. Of those households living on Limes Farm for three years or more, 34% confirmed that the environment in which to bring up children had improved during this period, though 29% did not agree with this statement (37% were unable to comment). While not all respondents in this group had children, it was considered useful to canvass a general opinion regarding this issue.

3.8.13. Some 9% of households who had been on the estate for three years or more, indicated that there had been improvements in local primary schools over this period, with only 5% noting improvements in secondary schools. A further
19% and 12% respectively suggested that primary and secondary schools had stayed the same.

Table 3.11  Satisfaction with schools children attend (base those with children, 88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.

3.8.14. All households were invited to comment on their satisfaction with the schools that their children attend. Only 48% of households indicated that they had children and it is from this sample that responses have been recorded (see table 3.11). 37% recorded some satisfaction with primary schools (with 52% unable to respond) and 26% expressed some satisfaction with secondary schools (67% unable to respond). It should be noted that these high non-response rates could reflect the fact that not all households have both primary and secondary school children and some respondents may not have felt qualified to comment.

Crime and safety

3.8.15. Crime and safety were key issues for the residents of Limes Farm where in the EFDC baseline survey, 74% felt unsafe in the staircase towers on the estate. These perceptions had changed quite dramatically by the end of the scheme with only 16% of residents in the EFDC 1998 survey still feeling unsafe in the staircase towers. These perceptions of safety were mirrored in the Cambridge resident survey where 79% of all households felt very safe or safe in their home at night (table 3.12). As would be expected fewer households (40%) indicated they felt very safe or safe walking out alone at night. However, when comparing general perceptions of safety with three years ago, of those households who had been on the estate during this period, 25% indicated they felt safer, 61% about the same and only 2% less safe and 12% did not know. This again falls in line with the EFDC 1998 survey
results where 81% of residents felt that measures taken to reduce the fear of crime had fulfilled their expectations.

### Table 3.12 Perceptions of safety (base all households 184)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At home at night</th>
<th>Walking out alone at night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little unsafe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.

3.8.16. Clearly the development of crime prevention measures linked to housing improvements, tackling the fear of crime, the provision of a beat officer, work with young people and highway improvements are beginning to have an impact. In addition the fall in crime experienced on the estate during the SRB scheme could be partially attributed to the introduction of the local police officer who would also be expected to contribute to a general reduction in the fear of crime.

3.8.17. Of those households with three years residency or more, 29% thought that the police were carrying out a better job than three years ago, though 37% indicated that this was not the case and 7% felt there was no change. 16% of respondents did not know and the remaining 11% made no response.

3.8.18. When asked what changes they had noticed in relation to safety the main factors stated were housing security, the removal of tunnels, improved lighting, the introduction of resident caretakers and increased facilities for teenagers such as the Drop-in-Centre and the Multi Use Games Area. This indicates that a range of physical and social improvements have impacted upon residents’ perceptions of safety.

### Value of improvements

3.8.19. Households with at least three years residency were asked which of the following three improvement categories they valued most. They were then
requested to rank order their choices first, second and third within each category.

3.8.20. In selecting the three most valued improvements on Limes Farm in the last three years, housing drew the highest overall ranking, with improved environment second, improved safety/reduced crime third and improved youth and sports facilities fourth (see table 3.13). Surprisingly improved health services had an overall ranking of fifth. Improved schools, improved community facilities and reduced unemployment were ranked sixth, seventh and eighth respectively. In many respects the highest rankings for housing, environment and improved safety are in line with expectations given the major objectives of the programme.

Table 3.13 Three most valued improvements on the estate in rank order (base households on estate for three years/more, 126)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved housing</th>
<th>237 (1st)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced unemployment</td>
<td>8 (8th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved environment</td>
<td>90 (2nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety/reduced crime</td>
<td>68 (3rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health services</td>
<td>33 (5th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved youth &amp; sports facilities</td>
<td>49 (4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved community facilities</td>
<td>20 (6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved schools</td>
<td>20 (6th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cambridge Evaluation Team Survey of Limes Farm Residents.

3.9. Benefits to Regeneration from Enhanced Partnership

3.9.1. While the physical refurbishment of the Limes Farm housing stock has been LA led with strong support from the London and Quadrant Housing Trust, the SRB programme has enhanced these improvements and enabled other key players to become directly involved in the regeneration partnership process.

3.9.2. The EFDC Leisure Services and Essex County Youth Service have also been involved in the socio-economic initiatives on the estate. Through the funding of a Community Development Officer (SRB and LA), the MUGA and Drop-in-Centre projects have provided much needed facilities for young people that have impacted on crime issues.
3.9.3. Essex County Council through the Highways Department also brought about improvements which would not have been targeted in the area in the absence of SRB. In effect works carried out on lighting, footpath and traffic calming improvements have impacted on other crime and environmental aspects of the programme.

3.9.4. The Training and Employment sub-group encouraged partnership working between the TEC and Epping Forest College, with both involved in the provision of training and employment courses. These initiatives could help to lay the foundations for future programmes such as New Deal. A local enterprise agency did offer business start-up courses, though the take up has been modest.

3.9.5. While the Safer Communities Partnership pre-dated SRB, it has expanded its activities with the advent of the Limes Farm scheme. The introduction of a beat officer (with funding from the Metropolitan Police) and the operation of courses on personal safety/fear of crime have seen dramatic improvements in crime rates and the perception of crime. Involvement with schools and the Drop in Centre have also enabled the police to build bridges within the local community.

3.9.6. Although the Health Trust operations also pre-dated SRB, the Health Clinic has expanded its operations on the estate and laid the foundation for future community health care programmes. While evidence of partnership working has been limited, there could be opportunities to work with schools, the Drop-in-Centre and LFCA as part of the forward strategy.

3.9.7. The programme, in bringing together a range of expertise/resources, has been able to demonstrate the benefits of partnership working in tackling both physical and socio-economic regeneration issues. While SRB has encouraged some capacity building within the community, the physical regeneration programme could provide the spur for partners to engage in further programmes such as New Deal.
3.10. **Successor arrangements**

3.10.1. In attempting to build a forward strategy the Limes Farm Community Association (LFCA) should have had a major role in representing residents’ interests regarding the further development of their estate. However, while there were consultations with the LFCA, as a member of the Partnership, its role within SRB was limited and perceived as a ‘watchdog’ that reported residents’ ideas back to the Partnership/local authority.

3.10.2. The issue of capacity building is fundamental if residents are to take full advantage of the programmes that are continuing beyond the life of SRB. The LFCA (previously Limes Farm Residents Association) pre-dated SRB and is recognised as representing the interests of the local community. The continuing Community Development Officer (part-time) will offer some opportunities for capacity building over the next three years, though their role should be determined by the LFCA in conjunction with the Parish Council, as the latter will be funding this element of the CDO’s work.

3.10.3. The continuing commitment to a crime prevention strategy and a beat officer will hopefully enable the local community to increase their ownership of a community safety strategy via a Neighbourhood Watch Scheme. The existing Safer Communities Partnership and the Metropolitan Police will be key elements in operating training programmes across the community and designing crime prevention initiatives. The LFCA could play a vital role in developing these initiatives and publicising them in its local newsletter.

3.10.4. The Health Clinic continues to play a major role in Limes Farm and the Health Trust should be encouraged to further expand its activities and operate health education programmes focusing on prevention/healthier living aspects. There is also the possibility that a GP might provide an estate-based surgery from the Health Clinic. Again the LFCA could have a role to play in promoting this facility on the estate.

3.10.5. The existing members of the LFCA are aware of the difficulties of encouraging local residents to become more involved in its operation. In attempting to increase its membership, the LFCA should seek to organise
around key issues concerning young people, crime prevention, health care, training and employment.

3.10.6. It is anticipated that the LFCA will be working in association with the Parish Council, as the latter will be part-funding the CDO for the next three years. The CDO will take their lead from the LFCA in terms of social development projects on the estate.

3.11. Conclusions and Lessons

3.11.1. The Limes Farm SRB Programme has demonstrated the advantages of partnership working, linked to existing regeneration initiatives. The addition of SRB funding has not only enhanced the physical upgrading of ageing housing stock, but encouraged a number of social development projects that have contributed to an increased range and quality of estate-based facilities.

3.11.2. Evidence of main programme bending and additionality (for example through the Metropolitan Police, Essex Youth Services, the Health Trust, EFDC Leisure Services and the Highways Dept.) has demonstrated that Partnership working has been an effective regeneration strategy for the Limes Farm Estate.

3.11.3. While it is understood that EFDC will continue to maintain and improve public sector housing stock and the environmental improvements on Limes Farm, it is crucial that the Council is also involved in the continuing socio-economic developments on the estate.

3.11.4. The physical regeneration and environmental aspects of the SRB programme have made an impact and this must be bolstered by a continuing social development programme that directly involves the community in the ownership of local initiatives and the management of change.

3.11.5. Within the scope of the SRB programme, greater emphasis could have been placed on developing the operations of the LFCA as a successor organisation. While a number of agencies will continue to operate on the estate, it is
important that residents’ interests are represented through an organisation that has been established in Limes Farm over a number of years.

3.11.6. While there has been a demonstration of the benefits of partnership working within SRB, the Limes Farm Partnership will cease to function after February 1999. Although a number of initiatives will continue as a legacy of SRB, there is a clear need for a coherent strategy to encourage agency co-operation, linked to possible further regeneration initiatives.

3.11.7. In seeking further funding sources, a development strategy would need to include the following elements:

- The further physical/environmental regeneration of the estate.
- A continuing programme of training/retraining that enables unemployed residents to take full advantage of local and wider area labour markets.
- The further expansion of social, cultural and health facilities that directly impact on the quality of life in Limes Farm.
- A continuing youth programme.
- The expansion of existing crime prevention measures.

Technical Endnote on The Limes Farm Resident Survey carried out by the Cambridge evaluation team

1. In evaluating the SRB programme it was considered important to conduct a postal survey of residents in order to determine the physical and socio-economic impact of the regeneration initiatives on the whole estate. In some respects this survey was seen as complementing the survey work of the Council.

2. In seeking to build a comprehensive profile of residents’ perceptions regarding the development of their estate, an opportunity was provided for respondents to comment on all elements of the SRB programme. Thus in developing the questionnaire consideration was given to the different aspects of residents’ lives in profiling the estate initiative.

3. Of the 1200 households on the estate, the survey targeted 650 which were equally divided between the core that were the recipients of physical regeneration and the periphery that inhabited the immediate area beyond the three courtyards that were renovated.

4. The questionnaire was sub-divided into brief sections in order to focus on the key elements that the SRB programme had sought to address. The majority
of the answers required the *ticking of boxes*, although there was an opportunity to provide further detail in some 30% of the questions.

5. The Limes Farm Community Association (partner and member of the SRB Co-ordinating Committee) also delivered the questionnaire to targeted households.

6. The response rate from the survey that went out in late 1998 was 20%, which was somewhat lower than the 1998 EFDC survey which achieved 32% (see research Annex). However, it should be noted that due to the evaluation timescale, both surveys had to be carried out within weeks of each other which may have had an adverse effect on response rates to the wider ranging SRB questionnaire. While the EFDC survey was a follow up, it was also directly focused on the physical regeneration aspects of the programme that obviously had a more direct impact on the estate. It should also be pointed out that some respondents were EFDC tenants and may have seen a vested interest in responding to their landlord.

7. To improve the response rate a second survey was carried out using the same questionnaire in the spring of 1999. This was distributed to all the households that had not responded to the first survey. The same method of distribution was used. As a result a total of 184 responses were used in the analysis giving a total response rate of just over 28%.
4. NORTHUMBRIA COMMUNITY SAFETY

4.1. Introduction; the partnership

4.1.1. The Northumbria Community Safety Strategy (NCSS) is a multi-agency approach pre-dating SRB and covering the Northumbria area (i.e. the counties of Northumberland and Tyne & Wear). While the Partnership and Drugs Accord Strategy were already in existence, SRB funding of nearly £1 million over 2 years (1995-1997) has enabled the operation of this initiative to be strengthened through capacity building among the partners and enhancing the delivery structure at local authority level. While a drugs initiative was considered a crucial area for attention, it was viewed as part of a wider Community Safety Strategy in which the issues of crime prevention and safety required a strategic and co-ordinated approach across the Northumbria area. The SRB programme provided an opportunity for local authorities to contribute to a county-wide strategy, while recognising the specific needs and requirements of local delivery.

4.2. The context for a community based safety strategy

4.2.1. Central to the well being and development of any community is an environment in which crime and the fear of crime is kept at the lowest levels possible. However, it has been a feature of many areas in the United Kingdom that levels of crime have risen in recent years, particularly amongst the young and the use of drugs. Those who are often amongst the weakest and vulnerable in the community suffer the most from criminal activity or the fear of crime.

4.2.2. Whilst opinion remains divided as to the precise links between unemployment, poverty and the incidence of crime there can be little doubt that if an area is experiencing high levels of criminal activity this, in itself, acts as a deterrent to the attraction of new activity and investment in the area concerned. Crime, and more often as not relatively pessimistic perceptions as to the amount of it, can act in a pernicious and destabilising way to reduce the general quality of life in local communities. Such negative perceptions reduce
the well being of the individuals affected making the task of regenerating local areas more difficult.

4.2.3. Reducing crime and improving the safety of local communities is clearly in the interests of all those involved in achieving local regeneration. However, progress has been slow in bringing about a co-ordinated approach to tackling and preventing crime and dealing with its consequences. This has been because;

- historically existing institutional frameworks have been rather rigid, with often quite sharp distinctions between those responsible for the maintenance of law and order and those responsible for dealing with the consequences of crime.
- the absence of robust local delivery mechanisms with which to tackle the problems concerned and a failure historically to recognise that policies drafted at the national level need to be customised in their delivery to reflect the nature of the problems which exist on the ground.
- the incidence of crime can be very easily displaced between local neighbourhoods and so there is need for co-ordination at that level.
- to achieve a safe and secure local environment requires action in many different areas of public and indeed increasingly private service provision.
- the absence of good statistical evidence about the incidence of the problem being experienced

4.2.4. It was against a background of the need for a co-ordinated approach to crime prevention that the Northumbria Community Safety Strategy came into being. The strategy evolved as the result of high levels of crime and civil unrest and was originally conceived through discussions between the Chairman and the Clerk to the Northumbria Police Authority and the Chief Constable. The discussions recognised the need for change in the way in which crime in local communities was being dealt with and the importance of getting local authorities and other agencies to work alongside the police. Relevant background impetus had been provided in the Morgan Report (Home Office; The Local Delivery of Crime Prevention through the Partnership Approach 1991). SRB was an appropriate funding source firstly because thematic bids relating to crime were welcome and secondly because a reduction in crime would enhance neighbourhood regeneration more generally.

4.2.5. After detailed discussion, and some modification, the original concept was launched in late 1994 and a number of other agencies, including all the local authorities in the Northumbria Police area were asked to become members.
Some twenty five agencies have now become involved. The lead partner is Northumbria Police Authority and the Secretariat is based at Gateshead MBC comprising two full time posts; the Head of Strategy and a secretary/administrator (seconded from Gateshead MBC). The Police Authority is the accountable body for SRB funding purposes. Overall monitoring of the SRB programmes is undertaken by Gateshead MBC as agents for the Police Authority.

4.2.6. Apart from Gateshead MBC there are five other local authorities involved, namely; Newcastle City Council, North Tyneside MBC, Northumberland County Council, South Tyneside MBC and Sunderland City Council. Each local authority area has a Community Safety Co-ordinator that reports to their respective Local Area Group.

4.2.7. Other agencies represented are Northumbria Probation Service, the Crown Prosecution Service, the Prison Service, the Northumbria Coalition Against Crime (which contains representatives from the private sector), Victim Support, Home Office Drug Prevention Unit, HM Customs and Excise, the Racial Equality Council, Tyne and Wear PTE (NEXUS), Tyneside Careers, Tyneside TEC and Tyne and Wear Fire Authority.

4.3. Objectives of the Partnership

In the light of the original concept the Partnership adopted a mission statement, namely ‘to improve the quality of life in the region through a working partnership with the community, public, private and voluntary bodies. A Partnership designed to reduce both crime and the fear of crime by targeted and sustained action against those activities which detract from the peaceful enjoyment of life’.
4.3.1. The programme established the following objectives;

- to achieve sustainable regeneration through increased community safety
- to supplement and expand existing multi-agency work on drugs misuse (The Drugs Accord)
- to achieve a reduction in drug misuse and drug related crime
- to reduce the fear of crime amongst the local population

The objectives set were general in nature and no attempt was made to set quantitative targets, progress towards which could be measured as the project proceeded.

4.3.2. In tackling aspects of crime and improving community safety the Strategy Board recognised that the above objectives were relevant to improving the employment opportunities, education and skills of the young and those at a disadvantage, and that this approach was a precursor to improving the wider socio-economic activity of the area.

4.3.3. To develop a coherent drugs strategy across Northumbria it was necessary to recognise;

- all areas and all social groups are a risk
- drug misuse is increasing, especially among young people of school age
- drug misuse is related to a rising drug culture

4.3.4. To ensure that the Community Safety Strategy Drugs Accord programme on a sure footing the partnership members drew on a body of research\(^4\). This was

Drugs Accord Inf. line pilot 1994 Activity Report
School liaison Drugs Survey – Wallsend Area Command (Northumbria Police) July 1995
“Drugs Prevention and Community Development” Paul Henderson Community Development Foundation. Paper No 7, Home Office, Central Drugs Prevention Unit 1995
also linked to the knowledge and past experience of those participating in the programme (e.g. local authorities, police, health authorities, schools and voluntary sector) who indicated a willingness to work in partnership within a strategic region-wide framework. The body of research provided the Partnership with a baseline position which indicated an urgent need for action to prevent and reduce drug abuse and the crime to which it gave rise.

4.4. Activities; mix of projects

4.4.1. This section is concerned to examine the activities which the Partnership undertook as part of its Delivery Plan under the round one SRB funding and as summarised in the Key Performance Indicators in the Delivery Plan.

4.4.2. The Partnership undertook a number of activities designed to bring organisations and individuals together in pursuit of the goal of increased community safety. A central element in its work was to help educate children about the dangers of drug abuse. The key projects comprised a Primary Schools’ Drug Education Programme, Drugs Education Seminars, A free Drugs Accord Information Line, a Drugs Awareness Programme (including interactive plays and video development), outreach youth work, peer initiatives in schools and support for community forums.

4.4.3. The SRB funds were used primarily for the purposes of developing the Drugs Accord and the development of Drugs Action Teams became the major part of the forward strategy. The Drugs Accord was thus able to facilitate the development of initiatives based on the work of essentially local groups but within an approach that was co-ordinated across the region and which thus formed the basis of a regional strategy. It also allowed the teams to interact with those involved in the Home Office Drugs Prevention Initiative.

4.4.4. More specifically the Drugs Accord programme involved drugs training sessions in primary and secondary schools, awareness and drug prevention
training for youth workers, parents and school governors and the opening of young persons information centres. Training sessions were also organised for community groups, seminars/forums were set in place and drama workshops involving role play. A drugs advice/helpline has set up across the region and literature/information packs were made available via schools for teachers, parents and children. Some initiatives were dovetailed with other drugs programmes to increase impact and prevent duplication of scarce resources e.g. health authorities, police, Drug Action Teams. By way of illustration it is helpful to describe the activities involved in the Drugs Accord Information Line and the North East Choices initiative.

4.4.5. The Drugs Accord Information Line was a regional initiative which provided a free telephone helpline for those who wanted advice about drugs abuse. Callers to the line were able to obtain a Parents Fact File (produced in collaboration with Proctor and Gamble). The emphasis within the Drugs Accord programme has been on developing drop-in centres, awareness campaigns in schools and colleges, and the setting-in place of counselling services.

4.4.6. North East Choices involved members of the Northumbria Community Safety Partnership working with the Northern Stage Group and featured a week long drama residency in 17 schools in the area for children in Year 9 (aged 13). The objective was to engage young people using the media of drama to think about issues relating to drugs. Parents, teachers and school governors were also involved and a video was produced to help with dissemination.

4.5. Expenditures and leverage

4.5.1. The overall expenditure incurred under the auspices of the SRB round one scheme amounted to £936,000 over the two year period 1995-1997. The funds from the public and private sector that were in the Delivery Plan were secured. Contributions from other public sector amounted to £875,500 and £179,000 from the private sector. Total expenditure overall was very much in line with original forecasts. This leverage was about the best possible in the particular circumstances.
4.6. **Actual and expected outputs**

4.6.1. In virtually all cases the actual outputs have exceeded the expected outputs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A Beneficiaries of Community Safety Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Total number of persons</td>
<td>35,225 (245)</td>
<td>175,190 (2,580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Of which are aged 60+</td>
<td>5,100 (54)</td>
<td>6,631 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Of whom are women</td>
<td>16,950 (108)</td>
<td>62,432 (194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C Number of Community Safety Initiatives</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D(i) Number of Youth Crime Prevention Initiatives</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Number of pupils benefiting</td>
<td>57,660 (415)</td>
<td>71,221 (490)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2. Thus, as table 4.1 indicates, the most significant output stream is the number of people who have benefited from the drug awareness schemes and help lines established by the project and in this respect the original target of 35,225 has been exceeded many fold. These achievements are reflected in the ethnic minority figures which have all been exceeded, most notably with respect to persons directly benefiting from the initiatives. This is clearly some indication of the success of the programme.

4.6.3. The available data does not allow a very disaggregative breakdown of the output streams and this is a problem in assessing impact as will be discussed in the outcomes section. While the total number of beneficiaries of the Drugs Accord programme were some 500% above output targets it should be noted that the benefits took a large variety of forms. Thus some only received literature on drugs, or used the helpline, whilst others participated in seminars or focus groups.

4.6.4. In terms of community safety initiatives there were seminars for parents, teachers, school governors, the launch of a number of initiatives such as the Infoline, and the appointment of Community Safety Officers and drugs Coordinators for each local authority area. The work in primary and secondary schools has focused on workshops and student centre activities designed to raise awareness of issues surrounding drug misuse/abuse. Young people have also received literature on drug abuse. The appointment of youth workers and
development youth projects has reinforced the message/impact of the drugs programme and the importance of understanding the key issues regarding drugs. The Drugs Accord programme through its Strategy Board and Area Teams developed initiatives designed to reach the maximum number of individuals whilst setting in place sustainable support structures using the resources of a wide range of organisations committed to tackling drugs related issues.

4.6.5. The total population of the target area of the scheme was £1.4 million. The number of community safety beneficiaries was 175,000 which represents over 12% of the total population.

4.6.6. The actual gross outputs achieved greatly exceeded those expected at the outset partly because local agencies were energised by the well co-ordinated approach and partly because there was significant leverage of private sector funding to finance the drug awareness material and dissemination.
### Table 4.2 Examples of qualitative outputs by area

#### Sunderland
- Drugs Education Sessions to Primary schools
- Drugs Awareness Training for full & part time youth workers
- Anti drugs training/education delivered to 13-16 year olds
- Anti drugs forums convened in three city areas
- “Model” schools drug policy piloted in schools

#### Gateshead
- School drugs presentations in schools
- Action van visits to primary schools
- “Cool Drinks Day” with NECA & Gateshead West Police Command
- Multi agency presentation to Gateshead Drugs Action Team
- NE Choices in role drama workshops
- Displays at Leisure Centres by Drugs Education Support Teacher

#### South Tyneside
- Parents training sessions on drug prevention at secondary schools
- Parents training sessions on drugs prevention at local Community Centres
- Hebburn Young Persons Information Centre “One Stop Shop” opened
- Drugs Accord Education dovetailed with DAT Action Plan

#### Newcastle
- Training sessions for community groups, parents and educators
- Review meetings with Head teachers
- Drugs awareness sessions
- Drugs awareness video
- “Rough Guide for Teenagers” booklet

#### Northumberland
- Child Accident Prevention Workshops
- Drug Area Network Groups established
- “Learning for Life” project
- Witness Information/Protection Scheme
- Pub Watch Scheme
- Home Security Pack

#### North Tyneside
- Drug Prevention Seminars
- Drug Accord publicity to all households in Borough
- Drug Accord Information Line to all parents via the schools
- Extensive media coverage

### 4.7. Additionality

#### 4.7.1.
It is rare to find easy answers to the central question which underpins the additionality issue, namely what would otherwise have happened in the absence of the SRB funding. In the case of the Northumbria Community Safety Partnership the central ideas and thinking behind it pre-dated the first round of the SRB CF. However, a relevant question is whether there were features of the SRB regime which enabled the initiative to be funded more
readily and according to a preferred format relative to any alternative policy regimes that may have been in place.

4.7.2. Key partners involved in the Northumbria Community Safety Initiative have been asked during the course of this evaluation about their views as to the importance of the SRB funding in allowing the initiative to be implemented. The Board of the Northumbria Community Safety Strategy had also commissioned some research which has been of use in the evaluation. This research was undertaken by Durham University and the researchers were asked to examine how the Partnership was functioning, its effectiveness and the “added value” of the Partnership approach. Although this research did not examine the additionality of the SRB funding specifically it did provide useful background material.

4.7.3. The evidence from the interviews with the key partners was that SRB funding had been of considerable importance in getting the concept off the ground. Clearly, the respondents could not know what would have been the nature of any alternative funding regime. What they were clear about was that the scheme was innovative and the SRB programme had recognised this. They felt that the design characteristics of SRB had enabled a particularly good “fit” with their needs at the time. The research team therefore presented the respondents with the design characteristics of SRB and asked them which feature had been of particular help.

4.7.4. The key relevant features of SRB which represented a departure from that which had gone before were;

- the principle focus on partnership and as the programme has progressed it has become more obvious what effective partnership actually means.
- emphasis on competition which was argued to provoke innovation in regeneration scheme design and delivery.
- devolution of management powers such that responsibility for the delivery, monitoring and general administration of the regeneration scheme was placed centrally and squarely in the hands of the partners concerned—a more ‘hands-off’ approach to that which had gone before.
- freedom as to the shape and form of the regeneration initiative that would be eligible for funding relative to that under previous schemes.
The first of these factors – the Partnership approach – was the most important in ensuring that the scheme was successful in reaching large numbers of people.

4.7.5. The Northumbria Community Safety Scheme had a clear focus on partnership working. It was also recognised by most of those concerned to be innovative and SRB has allowed such initiatives head room. It is debatable as to what the merits of an overtly competitive regime of funding were compared to the more proactive regimes before.

4.7.6. The key feature of SRB which allowed the work of the group to be funded was its encouragement of partnership and innovation. Both round one and two bids were successful because they played heavily to both of these elements. In the absence of SRB monies neither the round one or round two bids would have secured funding from existing mainstream sources and the conclusion is that additionality is therefore high.

4.7.7. This is predicated on the view that much of the work with schools could not have been developed without SRB funding. The co-ordinated Drugs Accord education programme for young people, parents, teachers, youth workers, school governors and community groups would not have taken place because funds were not available from the mainstream or elsewhere. The telephone helpline and literature on drugs would also have been very limited and certainly would not have been available region-wide. The various forums and seminars would have been very limited without the impetus of a co-ordinated regional strategy within the NCSS which has encouraged organisations such as DATs, health authorities, schools and police to become directly involved in the drugs programme.

4.7.8. The partnership did benefit from the greater flexibility inherent in the SRB. However it has been argued quite vociferously by some members of the partnership that it might have benefited more if the degree of flexibility that was actually available had been better understood at the time by both the Partners making the bid and the Government Office at the time.
4.7.9. A further issue is whether the evolution of SRB through what has now been five rounds has benefited the evolution of the Northumbria Community Safety initiative. As SRB has progressed through its respective rounds there has been increased understanding amongst all involved as to what is required for a successful bid. Thus, it has become clear that in the main successful bids have to be able to demonstrate that they represent effective partnership and that the relevant partners are at the table and that the proposed regeneration scheme can satisfy the general requirements of value for money.

4.7.10. However, there has also been considerable emphasis given by DETR and the GORs on informing partnerships what form a more strategic approach to local area regeneration might take. This has been reflected in the Supplementary Guidance which has been provided. In the North East it was made clear at an early stage by the Government office that only a broad area wide approach to tackling crime and community issues would find acceptance for funding. Against this background the Northumbria Community Safety initiative had the required breadth.

4.8. Value for money

4.8.1. The question as to whether the Northumbria Community Safety initiative has represented good value for the public expenditure committed is difficult to answer on the basis of conventional measures. The main regeneration outputs have been the number of people who have been receiving assistance and advice. The duration of the time for which they have been receiving the advice has often been quite short. The actual outputs generated have exceeded those indicated in the original delivery plan by a large amount and in this sense the value obtained ex-post has been well in excess of the minimum that would have been required on the basis of the original funding decision. However, the impact on final outcomes are downstream and relate to the benefits to the health of a large number of individuals.

4.8.2. There is not a comprehensive stock of cost per output achieved benchmarks with which to compare the achievements of the Northumbria Community Safety Partnership nor cost per outcome realised. However, what we can say is that £20,000 of total public expenditure has been associated with a basket of community safety initiative benefits amounting to 1947 people benefitting
from some form of community safety initiative and 790 school children benefiting from drug-related advice. To assess whether this represents good value for money would be easier if other similar initiatives had been evaluated so that VfM estimates could be compared. The mounting of a survey of beneficiaries would provide the only way of assessing how far the scheme had changed behaviour and therefore contribute to outcomes in the form of reduced levels of drug abuse and related crime.

4.8.3. However, it would not be very satisfactory if the value for money calculation focused solely on outputs delivered by the Northumbria Community Safety Partnership, although it would certainly be desirable to know more about cost per unit of outcome. Clearly of fundamental importance is the development of relevant and desirable institutional structures which build the capacity of the local areas concerned to tackle the problems involved in a progressive way. The Northumbria Community Safety Partnership seems to have done this and this has been recognised in the funding which has been given from other rounds of SRB to continue with the initiatives concerned.

4.8.4. While drugs issues remain a factor within Northumbria Community Safety Strategy (NCSS), they are only one element in a range of key activities for tackling crime and the fear of crime. Although the Drugs Accord programme did enable the Partnership to operationalise its activities in terms of an identified priority, SRB funding was only allotted for a two-year period. Under existing rules funding for a further initiative in the same research activity cannot be considered so further work on drugs and related crime has had to be incorporated in the wider crime prevention programmes. Whilst some change in direction has occurred, this is viewed as part of a wider strategic approach for which round two SRB funding was secured for a seven year programme focusing on the fear of crime.

4.9. **Outcomes in relation to baseline**

4.9.1. The basis of the partnership scheme lies in a recognition of the problems posed to the indigenous population and particularly the young from increased crime. A central objective therefore has been to improve community safety and thus improve the quality of life of the existing inhabitants of the area, as well as making the area an attractive place for industry to invest in. A
specific aspect of the scheme has been to increase awareness amongst the young of the problems associated with drug abuse. In recognition of the focus of the partnership on reducing crime and improving community safety the key baseline indicators relate to reported crimes in the area, particularly those which were drug related in a recent year (1995). Other non-key indicators reflect the numbers of people benefiting from Community Safety Initiatives in the area and a range of activity indicators including attendance of specific groups at events relating to drug awareness.

4.9.2. The achievements of the programme in relation to the baseline indicators has been significant. However, the baseline position is complicated by changes in the nature of crimes which have been occurring. The chief outcome indicators relate to crime and its incidence across the region. There is some good news here in the sense that the Police Area is pretty unique in showing a generalised reduction in the study period concerned (table 4.3). However, some types of crime like burglary have been falling whilst others, like drugs, have been rising relative to elsewhere in England. The difficulty is in knowing what would have been the alternative position. Given the nature of the programme to-date it is unlikely that it could be reflected yet in the desired outcomes of sharply reducing drug abuse and drug-related crime.

4.9.3. Given the early developmental stages of NCSS and the highly specialised thematic bid of the drugs initiative, some baseline indicators (such as the number of people benefiting from community safety initiatives, number of community safety initiatives, number of youth crime prevention initiatives, number of calls to “Drug Stopper”, promotion of training publicity) had to be set at zero. Despite this it has been clear that progress has been made in these areas and that significant outputs have been achieved. Other baseline figures were associated with Northumbria Police Force data on crime figures across the board and the general downward trend (table 4.3) could be associated in part with the impact of the Drugs Accord initiative – although other factors were at work nationally to reduce the number of notifiable offences recorded by the Police.
Table 4.3 Recorded crime figures for Northumbria (000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>1995 (baseline)</th>
<th>1997 (end of SRB scheme)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car crime</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>127.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Northumbria Police Authority

4.9.4. In terms of increasing awareness of the dangers of drugs abuse/misuse, the 1994 baseline position indicated that some 30 schools were involved in various drug prevention initiatives which increased to 751 by the end of the second year of the SRB programme. However, there appears to have been no systematic record of improvements in non-standard outputs such as numbers attending training sessions and local advice agencies although the Drugs Accord Information Line was monitored on a monthly basis and evaluated on two occasions. Thus the individual quantifiable output measures (Strategic Objective 10) as indicated in the initial baseline position, have not been followed through and cannot be measured against projected end of programme targets. However, the actual end of programme outputs do indicate progress in terms of the creation of 32 youth centres and some 175,000 people benefiting from community safety initiatives across Northumbria. Further evidence indicates that schools and other key public agencies have made a positive contribution to the local delivery of the drugs programme.

4.10. Benefits to regeneration from enhanced partnership, and the benefits to the public, private and community sectors from partnership working

4.10.1. In formulating a co-ordinated approach it was recognised that the partners had a wealth of collective experience and knowledge regarding drug issues and the impact of drugs on local communities. In co-ordinating this information and the delivery of a drugs awareness programme it has been
possible to raise the profile of this issue in the targeting of parents young people and high risk groups.

4.10.2. While each local authority has developed its own drugs programme to meet specific identified local needs, this has been greatly enhanced through the co-ordinating activities of the Strategy Board in raising the profile of drugs issues within the wider context of the Northumbria Community Safety Strategy. This co-ordinated approach has also enabled local authorities to exchange information and work more closely with agencies across the region.

4.10.3. While the Drugs Accord initiative was part of a wider crime prevention strategy, it was also viewed by the Strategy Board as an opportunity to demonstrate the value of partnership working using a multi-agency approach in tackling a significant structural problem. The confidence of the Strategy Board has been endorsed by the Home Office in viewing the NCSS as an example of good practice. This has been further confirmed in that the Home Office Drug Action Teams are now the principal delivery mechanism for the forward strategy for the Drugs Accord programme across Northumbria and indeed the rest of England.

4.10.4. In summary the attractive features of the approach which was adopted by the Northumbria Community Safety Scheme and which have served the Partnership well in the face of considerable changes in the amount and nature of crime would seem to be;

- the development of a framework which is more able to bring together issues relating to crime prevention, enforcement and welfare support for the victims of crime.
- a policy which ensures that the overall strategy, priorities and decisions about funding are taken by a Strategy Board with members drawn from each of the key Partners.
- that policy initiatives are implemented by Local Area Groups which work at the grass roots level. The Area Groups work within strategies and priorities which are agreed by the Strategy Board.
- an active attempt to ensure networking between key players

4.10.5. Thus a study commissioned by the Northumbria Community Safety Strategy Board in 1996 and which was completed in 1997 stated, ‘Northumbria...
Community Safety Strategy has moved on from being a simple steering groups and has become a mature network. Partly this is because of the need to make connections between the various levels of activity and to focus on themes. But a major aspect promoting increasing complexity has been the issue of funding, especially dealing with the annual SRB regime and becoming involved in EU programmes’ (Robinson 1997).

4.10.6. The evidence is that the Northumbria Community Safety Strategy has been able to evolve into a Partnership which has an institutional format capable of allowing:

- interaction and collaboration across a wide range of partners which are in many ways quite diverse but which need to come together to address the problems concerned in the light of evidence which continues to point to the need for an integrated approach
- dissemination of best practice and the development of an evidence based approach to tackling the problems of crime
- strategic regional wide decision taking but local area based implementation

4.11. **Successor arrangements; sustainability - the legacy**

4.11.1. Although funding for the Drugs Accord was only for two years, the strategic framework in which this initiative functioned (i.e. NCSS) has enabled the Strategy Board to develop a sustainable programme in its fight against crime. Thus the work of NCSS is continuing to enable local authorities to tackle the wider aspects of crime while supporting Drug Action Teams as the forward strategy for the delivery of the Drugs Accord. Co-ordination and coherence in tackling a major region-wide issue such as crime continues to be a guiding principle that underpins local delivery.

4.11.2. Following the success of the round one funding a much larger bid was prepared for a seven year project designed to build on the work of the Partnership in round one. This second bid was designed to tackle issues relating to the fear of crime and was successful securing £10.6 million of SRB funds with Northumbria Police Authority as the Accountable Body. A third bid was also prepared for round three which focused on the young but
this was not successful. However, funding under round four was secured on the basis of a bid which contained elements of the round three bid but which was more clearly focused on Young People and Youth Crime.

4.11.3. The Partnership structure is evolving through time to recognise new needs and challenges as well as opportunities to share experience and gain funding with which to secure Partnership objectives. Thus, a recent development has been the attempts made by the Partnership to seek funding from European sources and to share experience in relation to enforcement, welfare and voluntary activity with European partners. One real problem facing the Partnership is that the impact of crime and fear of it at the local, level will continue to require innovative responses. There is a very full agenda. In the face of this, the need for funding regimes with the flexibility of SRB remains significant.

4.11.4. What is also very positive is that the Community Safety Strategy and its activities have now become more of an integrated part of the mainstream activities of the key players represented on the Strategy Board. This undoubtedly reflects the fact that the original idea and structures which emerged under the auspices of the SRB funding have proven themselves eminently suitable to meet the needs of new and emerging policy imperatives such as those relating to Drugs Abuse and the impact at the local level of the new Crime and Disorder Act of 1998. However, in some cases many useful features of the round one SRB programme have had to be withdrawn because they cannot be funded through mainstream expenditure at the present time. Resources continue to be required on a longer term basis to tackle drug abuse by the young. The drug helpline was a feature of round one which no longer exists.

4.11.5. The Crime and Disorder Act places a statutory responsibility on local authorities (county, district or unitary level) to work in partnership with the Police to formulate local strategies for the reduction of crime and disorder. As the act says, such strategies have to be based on evidence from crime and disorder audits which reflect the views of the local communities concerned. The Northumbria Community Safety Partnership has already shown itself capable of meeting this challenge.
5. NEXT STEPS

5.1. The three case study final evaluations included in this progress report are the first stage in the final evaluation plan which envisaged 17 more case study evaluations to be conducted between now and 2003. In the current year two case study schemes come to an end and they will be subject to final evaluations this year. They are the Round 1 West Cornwall Initiative and the Round 2 West Midlands Industrial Club.

5.2. The twenty case study partnerships were selected to reflect a number of characteristics that could affect the nature and scale of regeneration achieved. These were;

- duration of the case study
- SRB expenditure devoted to the scheme
- the region in which the scheme was situated
- the type of regeneration leader
- the objectives of the schemes
- the area type, e.g. small area, LA District, two or more Districts, county, region.

5.3. The case studies are described in table (6.1) according to these characteristics.

5.4. As the number of completed case studies increases it will be possible to reach firmer conclusions on how well, not only small schemes but also medium sized and large schemes, are achieving sustainable regeneration. It will then be possible to make a more robust assessment of SRB as a whole, so far as Rounds 1 and 2 are concerned, than was possible on the basis of the three small case studies included here.

5.5. Each of the case studies are being examined in terms of their contribution to cost/benefits and thus VFM, wider achievements and partnership effects. We are thus building an extensive research database which allows an assessment of how the regeneration achievement varies according to the key characteristic of the regeneration scheme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Rnd 1/2</th>
<th>SRB Exp £m</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Area Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria Community Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Crim, Emp, Ethn</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Midlands Industrial Club - Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vol</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limes Farm Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Hous, Crim, Env</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cornwall Initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Priv</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Econ, Emp</td>
<td>&gt; 1 LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent &amp; Harrow SRB Bid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Emp, Educ, Train</td>
<td>&gt; 1 LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangleton Knoll Challenge Fund Prog</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Com Gp</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Emp, Educ, Train, Env, Crim, Qual</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol 2020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Emp, Econ, Hous, Ethn, Crim, Qual</td>
<td>LA District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside Learning Partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Educ, Emp,</td>
<td>County/TEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkhill Estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Econ, Emp, Hous</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canalside Rochdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Econ, Emp, Hous</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regenerating Wolverhampton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Emp, Econ, Hous, Ethn, Crim, Qual</td>
<td>&gt; 1 LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swadlincote Woodlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Educ, Train, Econ, Env, Hous, Crim</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Leytonstone Community Partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Hous</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regenerating Central Brighton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Emp, Train, Educ, Econ, Hous, Ethn, Crim, Env, Qual, Health</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sunderland Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Priv</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Econ</td>
<td>LA District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull City Visions First Challenge Fund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>YH</td>
<td>Emp, Educ, Train, Hous, Crim, Qual, Health</td>
<td>LA District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Capturing the Dynamic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Emp, Educ, Train, Econ, Hous, Ethn, Crim, Env, Health</td>
<td>LAD/TEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Regeneration - Woolwich Rev</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Econ</td>
<td>LA District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royds Bradford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vol</td>
<td>YH</td>
<td>Hous</td>
<td>Small area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6. Moreover, each of the case studies are being examined at the interim and final evaluation stage and this allows more understanding about the dynamics of the regeneration product and the durability of the partnership delivery mechanism at the local level. Figure (6.1) describes the duration of each of the case studies and when they come to an end. It is also planned to undertake an ‘after-glow’ analysis which will further enhance our understanding of the durability of the regeneration gains.

5.7. The research programme is also designed to provide research which enables a better understanding to be gained about the nature and the scale of the problem being tackled. That is, it is seeking to understand more about social exclusion at the local level in its various forms. The research team have already produced two reports which have helped with this important research objective5. These reports describe the results of a large scale survey of households in 7 of the case study areas. The programme of social surveying is designed to continue and in 7 of the 17 case studies which will be subject to final evaluations in the next three to four years we shall have the benefit of the results of a resident survey. A baseline survey was conducted by MORI in 1996 for the seven case studies and this is being repeated in two phases in the year 2000 and 2002, to coincide with the closure of the seven schemes. A separate paper is being circulated for this meeting which sets out the plans for executing the resident surveys.

5.8. The significance of the resident surveys is that they will enable us, in seven case studies, to make a comprehensive assessment of how far target area economic and social outcomes have changed during the lifetime of larger schemes which is the ultimate test of whether sustainable regeneration is being achieved. Factors other than SRB will have had some influence on any

5
• ‘Key results from the residents’ baseline social surveys’ by Christine Whitehead and Lesley Smith (Discussion Paper 100, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge).
• ‘New findings on the nature of economic and social exclusion in England and the implications for new policy initiatives by Angela Brennan, John Rhodes and Peter Tyler (Discussion paper 101, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge).
changes in outcomes observed but these will be taken account of, partly by comparing outcome changes in SRB areas relative to changes in England as a whole and partly by taking account of other policy and local non-policy factors.

5.9. In case studies for which a resident survey is not being undertaken the final evaluations will have to rely more heavily on existing secondary source data for measuring changes in outcomes. Scheme output data will be used in all schemes to assess cost effectiveness and to understand more about the mechanisms whereby scheme outputs generate a change in area outcomes. As we conclude in this report, small schemes have only small or negligible impacts on area outcomes as a whole.

5.10. Further evaluations will continue to focus on how well SRB schemes address key regeneration issues such as Partnership working, private sector participation and leverage, the influencing of main programmes and their expenditures as well as assessing impacts, sustainability and value for money.

5.11. The significance of the resident surveys is that they will enable us, in seven case studies, to make a comprehensive assessment of how far target area economic and social outcomes have changed during the lifetime of larger schemes which is the ultimate test of whether sustainable regeneration is being achieved. Factors other than SRB will have had some influence on any changes in outcomes observed but these will be taken account of, partly by comparing outcome changes in SRB areas relative to changes in England as a whole and partly by taking account of other policy and local non-policy factors.

5.12. In case studies for which a resident survey is not being undertaken the final evaluations will have to rely more heavily on existing secondary source data for measuring changes in outcomes. Scheme output data will be used in all schemes to assess cost effectiveness and to understand more about the mechanisms whereby scheme outputs generate a change in area outcomes. As we conclude in this report, small schemes have only small or negligible impacts on area outcomes as a whole.
## Figure 6.1  Duration of case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>95/96</th>
<th>96/97</th>
<th>97/98</th>
<th>98/99</th>
<th>99/00</th>
<th>00/01</th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>02/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northumbria Community Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W Midlands Industrial Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limes farm Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Cornwall Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brent &amp; Harrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hangleton Knoll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bristol 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Merseyside Learning Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chalkhill Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Manufacturing partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Canalside Rochdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regenerating Wolverhampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Swadlincote Woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S Leytonstone Community Pship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Regenerating Central Brighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>City of Sunderland Pship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hull CityVision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nottingham Capturing the Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Greenwich-Woolwich Revival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Royds Bradford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.13. Further evaluations will continue to focus on how well SRB schemes address key regeneration issues such as Partnership working, private sector participation and leverage, the influencing of main programmes and their expenditures as well as assessing impacts, sustainability and value for money.
A1 RESEARCH ANNEX; ISSUES RELATING TO RESEARCH METHOD

A1 Issues arising from the application of the research methodology experienced by the Cambridge evaluation team

General lessons and comments

1 It was clear to the research team that it was crucial to commence the evaluation of projects in advance of their closure e.g.: interviewing staff; collecting key data; discussions regarding exit strategy; exploring issues of sustainability and capacity building. This was because key personnel can often move on relatively quickly and interviews with them yield higher quality information and data that may not readily be available on the closure of programmes.

2 While postal surveys are a relatively inexpensive method of empirical study compared with face-to-face interviews there is clearly a trade-off between the quality of response and cost of survey. The research confirmed that as long as questionnaires are uncomplicated and not too long, postal surveys generally are a good medium to use.

3 Surveys are more likely to attract higher response rates if questionnaires are distributed as soon as possible after projects have ceased their operations, rather than expecting recipients to recall the impact of projects as a matter of historical record.

4 It is imperative to research any concurrent survey work and major reports (whether commissioned internally or externally) as this is invaluable in developing an evaluation of the programme and also offers a context for evaluation surveys.

5 Sometimes contractual arrangements between a lead partner and contractor can make it difficult to gain access to data without incurring extra
expenditure for the manual retrieval of data. This has implications regarding the procedures for recording information using computer databases which should be somewhat consistent across SRB programmes

6 The resources required to provide an ongoing monitoring service for the survival of small businesses may mean that they are not followed up sufficiently in terms of survival rates beyond SRB. This is significant for a short duration project vis a vis the much longer periods required for small business consolidation.

7 The development of evaluation workbooks has proved to be useful in collecting information on a consistent basis from widely differing SRB programmes. While there has been no intention to directly compare programmes or individual projects, it has been possible to draw out lessons regarding the strategic and operational development of the various initiatives e.g. in terms of socio-economic enhancement, opportunities for wider partnership working, elements that increase the bending of main programmes, evidence of closer working between the public, private and voluntary sectors.

8 It would aid the research process considerably if strategies could be developed to draw local communities into the evaluation and monitoring process. This could be achieved through more detailed social surveys, workshops and opportunities for local communities to directly influence research and evaluation during their implementation. The evaluation process should therefore record the degree of local involvement in key evaluative and research issues as an integral element of output measures, capacity building and sustainability.

A2 Experience of the Partnerships in the use of research evidence to develop their regeneration schemes

Limes Farm Partnership

1 Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) carried out two postal surveys of the Limes Farm estate. The first survey was conducted in 1994 and laid the
foundations for the development of the SRB initiative. Within the LA Building Services Department it was considered a sound basis from which to develop the baseline profile and identify key areas of regeneration as perceived by the local community. Following this initial involvement of estate residents a consultative group was created so that EFDC’s proposals for the physical regeneration of the housing stock could be commented on by local residents.

2 The target population for the survey was three courtyards that were the subject of the Housing Improvement Scheme and amounted to some 321 households. In addition a further 450 households that bordered the courtyards were also surveyed to gauge their opinion on the physical regeneration to take place in their vicinity. In using this strategy, it was possible to build residents’ priorities into the Strategic Objectives and baseline indicators of the SRB programme. The survey was not simply confined to the physical regeneration of the housing stock but extended to environmental issues, estate facilities and community needs. The overall response rate for the first survey was 46.7%.

3 However, EFDC did not see this process as a one off event, but a way of tracking the effectiveness of the programme over time through a follow-up survey in late 1998. This strategy was particularly useful in terms of a comparison of the intended and actual positions at the end of the scheme. In any event the substantial improvements were confirmed through this second survey which, in some measure, vindicated an evidence-based strategy in recording the impact of the programme on the local community.

4 The second survey was confined to the 321 households in the three courtyards who had been directly affected by the improvements, it was felt that those living in the surrounding area would be less able to comment directly on the physical improvements that had taken place. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A was designed for residents who had lived on the estate prior to the improvements and section B for completion by all residents. The questions in the survey related as closely as possible to the original, as it was essential to track the programme impact and residents’ responses over time. Questions were confined to box ticking in recognition that respondents would not wish to spend a long time on detailed
answers. However, a section was provided for those wishing to make more
detailed responses. The second survey achieved a response rate overall of
32%.

5 The development of the questionnaire, delivery, input and analysis work was
carried out by the local authority Building Services Department. Overall the
work involved amounted to some 4 person days. By using different coloured
paper for each of the three housing block questionnaires and asking residents
at which level they lived within the maisonettes it was possible to gauge
different perceptions according to location. This was important, as any direct
questions regarding actual addresses might have dissuaded residents from
having any criticisms of the local authority initiatives.

6 Although it is the first time that EFDC has used this strategy in tracking
development programmes over time, the Building Services Group see this as
one technique in developing its approach to Quality Assurance in its
regeneration initiatives.

Conclusions

7 Limes Farm provides an example of using local surveys to shape the scope
and direction of regeneration programmes. EFDC, in using their initial
survey as a key input into the Strategic Objectives and baseline indicators of
their programme were able to include the local community at the outset. In
carrying out a follow-up survey EFDC were able to measure the intended
against actual position at the end of the lifetime of the programme.

8 In making decisions regarding the use of the survey methods it should be
noted that:

- Local surveys can provide an opportunity for communities to be both
  informed and consulted at an early stage in any proposed regeneration
  programme. This could be a key issue in future programmes such as New
  Deal for Communities.
- Clear objectives should be established for the use of surveys both at the
  pre bid/consultation stage and as a subsequent strategy for the effective
  monitoring of programme outputs/targets.
Local surveys can provide invaluable data not always accessible from larger data sets (particularly at sub-ward level) and in any event can also clarify local perceptions regarding regeneration issues.

The general costs associated with the setting-up and operation of local surveys can be modest providing there is sufficient planning and the in-house resources of partners can be employed in the design and implementation of such surveys. In any event they can be very effective as part of the consultation and subsequent monitoring process and consideration should be given to financial allocations as an integral part of regeneration programmes.

Timing is important. Surveys should be carried out as soon as possible after the end of a programme to gauge the immediate impact it has made. However, in the case of Limes Farm the local authority survey went out at this time which meant that the Cambridge survey had to be put back a few weeks to avoid re-surveying at the same time.

Northumbria Community Safety

The initial Partnership has drawn on a wide range of existing research/studies in developing its planning and operational framework. The Strategy Board has also commissioned a number of studies/evaluations of the Drugs Accord Programme in order to assess the effectiveness of existing policy and develop a sustainable forward strategy. The following studies/research have been used by the Strategy Board:

- Drugs Accord Infoline pilot 1994 Activity Report
- School liaison Drugs Survey – Wallsend Area Command (Northumbria Police) July 1995
2 Wider links and exchanges have taken place with UK local authorities/organisations and European Countries which has further enhanced the capacity of the Partnership to be at the cutting edge of policy making and current thinking regarding the delivery of crime prevention programmes. Events and conferences have provided a key source of information and in the case of European links could lead to EU funding for further community safety programmes. The partnership have even produced a video entitled ‘Developing an evidence based drugs prevention programme’.

3 In developing the various strands of the Drugs Accord initiative, the Partnership Board has taken a proactive stance in bringing drugs information to local communities. The strengths of the programme have been a region-wide information service; multi-agency approach; a general awareness raising campaign; the targeting of specific groups such as school age children, teachers, youth workers and other professionals working in the field of drug misuse. This has been supported by various counselling/advice services and the telephone infoline. Such an approach has had a significant spin-off in that an assessment of local needs and conditions have informed subsequent developments within the wider Partnership.

4 The Partnership Board has also been concerned to evaluate the internal structure of the Partnership in creating an effective sustainable programme. More specifically an independent study was commissioned from Durham University and Mason-Port Associates (May 1997) to evaluate the operation of the Partnership. Researchers were requested to examine the functioning of the Partnership, determine its effectiveness and consider the ‘added value’ of this Partnership approach. Thus the evaluation examined the working relations between partners, the characteristics of the Partnership and the effectiveness of its structure. The study was also concerned with the future operation and direction of the Partnership. The evaluation was undertaken in three phases:

- Review of the history and development of the Partnership to explore its origins, philosophy and evolution
- An audit of the current operational strategies and characteristics of the Partnership
- Key issues for the future development of the Partnership
5 In carrying through the evaluation of programme partners a number of techniques were used. These included surveys, interviews, questionnaires including a Learning Diagnostic Questionnaire linked to individuals’ perceptions of their role and place within the Partnership. The main findings focused on:-

- The diversity and ability of organisations involved in the Partnership
- The need for clear strategies including priorities for action
- Moving the partnership beyond a talking shop including the tension between formulating regional strategies/initiatives and delivering local projects i.e. striking a balance between partnership working through the Local Area Groups and the Partnership being seen to be too prescriptive
- Strengthening the channels of communication that could provide opportunities for learning, sharing information and debating options
- Evaluating the role and capacity of the NCSS secretariat
- Developing the image/profile of the Partnership

6 Thus the evaluation has laid the foundation for the NCSS to move forward as a Partnership that is committed to further development and change in co-ordinating its activities across the region.

7 It is extremely important that the strengths and weaknesses of Partnership be examined through the application of readily available techniques. Key questions thus relate to how the individual partners feel that the Partnership is listening to their needs, aspirations and objectives as well as perceptions of effectiveness and strategic vision.
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