

STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 26 June 2020 at 2.00 pm
Broxtowe Borough Council, MS Teams Meeting

PRESENT:

Ian Jowett (Chair)	WMD Ltd
Paul Sweeney (Vice Chair)	Robert Ellis Estate Agents
Ruth Hyde	Broxtowe Borough Council
Darren Henry MP	MP for Broxtowe Borough Council
John McGrath	Stapleford Community
Councillor Ella Kearney	Stapleford Town Council
Councillor Richard MacRae	Broxtowe Borough Council
Councillor David Grindell	Broxtowe Borough Council
Jeff Edwards	Edwards Clegg Solicitors
Louise Lyddiatt	Hawley and Rogers Solicitors
Sally Gill (sub)	Nottinghamshire County Council
Will Morlidge	D2N2 LEP
Liz Clarke	GT3 Architects
Matt McCreith	GT3 Architects
Paolo Coyle	GT3 Architects
Jason Pacey	HS2
Ella Kearney	Stapleford Town Council

OBSERVERS

Rebecca Ogden	Broxtowe Borough Council
Ryan Dawson	Broxtowe Borough Council
Cllr Tim Hallam	Broxtowe Borough Council

APOLOGIES:

Cllr Richard Jackson	Nottinghamshire County Council
Frank Taylor	Property Investment

	ACTION
<u>Welcome and Introductions</u>	
IJ welcomed the Executive Board to the virtual meeting.	
<u>Apologies of absence</u>	
There were no apologies of absence received.	
<u>Agree Minutes of previous Meeting</u>	
Minutes of the previous meeting dated 26 May 2020 were approved.	

<p><u>Declarations of interest</u></p> <p>There were no declarations of interested noted.</p>	
<p><u>Further government guidance - summary</u></p> <p>RO reported that government guidance had been received for the Towns Deal. The main point gave three submission deadlines of 31 July, end of October and end of January 2021. It was proposed to aim for the October deadline but any comments or issues to be raised to RO/IJ. If there are no objections RD will advise government of the Board's intentions. WM advised that there is also an option for a second date choice if the initial deadline cannot be met.</p> <p>JE referred to p59 section 2 of the document to provide some funding support. RO explained that GT3 would be involved in looking at private sector investments as well.</p> <p>PS asked for further discussions once different pots of money had been aligned.</p> <p>JE continued that the projects had to be costed, funded and be deliverable and made reference to p14 3.19-3.29 where government asks for co-funding or match funding. RO advised that Thomas Lister could be responsible for costing and the funding elements would be split between GT3 mapping exercises and consultancy support from the private sector. RD emphasised the lack of time to put together a full business case therefore there was a need for robust outline cases. It was expressed to look at longer term vision of 25/30 years rather than the shorter term.</p> <p>RO explained that the board need to consider if the fund will be used to mitigate the impact of Covid-19. Justification needs to be given if it is not. The Economic Development Team are currently collating evidence as to the wider impact of Covid-19 throughout the borough, this will offer a better understanding of the impact on businesses within Stapleford.</p> <p>RH offered support for match funding from the authority's house build budget if necessary for a skills centre. DG was passionate that young people needed to be trained or retrained in the 18-30 age group.</p>	
<p><u>GT3 findings – Initial Mapping of Feedback to date</u></p> <p>MM presented each of the key projects for Stapleford's Masterplan. GT3 noted the interconnected nature of each of the projects and how these could be evaluated by the board.</p> <p>The high street was built in to the proposal which had initially looked at the possibility of pedestrianising the area by rerouting traffic which</p>	

could prove difficult although access for just public transport could be a possibility. However, given the volume of traffic that used the high street, this was found not to be possible.

The Methodist Church could benefit from increased visibility from the high street as part of the community review and improve the look and feel of the town with open spaces for outdoor dining, wider pavements, green spaces, offices and retail. MM required more formal feedback.

PC presented the cycle destination project from the national cycle route 67 with links to neighbouring Ilkeston, Beeston and beyond. His proposal was to implement dedicated cycle lanes/repair stations and introduce coloured lanes, provide provision for off road cycling for recreational, training or sport.

LC discussed the plans for an improved community offer for Stapleford. The area's community buildings could co-locate to free up other sites. The Old Rock PH site being at the centre of the town would be a great gateway landmark. Its social value needs to be realised at a busy road junction.

Strategic Leisure conducted a Needs Assessment study to look at a mix of leisure facilities in the area to establish any gaps in provision. A fitness suite was not essential due to its close proximity to Bramcote Leisure Centre although outdoor leisure was missing. This would include tennis courts, recreational parks and links to the cycle infrastructure. They looked at outdoor gyms which aligns with CV-19 response. It would encourage a more pedestrianised environment and people's activity. They identified five recreational parks but favoured two key sites at Hickings Lane and Ilkeston Road Recreational Ground. Each could incorporate a cycle path around the park, host football pitches and outdoor gyms and utilise existing buildings to develop into a café and toilets.

RMac noticed that Montrose Court had been omitted from the buildings which is a community facility and available to hire. He also mentioned that Stapleford Youth Centre is interested in moving its youth club to Hickings Lane park. He expressed the need to have a super hub pavilion which would serve both cricket and football clubs with kitchen facilities to cater for hiring out the facilities. It would be an umbrella for all age groups which would show vision and give people of Stapleford encouragement. JMcG confirmed that having a leisure focal point can give young people a purpose and provide them with a central hub to obtain information to give them opportunities to learn new skills.

TH asked if the Board had considered the Carnegie Centre for redevelopment including the library. DH agreed that the town building could have flexible uses for mobile library shelves, computers and arts attached to free up the library building.

<p>LC would consider a one-stop shop for different ages.</p> <p>DH queried what would happen to the outdoor gym facilities during inclement weather/winter months. LC/RO would need to ask Strategic Leisure to conduct further studies to ascertain the necessity for indoor gym facilities as suggested by LL. DH considered the prospect of an indoor space being funded by investors if the right conditions were provided to attract them.</p> <p>PS was aware that The Old Rock PH had been dormant for five years. JMcG had an interested party who RH suggested they should contact Peter Goodrick, House Building Development Manager for the borough who looks at suitable sites to develop for housing. Subject to Council approval it could be match funded in the bid. With regards to other available sites PS was mindful that owners may be offering their land for sale at above market value and the Board should not be held to ransom.</p> <p>RO will email feedback forms to formally capture the boards thoughts on each of the proposed projects following the meeting.</p>	RO
<p><u>Agree Vision for Stapleford</u></p> <p>RO had previously issued three versions of a Vision Statement written by Rizk McCay. She had received votes from the vast majority. The favoured Vision Statement which was vision Statement Number 2, required a reference to connections to HS2 bringing skills and opportunities to the area. The finalised version will be available in two weeks' time for the Board.</p>	
<p><u>Approve updated Terms of Reference to include ability to create sub-committees</u></p> <p>RO referred to the revised Terms of Reference (ToR) updated to include the work of sub-committees. This would allow the sub group to have delegated authority of certain work areas, to save time without having to refer decisions to the Executive Board for approval. Any sub-groups would be approved by the board prior to activity taking place with no spending powers. A sub group was created for design and branding purposes on behalf of the Executive Board.</p> <p>RH was concerned that no spending limits were imposed on the sub group and suggested any decisions to be made could be emailed to members of the Board for their agreement.</p> <p>It was unanimously agreed, by a show of hands, that the ToR should be amended to include formal agreement. The updated version will be made available to view on the website.</p>	RO

<p><u>Update on capacity fund spend</u></p> <p>RO outlined an additional spend for external communications support due to the lack of resource from within the council's in-house communications team. This has involved putting videos together and creating a social media schedule for June. The Leisure Needs analysis carried out came in under budget. JE asked if the ARUP figure was correct. RO explained that ARUP had provided extra work for the Work Programme. RO continued to inform the Board that Jenny from ARUP was involved with the wider towns project as a Towns Co-ordinator but this work was being paid from government funding.</p> <p>RO will issue an updated version of the Capacity Fund spending.</p>	<p>RO</p>
<p><u>Update Work Programme</u></p> <p>RO reiterated the October deadline. Feedback on the current plan is being sought through public consultation during July. GT3 will factor in any feedback to the final Masterplan. The next meeting projects to have OBCs carried out will be agreed. These will then be presented to the Board at the August meeting to be finally shortlisted and the writing of the TIP will commence. There is a framework for TIP guidance how it is to be structured and what needs to be included with draft headings. The design bid document will be circulated when available.</p>	
<p><u>AOB</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DH queried if there were any limitations for the number of storeys which could be built above shops. RD gave an overview of planning policy explaining that there were no specific rules for height but the applicant would need to apply for Change of Use. It would have to be in keeping with the surrounding area and not allow overlooking. RD asked DH to email him with any further planning queries. 2. PS acknowledged the town already had Victorian houses with three-storeys. Cambridge House was four-storeys high. EK had no issue in principle but parking for existing residents is a problem in the town. PS considered underground parking for residential and commercial use. RH referred to the Stapleford Neighbourhood Plan to pick up the style and design of the STF to be fully aligned with the Aligned Core Strategy and HS2 as what we are doing is part of a bigger picture. EK reported that Stapleford Town Council had a good working relationship with the town planning consultants and kept in touch with RO and GT3. RH thought that it should be recognised that we are working in harmony with each other over the bid. 3. JMcG had discussed key sites with RD to unlock Hickings Lane with Pinfold Lane for potential buildings on the site of the former fire station. 	

--	--

Future Meeting Dates

Friday 24 July 2020

- Consider feedback from Masterplan consultation
- Masterplan FINAL
- Agree list for OBC creation

Friday 21st August 2020

Friday 18th September 2020

Friday 16th October 2020

It was noted that face to face meetings would legally allow a public forum therefore it was agreed to continue to conduct these meetings virtually to avoid current social distancing restrictions.

RO

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.35 PM