

STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 18 December 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
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
Paul Gaughan	Paul Gaughan Property Consultants
Will Morlidge	D2N2 LEP
Hayley Miles	Thomas Lister
Melanie Phythian	MHCLG
David Brierley	HS2

OBSERVERS

Rebecca Ogden	Broxtowe Borough Council
Phillipa Ward (notes)	Broxtowe Borough Council
Liz Clarke	GT3 Architects

APOLOGIES:

Sally Gill	Nottinghamshire County Council
------------	--------------------------------

	ACTION
<u>Welcome and Introductions (Chair)</u>	
IJ welcomed the Executive Board to the virtual meeting.	
<u>Apologies of absence (RO)</u>	
Apologies of absence were received and noted.	
<u>Agree Minutes of previous Meeting (Chair)</u>	
The Minutes of the previous meeting dated 13 November 2020 were approved.	

<p>Declarations of interest (Chair)</p> <p>Paul Gaughan declared an interest at Item 5 over the purchase of the Tile UK project.</p>	
<p><u>Summary of process to date (RO)</u></p> <p>RO summarised the work of the Board from September 2019 to November 2020 showing each month's achievements at various stages of consultation and commissioned work which has continued on track through the pandemic.</p> <p>RH was concerned with the recent announcement over the HS2 Station at Toton that the bid strongly referenced the connection with the application which might now need to be tweaked. Our opportunity and potential of the town stands alone whether or not HS2 goes ahead.</p>	
<p><u>Summary of project with costings (HM)</u></p> <p>HM provided an update following the last Board meeting with some interventions modified and re-costed by their cost consultant.</p> <p>Total calculation based on highest costs £21.2m (this figure will increase closer to £25m once finalised).</p> <p>RH raised two points: (i) the way we frame Hickings Lane needs to be connected to youth skills building with one or two Outreach workers. There are pockets of low skilled young people in the town who need a help to achieve the right skills. Tweak how can frame the pavilion so we can train young people into the skills offered and they wish to develop. (ii) develop a national skills academy on strategic growth. RO to check with KH what connections we can draw upon to make it an attractive proposition. Employ a five-year Outreach worker on the site. RO in discussion with MHCLG and can bid for this within costs. RO to speak to KH at NCC in the new year for scope to link in more enterprise situations and the feasibility for skills training in the centre of Stapleford.</p> <p>JMcG agreed skills were required but unemployment wasn't reported to be bad in the area. Central hub on Hickings Lane to be a central hub for an employment site and a multi-purpose sports area. Include food banks under one hub so nobody misses out. A place to physically meet people for health and fitness.</p> <p>HM accepted the pavilion would serve existing users but could expand services to include in the bid at FBC stage so that all opportunities are captured. She also recognised the 4G match funding being undertaken which would strengthen the bid including the cycle tracks to Notts into the TIP 2 document.</p>	

DG expressed his agreement with the Hickings Lane building proposal although suggested CCTV and lighting at night would be required and would need to be considered in the costs. HM advised that high level conceptual plans would be enhanced and their cost consultant could add these costs on but would need to prioritise which ones could sit within the projects.

RMac agreed the car park would be better than building on Tiles UK site and Hickings Lane Park. Agreed with DG about lighting although controversial whether this deters ASB but definitely CCTV should be included. He suggested making enquiries with the new Stapleford Community Centre to see if they had any money from moving their community centre into the new facilities. HM advised that it would be difficult to include any potential funding from occupiers into the bid if unsure of occupancy and proposals. RO confirmed Stapleford Community Centre and the new Stapleford Community Centre will be offered space in this facility which could be acknowledged in the submission.

PG raised concerns about the costs of the library extension. HM gave a breakdown of costs from site preparation through to professional fees and associated costs including energy efficiency levels.

PG to register a declaration of interest in the purchase of the Tiles Warehouse project.

HM confirmed the purchase price was based on the green book valuation.

TN compared the Option 1 Tile Warehouse draft financial model 70.54 and Option 2 Victoria Street 73.53. HM and MHCLG believed the Tile UK site was good value for money although Victoria Street was better for Stapleford in terms of location and its wider benefits.

DH noted the current skills gap and cost attached. An innovative campus with the three universities of Trent, Nottingham and Derby could produce a site for R&D high level roles within the project for lifetime skills. Future homes need to be more carbon efficient therefore will need more engineering skills for these associated trades.

RO was aware of this and reference had been included in the TIP but there are currently no sites available to facilitate this.

RH suggested a conveyor belt system for construction skills but would need basic English and Maths before vocational skills to articulate development skills for the area.

HM asked to make sure that it was in the TIP for TLister to link into the projects for the first part of Stapleford's journey with the next stage in 5 years' time.

<p>DH would like to increase dwelling space in the town up to four storeys. RO to discuss with RD how to address this and acknowledge in TIP 1 document although no finance is needed at this stage.</p> <p>DG asked if Victoria Street car park was built what would go on the very top, apartments or start-up businesses? HM advised that there was no plan for residential within the project. The first floor would be flexible offices/workspace. The mix development would increase foot-fall and jobs in the town centre.</p>	
<p><u>Project prioritisation (RO)</u></p> <p>RO shared a document which showed how each project was scored based on tools to rank the nine projects for costs involved and their impact. Although the top option was Tile UK members did not have to agree with that choice. It was voted 10 in favour of option 2, with two against and one abstention for the Victoria Street car park development site.</p> <p>MP advised that the community pavilion was aligned with Arts and Heritage as it included sport.</p> <p>HM suggested to take out the car park from Tiles UK. She recognised that there needed to be a Town Centre Car Park Review to help with decisions although a strategy would be too late for this bid.</p> <p>JMcG saw this bid as a once in a lifetime opportunity for the town and to move the car park from (a) to (b) and reconsider later.</p> <p>TN regarded this decision as the first part of the journey for Stapleford and preferred the Tile UK option which had greater potential for development and regeneration of the precinct for a wider high street boundary being circular rather than linear. Victoria Street construction work could kill the town centre and believed the Tiles Warehouse site should be developed first leaving the town centre intact and redeveloped at a late stage.</p> <p>HM advised that the submission looks at opportunities identified in the town centre and to be deliverable. An OBC submission and FBC are completely different. MHCLG would check if there is a strategy in place and a vision in place which can be reconfigured at the next stage. HM reassured the Board that the Bid was fairly safe.</p>	
<p><u>TIP update and summary of Board feedback (RO)</u></p> <p>RO confirmed that feedback comments had been addressed and noted references to content and updating paragraphs and wording to create a snappy Vision Statement. Harriett had provided a selection of one-liners which RO will send out for preference and report back to</p>	

<p>the next Board meeting. The inclusion of Outreach workers had been included in the TIP1 and TIP2 documents around the pavilion facility. Skills emphasis is included in both TIP1 and TIP2 documents as part of the masterplan and National Skills Academy. To support businesses and start-ups design increased up to four levels now in TIP1 document.</p> <p>RO will circulate the Design document following the meeting for feedback and comment on content by 5 January 2021 to be finalised at the next Board meeting on 15 January 2021.</p>	
<p><u>Summary of final stages before submission (RO)</u></p> <p>The TIP process will be submitted to the borough council on 13 January for sign off and the town council on 15 January with the final document presented to the Board on 15 January. There will be scope for small tweaks and RO requested to receive these before 6 January. Once these have been received any changes will be emailed to the Board for final sign off for submission by the 29 January 2021.</p> <p>Terms of Reference will be discussed at the next Board meeting on 15 January.</p> <p>DH queried how competitive our bid would be to stand out from other bids having spoken to MHCLG advisers to Ministers. HM recommended the Board appoint an external consultant from available resources to check and challenge the TIP 1 document. MP advised that the Bid was individually assessed based on the information set out in the guidance and criteria met by following the TIP template.</p>	
<p><u>Project spend update (RO)</u></p> <p>There was nothing new to report on the project spend apart from securing communication support through a consultancy package for the TIP submission at the end of January 2021.</p>	
<p><u>Work programme (RO)</u></p> <p>The work programme was in its final stages before submission of the Bid. The Stakeholder meeting being held on 8 January will also look at the Design documents.</p>	
<p>Future meeting dates – Friday 15 January 2021</p> <p>WM wished to express how impressed he was with the quality and support from RO throughout the process.</p> <p>DG showed his appreciation of the work done by everybody especially RO/HM and could not thank them enough.</p> <p>The Chair wished everyone a good Christmas and a Happy New Year.</p>	

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.45 PM

