

STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 15 January 2021 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
Councillor Richard Jackson	Nottinghamshire County Council
Councillor David Grindell	Broxtowe Borough Council
Councillor Richard MacRae	Broxtowe Borough Council
Ryan Dawson	Broxtowe Borough Council
Councillor Teresa Needham	Stapleford Town Council
John McGrath	Stapleford Community
Jeff Edwards	Edwards Clegg Solicitors
Will Morlidge	D2N2 LEP
Hayley Miles	Thomas Lister
Melanie Phythian	MHCLG

OBSERVERS

Rebecca Ogden	Broxtowe Borough Council
Phillipa Ward (notes)	Broxtowe Borough Council
Sally Gill	Nottinghamshire County Council

APOLOGIES:

David Brierley	HS2
----------------	-----

	ACTION
<u>Welcome and Introductions (Chair)</u> The Chair welcomed everyone to the Virtual Board meeting and wished them a Happy New Year.	
<u>Apologies of absence (RO)</u> Apologies of absence received and noted from DB.	
<u>Agree Minutes of previous Meeting (Chair)</u> The minutes of the previous meeting dated 18 December 2020 were agreed.	

<p><u>Declarations of interest (Chair)</u></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
<p><u>Final TIP sign-off (RO)</u></p> <p>RO had circulated the updated version of the TIP and asked for any comments before final proof reading on 18 January and final upgrade before submission of the bid document by 29 January.</p> <p>JMcG thanked RO and the team. He reiterated Cllr Roberts-Thompson comment made on Wednesday and queried if the 37,000 jobs in Stapleford was an accurate figure. RO would double check the statistics from the D2N2 data dashboard.</p> <p>MP had received a version of the TIP and wanted to ensure that check and challenge had been addressed. RO confirmed that this had been addressed and would be included in the final document. MP asked for Annexe C to be checked before being finalised.</p> <p>RJ referred to the grammatical errors reported at the meeting on Wednesday. RO will speak to Cllr Roberts-Thompson for more guidance following proofing of the document.</p> <p>DG wished to propose bid funding for St John's School. RO confirmed that this project would not be included in the TIP. He announced that part of the main school building (which was not listed) required an extension which would serve as a community hub when it was not being used by the school.</p> <p>RO reported that there would be a few other updates following discussion with the Towns Fund and Government colleagues and asked if these could be passed through the Chair and Vice Chair before submission of the Bid or if the Board wished to see the changes first.</p> <p>RH suggested that the Chair and Vice Chair could approve the changes on behalf of the Board provided there were no significant changes to the content to meet the deadline with a copy of the document circulated to the Board. This was met with approval from RMac, DG and WM. MP also agreed as that was being practised by other town bids.</p> <p>RO would email the updated version to the Board but the appendices would be available to view on the website via an attached link due to its size.</p> <p>RH asked how the submission of the document would be publicised. RO confirmed that a communications team had been appointed to advise the public through social media channels by issuing press releases and email bulletins.</p>	

<p><u>OBC document sign-off (HM/RO)</u></p> <p>HM reported the amended financial modelling was £24.2m with a final costing of £29m requiring £4.8m from either BBC or NCC investment or from assets already owned up to OBC stage.</p> <p>RO queried if the project costs agreed included development costs by NCC to deliver the cycle network. HM confirmed that 10% had been added to allow for in-house or public sector investment for each scheme separate to the Covid Recovery Fund.</p> <p>RH referred to the Library which was a NCC asset and asked if it would be their contribution or investment. HM explained that the building was an existing asset with some façade alterations and extension to the building which £225k had been assigned and therefore there is no contribution in the GAP as it was not a new build. It was also confirmed that the capital and revenue figure was combined for each project.</p> <p>MP advised that this would need to be made clear in the TIP with the figures broken down with a global breakdown in TIP 1 but provide match funding information in TIP 2. HM agreed to pull out the figures from the financial model to put into the TIP.</p> <p>HM explained that the TIP 2 document was still in progress with the economist since the projects have now been finalised. This will provide a profile across six years of co-funding and match funding. RO to provide a list of match funding including £3m for the 4G pitch or supported projects. The TIP 2 document is expected by 20-21 January.</p>	
<p><u>TIP Discussion Cont. (RO)</u></p> <p>JE agreed that the document needed to strike the right balance. RH believed it needed to be tweaked with nuance wording throughout the document. He referred to TIP 2 Theory of Change with HS2 listed as No.10 in the schedule and believed it should have more emphasis and suggested to move it to No.1 in the list. RO explained that it was a timeline and aimed to address HS2 for the longer vision. RH considered it appropriate to list priorities with short, medium and long term activity. RO suggested from the feedback to keep the reference to HS2 in the document but demonstrate to central government that the scheme would be made better with HS2 but would still work without it for the surrounding developments including additional housing at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks.</p> <p>RH was concerned about the sensitivity surrounding HS2 and the dilemma to either keep on assuming that the station comes to Toton to uplift jobs and prospects but if it does not happen that the projects put</p>	

<p>forward are still valid and bring value to the area with or without HS2. The wording in the TIP document should back it both ways.</p> <p>It was voted unanimously to propose giving Delegated Authority for wording to RO and WM before presenting to the Chair and Vice Chair for final approval and the Board would support the document once seen and discussed.</p>	
<p><u>Vision Statement Update (RO)</u></p> <p>RO asked the Board to vote on the following statements to be used in social media, email and website communications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>This is our time. This is our future. This is our Stapleford.</i> 2. <i>A proud heritage. A passionate community. A powerful future.</i> 3. <i>A future you can shape. A community you can be proud of. This is our Stapleford.</i> 4. <i>Stapleford, this is our time. Let's come together and build a brighter future for the community we call home.</i> <p>There was one vote for Option 1, six votes for Option 2, no votes for Option 3 and four votes for Option 4.</p> <p>RO will contact the communications team to use Option 2.</p>	
<p><u>Review ToR (RO)</u></p> <p>RO asked if the ToR still reflected the role and purpose of the Board. A mechanism would be required for the person to be appointed in the role as Chair whether to refresh over the next year or so as it would be quite a commitment over a long period of time.</p> <p>JE did not believe the public document reflected the guidance in June 2020 as the Board is not an advisory body. RO will raise the advisory role issue to the council in terms of governance and report to the next Board meeting to be approved.</p> <p>RH advised that without the council's purchases the projects would not get funded which needs approval from the council. She agreed that governance and arrangements would need to be reviewed another time.</p> <p>JE agreed this was premature and the amendment to the Board's advisory capacity to be approved at the next Board meeting. RO confirmed the role of the Board would be referenced in the TIP with a general statement to review the role of the Board moving forward.</p> <p>MP announced that the outcomes from submitted bids would be expected by the end of March 2021 before the end of the financial year and local government purdah.</p>	
<p><u>Meeting Dates for 2021 (RO)</u></p>	

RO proposed future Executive Board meetings to be held every six weeks and will update on the advisory capacity and role of the Board at the next meeting scheduled for 26 February 2021.	
<u>Project Spend Update (RO)</u> RO had previously circulated the project spend update. There were no comments raised.	
<u>Work Programme (RO)</u> RO had previously circulated the Work Programme which was now complete. At the February meeting there will be an updated work programme as part of the TIP stage.	
<u>Any other business (RD)</u> RD wanted to express his gratitude to all Board members for their contribution to the joint approach between private and public sectors and their commitment to regularly attend meetings. A mix which proved challenging at times through the Council's format including other parties being involved to co-ordinate and agree the process and stages throughout the bid.	

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.00 PM