## STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 8 July 2022 at 10.00 am Council Chamber, Beeston Office

### PRESENT:

Ian Jowett (Chair) Paul Sweeney (Vice Chair) Darren Henry Zulf Darr Councillor David Grindell Councillor Richard MacRae John McGrath Councillor Teresa Needham Councillor Sue Paterson Sally Gill Will Morlidge WMD Ltd Robert Ellis Estate Agents Broxtowe MP Broxtowe Borough Council Broxtowe Borough Council Broxtowe Borough Council Stapleford Community Stapleford Town Council Stapleford Town Council Nottinghamshire County Council D2N2

### OBSERVERS

Jonathon Little Vicky McCourt Anya Lyons Phillipa Ward (notes) Stuart Baird Broxtowe Borough Council Broxtowe Borough Council Broxtowe Borough Council Broxtowe Borough Council BakerBaird

# APOLOGIES:

Ruth Hyde Tom Spink Ryan Dawson David Brierley Jeff Edwards Melanie Phythian Broxtowe Borough Council MyPad Broxtowe Borough Council HS2 Ltd Edwards Clegg Towns Fund Policy Advisor

	ACTION
Welcome and Introductions (Chair)	
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
Apologies of absence	
Apologies of absence were received and noted.	

Agree Minutes of previous Meeting (Chair)	
The minutes of the previous meeting dated 20 May 2022 were agreed.	
Declarations of interest (Chair)	
Councillor David Grindell declared that he had been appointed as His Worshipful The Mayor of the Borough of Broxtowe.	
There were no declarations of interest.	
Staffing Appointments (IJ)	
The Chair welcomed Vicky McCourt, Regeneration Project Manager, to the Economic Development Team filling the vacant position.	
<b>Revised Local Assurance Framework and governance moving forward</b> (VMc)	
VMc reported that the Local Assurance Framework (LAF) was the Terms of Reference for the Board and a constitution document. VMc summarised the key changes on p24 which needed Board approval to move any business forward.	
Three options were presented for governance.	
Option 1 would be to increase Executive Board to 23 Members (split by 9 from the public sector, 10 from the private sector and 3 from the voluntary sector with the same percentage as previously but increase the Board Members to ensure meetings were quorate).	
Option 2 would be to reduce Executive Board to 10 Members (split by 4 pub- lic sector, 5 private sector and 1 from the third sector. Board would meet quarterly but be able to call urgent meetings as and when required.	
Option 3 (preferred) would remain with the same membership but could ex- tend to govern the Levelling Up Fund if successful. The Board would meet quarterly but be able to call urgent meetings as and when required.	
Under contracting and construction methodologies the best methods of how to tender were summarised. There is a concern that it has been difficult to obtain three tenders which has caused delays with projects. It may be appropriate to accept a single waiver justification tender under exceptional circumstances to avoid further delays with the programme. The decision would be made by the Council's S151 Officer or Chief Executive as Accountably Body for the fund. The procurement process will be followed wherever possible.	
The role of the Delivery Board would be to feedback to the Executive Board with any issues that may arise from each of the projects which will need Board approval or decision. There will be a Project Manager for each project who needs to be agile and pro-active. The Delivery Board will meet on a six- weekly basis in line with the Executive Board's quarterly meetings. Substi- tutes will be allowed but will need to be identified prior to the meeting as per	

current arrangements. If apologies are received for three consecutive meet- ings it may be appropriate to find a replacement from the same sector (JL/VMc to action). Applicants who have received a grant offer letter may be asked to be a representative on the Board. The Delivery Board needs to be focused with Delivery Managers given time slots for presenting and action.	
JMcG queried if there was any legal obligation that prevented acceptance of only one tender. JL advised that BrBC works within its Standing Orders and remains transparent. Only under exceptional circumstances would the waiver procurement procedure apply.	
DH asked if under Option 3 the STF, LUF and Prosperity Fund would all be aligned. JL advised that the LUF bid would have a stronger case if it already had a partnership in place and is therefore asking to co-opt Members of the Executive Board. DH would like RF from his constituency office to be a member of the Delivery Board as a channel to Government.	
PS wanted to confirm that individual Project Managers leading their respec- tive projects had the necessary technical ability. JL confirmed that an archi- tect would be on the Delivery Board managing the library able to identify risks, plans and day to day issues.	
VMc confirmed that there are currently 19 Executive Board Members to be increased to 23 Members. It was voted unanimously for Option 3.	
It was voted unanimously to accept the revised Draft Local Assurance Framework for the Executive and Delivery Boards.	
Project Updates (JL/AL)	
JL provided an update on the following projects.	
The Enterprise Hub has land issues and will be appointing Lungfish Archi- tects to drive the planning application to keep on track of the timeline.	
The Enterprise Hub has land issues and will be appointing Lungfish Archi-	
The Enterprise Hub has land issues and will be appointing Lungfish Archi- tects to drive the planning application to keep on track of the timeline. There was a debate about the siting of the Enterprise Hub building. It was realised that an Outline planning application would enable the project to move forward. Concerns were raised that the Hub would be set too far back. It was illustrated that the Hub building would only be set back by 20m with landscaping to the front where it would be welcoming with benches for peo-	
<ul> <li>The Enterprise Hub has land issues and will be appointing Lungfish Architects to drive the planning application to keep on track of the timeline.</li> <li>There was a debate about the siting of the Enterprise Hub building. It was realised that an Outline planning application would enable the project to move forward. Concerns were raised that the Hub would be set too far back. It was illustrated that the Hub building would only be set back by 20m with landscaping to the front where it would be welcoming with benches for people to sit and relax. JL needs to arrange a topography survey.</li> <li>The Library fascia is suitable for its age and type and will remain. The project will be split into internal and external works. The remodelling of the internal</li> </ul>	

AL advised that the Cycle Hub needed Board direction for publicity. It would be more viable to create the Cycle Hub at Ilkeston Recreation Ground which is where it is eventually intended as opposed to a temporary location at the Tiles UK Warehouse site but combine publicity for the two sites. The Cycle Hub would be staffed by Ridewise (based at Lenton Avenue) rather than having technical support on site.

RF suggested that the schedule for the Cycle group did not necessarily need to meet on a monthly basis if there was no new announcement he would prefer an ad hoc arrangement. JL suggested whoever the Project Manager was should lead. RMac was baffled by the removal of hedges to complete the cycle path along Ilkeston Road. He believed the Cycle Hub should be sited at the Recreation Ground to avoid unnecessary funding being spent on a temporary cycle shed on the Tiles UK site that has to later be moved to Ilkeston Road. It would save time in having to apply for two separate planning applications. JL agreed that it was more logical and better use of money. RF preferred siting the cycle hub in one permanent location.

Lungfish will also redo the masterplan bid for Hickings Lane with the Football Association's funding.

AL updated on the following projects.

A planning application for the demolition of Tiles UK site is due to receive contributor comments by 5 July with a decision expected by 19 July. A bat survey was carried out and concluded that there was no evidence of bats being present on the site. Three quotes were received for demolition of the site.

JL advised that VIA will work on the Beacon crossing and dropped kerbs to lay the car park and design for the scheme. There is a Prior Approval Notice planning application for the works. DG asked that electrics are laid and rubble reused with attention to drainage works. VMc confirmed that the car park would be constructed of a porous surface. RMac asked for disabled car parking spaces and with larger vehicles now being manufactured to make those car parking spaces wider.

JL suggested that BakerBaird should promote community engagement to ask schools and organisations to name the car park and create publicity. It was suggested by Board Members to name the car park after the late Stapleford Town Councillor Ray Darby.

SG confirmed that she had not received any communication regarding Mini Holland but would forward to JL for circulation with any funding available from them. JL advised that he has a meeting on 11 July to discuss Baulk Lane for a potential £200k from the fund.

AL provided an update of the Stapleford Town Centre Recovery Fund (STCRF). There had been 67 applications received to date with £330k being awarded to 25 schemes. There have been 11 grant offer letter issues to successful applicants. The total amount of grant funding sought from applications is £1.085m.

The next Panel meeting will be held on Friday 15 July. Due to the fund being over-subscribed it was decided to close the grant applications on 8 July with the possibility to reopen if the funding had not been fully committed.

AL confirmed that four site visits had been carried out with the Planning Manager to assess the feasibility, construction and disabled access. The common problem with BDF schemes is the construction delays. It was reported that we are on target for creating jobs and the number of businesses awarded grants. More work is needed to meet the disabled access and green retrofit. The next wave of successful applications is likely to create delays in issuing grant offer letters due to processing hurdles but we are looking to appoint some temporary support.

It was understood that Application no.3 had secured the purchase of the property which means the balance might change with regards to his application. He intends to purchase the land to the rear of the property to extend the ground floor into further offices. IJ believes this should be a resubmission.

JL would suspect that all grants will be offered by the autumn. AL advised that BakerBaird are providing publicity of successful applicants after the grant offer letters have been sent out.

### Street Improvement Scheme Workshop (VMc)

VMc reported that VIA are working closely with us on the traffic management and street calming improvement works with the car park area crossing a public pathway onto the highway.

A workshop has been arranged for Tuesday 12 July at 10.00 am in Stapleford Carnegie Centre. VIA will provide information for comment and will note any changes from the workshop.

TN asked who would be able to attend the workshop. JL advised that it would be Board Members and anyone who was positive about the scheme and could provide an informed contribution to the workshop.

VIA would need to project their drawings to attendees as no hard copies will be made available.

#### Communication Update (SB)

SB announced that Stapleford residents still did not know what was happening to the town centre. They have spoken to people and have arranged a photo call for Thursday 14 July with media coverage to be more visible. There will be an animated graphic of Stapleford Town, QR Codes so that people can look at each of the schemes. There is a video of successful grant applicants and the MP ahead of the school break. Hoarding boards with consistent branding to advertise what is coming, remaining community focused will help to secure future bids from the Prosperity Share Fund for the town, borough and the county which will be launched in the autumn. A briefing pack will be distributed following the meeting.

IJ was unable to access any social media which SB confirmed would not be available until 14 July when this will be made public.

JMc considered community groups should be contacted to update them for those who do not use digital technology. SB advised that there would be a leaflet drop in the autumn.	
SP invited BakerBaird to give a presentation to the Helpful Bureau who has 60 attendees to be made aware of what is going on. SB reported that he was meeting church leaders per month to supply them with information for pastors and community leaders. JL was satisfied with the good communications network taking place.	
SB asked who would be available for the photo call on Thursday 14 July at 11.00 am at the Stapleford Library. RMac, PS, SP confirmed their availability.	
AOB	
<ol> <li>JL updated the Board that S4W had identified in their co-funding re- port that Severn Trent had showed an EOI for cycling, walking and recreation upto a maximum of £200k. With Board permission JL would like to commission this work. All in favour.</li> </ol>	
Date of next meetings (Chair)	
The following meeting has been scheduled in the Council Chamber, Beeston Offices unless otherwise advised.	
Friday 9 September 2022 at 10.00 am	

MEETING CLOSED AT 11.15 AM