

To: Councillor Ivan Henderson, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, Regeneration & Tourism

From: Kirstin Foley, Economic Growth Officer

Cc: Lee Heley, Deputy Chief Executive & Corporate Director, Place and Wellbeing

Cc: David Ousby, Interim Assistant Director, Project Delivery (Head of PD Unit)

Cc: Barbara Pole, Economic Growth and Enterprise Manager

Cc: Emma Twine, Project Delivery Unit Manager

Date: 15th October 2025

Dear Councillor Henderson,

Community Regeneration Partnership (CRP) Ten_08 Shopfront Improvements

The purpose of this report is to inform you of the background and details set out in the Executive Decision. The funding of £0.50m for this grant scheme is coming from the Community Regeneration Partnership funding.

Background

Improving tired shopfronts in Jaywick Sands, Holland on sea and Clacton on sea, aiming to improve pride in place. Funding will enable shop owners to improve their shopfronts through a range of measures, such as new signage, lighting, internal and external works.

Since 2022 TDC's Economic Growth team have delivered a range of public grant schemes funded by the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) - including a district-wide shopfront improvement grants scheme. UKSPF and the Partnership funding were established under the same funding agenda of the previous government, with aligned investment priorities including supporting local business, skills and improving pride in place.

Project scope

- Both tenants and business owners can apply
- Lease-holders with a commercial shop-frontage must have to have at least 2 years remaining on their lease
- Multiple businesses with the same owner are not eligible for support at more than one address. However, multiple premises owned by the same landlord are eligible, if more than one active tenant business applies for support
- No requirement to match fund
- The scheme will not support works which have already been undertaken or any works which are started prior to a formal offer of grant funding being made

Project board

Barbara Pole – Economic Development and Enterprise Manager

Matt Lang – Planning Team Leader

David Ousby – Interim Assistant Director, Project Delivery

The 2 scoring officers are Barbara Pole and David Ousby for the approved grants in the table below

Applicant	Proposed Grant Award	Planning Consultant Fee	Scores
Scizzor Sisters	£7,042.66	TBC	BP 3 DO 3
Those precious moments by Hannah	£2,502.00	TBC	BP 3 DO 3
The Bakehouse	£18,500.00	TBC	BP 3 DO 3
Keith Smith Upholstery	£5,708.33	TBC	BP 3 DO 3
Coffey Brooks Financial	£1,974.55	TBC	BP 3 DO 3

It should be noted that as per the Project Initiation Document the following costs have been allocated to the project Contingency £45,454.55, capitalising resources £25,000.00 and other project delivery costs £25,000.00.

If you could, by way of a completed form (below) or by return email, indicate your consent to proceed with the proposed projects, we would be most grateful. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with us to discuss any aspect further before granting your consent, on any of the above outlined proposals.

Kind regards,

Kirstin Foley

Economic Growth Officer
Tendring District Council

Email: kfoley@tendringdc.gov.uk

To: Kirstin Foley, Economic Growth Officer

To: Councillor Ivan Henderson, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, Regeneration & Tourism

From: Kirstin Foley, Economic Growth Officer

Cc: Lee Heley, Deputy Chief Executive & Corporate Director, Place and Wellbeing

Cc: David Ousby, Interim Assistant Director, Project Delivery (Head of PD Unit)

Cc: Barbara Pole, Economic Growth and Enterprise Manager

Cc: Emma Twine, Project Delivery Unit Manager

Date: _____

Dear Kirstin,

Community Regeneration Partnership (CRP) Ten_08 Shopfront Improvement Grants

Thank you for your memorandum 6th October 2025 giving the update on the progress of the Shopfront Improvement Grants.

I agree/ do not agree with the outlined process.

Kind regards,

Cllr Ivan Henderson

Deputy Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth, Regeneration & Tourism

All applications have been scored against the following criteria:

Pass/Fail Criteria

1. Must have a town or village commercial (public facing) premises in Tendring
2. Application must be from tenant rather than landlord (where leased)
3. Application must be above £1,000 and below or exactly £20,000 (total cost can be more, but match funding must be evidenced if so)
4. Works applied for must be:
 - Capital only
 - External/Exterior Works, clearly identified and explained
 - Improvements, not like-for-like
 - Works to the premises, not items purchased
5. Is all information, permission from landlord, quotes, photograph submitted? Ask follow up question/s if not and give a deadline. If deadline not met, this becomes a fail.
6. Satisfactory responses to subsidy control section

Scored Questions:

As well as the pass/fail questions, there are 2 scored questions as part of the application process, meaning the overall score will be out of a maximum of 6 as per the table below. Two people will score individually, then discuss to agree one overall score out of 6. No grant will be made with an application scoring lower than 4 points overall. Those scoring at the lower end of eligibility, 4, will be subject to a value for money consideration and are therefore unlikely to receive a grant of the full maximum £20,000, but may be accepted for a lower amount/offered a lower amount than requested where appropriate.

Question 14: What is the purpose of the grant?

Question 15: What would be the expected benefits from completing your project, in terms of sustainability, employment, environment or increasing turnover? Please give brief details

Scored Questions:	
0	Wholly Unsatisfactory
	No response or the whole response is irrelevant to all of the question and evaluation criteria.
1	Unsatisfactory
	The response only covers a minor element of the question and evaluation criteria and does not provide evidence to all points mentioned in the question

2	Partially Acceptable
	The response covers more than one element of the question and evaluation criteria but does not fully evidence all points mentioned in the question
3	Acceptable
	The response addresses the question provides sufficient evidence for all aspects of the question