STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 17 September 2021, 10:30am-12:50pm

Broxtowe Borough Council – Council Chamber

PRESENT:

Ian Jowett (Chair) WMD Ltd

Paul Sweeney (Vice Chair, via Teams) Robert Ellis Estate Agents

Darren Henry MP MP for Broxtowe Borough Council

Councillor David Grindell
Councillor Richard MacRae
Councillor Teresa Needham

Stapleford Town Council
Councillor Teresa Needham

Stapleford Town Council
Councillor Teresa Needham

John McGrath Stapleford Community

Sally Gill (sub Cllr Jackson)

Ruth Hyde

Nottinghamshire County Council

Broxtowe Borough Council

Will Moorlidge D2N2 LEP

Louise Lyddiatt Hawley and Rogers Solicitors

OBSERVERS

Tom Spink MyPad

Luke CairneyBroxtowe Borough CouncilMelanie PhythianTowns Fund Policy AdvisorDeb Griffiths (minutes)Broxtowe Borough Council

Clair Storey Markets Officer

Ryan Dawson Broxtowe Borough Council

Colin Hallahan Faithful and Gould Aarifah Mohammed Faithful and Gould

APOLOGIES:

Jessica Brannan Broxtowe Youth Homelessness Councillor Richard Jackson Nottinghamshire County Council

Jeff Edwards Clegg Solicitors

Frank Taylor
Paul Gaughan
David Brierley
Frank Taylor
Paul Gaughan
HS2 Ltd

| | ACTION |
|---|--------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions (Chair) | |
| The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. | |
| 2. <u>Apologies of absence</u> | |
| Apologies of absence were received and noted. | |
| 3. Agreement of Minutes of previous Meeting (All) | |
| | |

The minutes of the July meeting were agreed. John McGrath clarified that VIA are heavily involved with cycling. Ruth Hyde confirmed the County Council are also engaged in the cycling working group.

4. <u>Declarations of interest</u> (Chair)

There were no declarations of interest.

5. <u>Personnel and Resource arrangements for the Town</u> <u>Deal Programme</u> (RD)

Since the last meeting the Business Growth manager and former Major Projects Officer have left the authority. Luke Cairney has now been appointed as the Council's Major Projects Officer and will be the lead officer on the Town Deal. Ryan Dawson and Luke Cairney are doing everything possible to keep progressing Economic Development projects, whilst the recruitment of 3no. officers for the wider department takes place.

Agreement of Local Assurance Framework Document

Luke -

This document sets out the process for approving full business cases, board structures, amongst other governance items which must be addressed as part of a Town Deal process. A draft version of the Stapleford Town Deal Board's respective Local Assurance Framework was agreed in principle at the July meeting, with any board members' comments to be agreed and inserted. Ruth Hyde provided further lines for insertion on Pgs 4, 9 and 11. The LAF is considered a working document and will be reviewed regularly, with any changes subject to board approval.

Mel – Re the 'co-funding' section – how does that sit with grants project? Should the board consider a reference to the way co-funding is dealt with differently with this project Vs. others in the LAF document?

Luke – there will be an agreement at the point of grant offer letter to successful applicants, with reference to co-funding elements of any submissions for support under the Recovery Grant Scheme.

[VOTE: Approve and Adopt the LAF document v2 subject to the following amendments.

 The yellow highlighted additions from RH to be inserted into LAF document. Additions to the co-funding section to reflect the difference in process with regards to the 'Recovery Grant Scheme (Project D). ALL voted in favour.]

7. Revised Submission Milestones for FBCs (LC)

Luke – referencing advanced briefing note – latest Project Summary Document submission deadlines for Town Deal capital drawdown were provided to the meeting. Current plan is to submit documents to government by 14 January '22 which would mean receiving payments around March '22 for 5 of the 6 projects.

Ruth – should we be aiming for a later submission date?

Luke – suggested everyone keeps in mind that with the complexity of some of the business cases, it may be better to split some of the submissions.

Mel – it's not helpful to work to a set deadline which might not work for some projects, as some are more complex so it may be prudent to stagger submissions.

Will – clearance processes must also be considered e.g. education facility is in a NCC building, so needs signing off by them.

Luke – Notts County Council must advise Town Deals as to the level of detail required in reports into their committee cycle. Are decisions from NCCs Economic Development and Asset Management committee required exclusively to move forward with projects? This could dramatically impact deliverability, given deadlines for papers into the NCC committee cycle are typically 6 weeks prior to any meeting. Therefore, sign-off on any NCC/VIA impacted projects for FBC submission by January '22, would require reports drafting as soon as October '21. This is a challenge as FBC development will not be progressed enough.

Sally – projects needing NCC approval need to go through their committee process. As soon as there's information they can put this to their members as to what's happening and what's needed, but need detailed information fairly swiftly. Sally to provide the dates NCC require papers by.

Will – what do we mean by approval? – NCC are signed up in principle already. Timescales and costs are all we're really talking about now. Building control/planning permission – can we prioritise at district level?

Ryan – it might be an issue if they need to go to committee but there shouldn't be any concern from Planning.

Sally Gill, to provide update on NCC committee cyles and required information.

John – go to NCC for notes and reports.

Cllr Grindell – clarification is important; we need to move quickly.

8. Faithful & Gould Working Group Updates (F+G)

Luke requested the chair of each WG provide verbal updates.

Will Morlidge – additional learning facility

The immediate practical bit adding extra space to the library is proceeding well. There is a good sense of the type of courses that would be delivered – desk based, computer based. The next stage with NCC and consultants is to work out floor space requirements and how much is needed for reconfiguration. Designers think they might be able to re-jig some of the existing Library floor space, should the new building's footprint require reduction from the original project proposals. All seems doable within the time-scales. The funding side might be an issue.

Looking ahead, it was agreed the project would produce a helpful addition to the town, but work more is needed in partnership with NCC and DWP and partners, to find out what businesses and residents want and do gap analysis, e.g. better transport facilities. floorplans and costings are being taken to the next sub-group meeting.

Darren Henry MP – cycle network project

There has been no time for full consultation given with the public but he has been dealing with several local reps from cycling groups.

With regards to Trowell to Toton Lane – how can it be made a 15-minute neighbourhood and also the issue of safety getting across the A52?

Proposed cycle network map revisions – awaiting a further site visit then the map will be finalised. £3.7m capital as part of a revised project budget may not be enough to deliver the original TIP proposals.

There will be challenges – there may be footpaths which NCC need to get involved with, may go across farmland etc. The key is encouraging people going to work, shops, schools so need appropriate surfaces and lighting as safety is key. Need to tie in additional funding. Draft documents need to be completed by December '21.

Luke Cairney, to seek further clarification on land ownership at bottom of Victoria Street Car park site; Will – Re electric scooters – are we also thinking about charging infrastructure and where it would go?

John – mini Holland scheme – down to tram stop – asked to include various footpaths as there's only three routes through Stapleford – need to interlink everything. Pasture Road needs resurfacing so there could be links there. We need to include schools more in the cycle infrastructure.

Darren Henry – Ilkeston Road up to the roundabout on Coventry Lane is the most dangerous part of the network – need to develop that to allow cycling in safety.

Luke Cairney - Enterprise Hub

Working group is progressing well. Architects are working on high level design and it has been agreed what goes on which floor, with market/street food vendors on ground floor, office space and workshop space on the first floor, and roof garden.

There will be changes to the surfaces at the surrounding car park and the road, to achieve a design language which better connects the new building and exiting public realm. It will double up as an event space when markets stalls are packed away.

During the last working group, designers presented a second option for consideration, which involves alternative placement of the new block within the car park site, with some existing parking areas 'built over'. This could be a more efficient use of the land and have cost saving advantages, so is being explore further. The need for further cost detail in order to develop this project's business case means a decision on the preferred option re the building placement is required swiftly.

lan – Consider bringing the building to the front Derby Road and design it as such to not to look like a car park.

Poundstretcher do not want to relinquish the piece of land at the front, which is currently leased by the Council to provide disabled parking bays.

Paul – Sceptical we'd get permission to build over at this point. Option 1 (TIP proposed option) looks very much more like the iconic building and centrepiece the board are trying to achieve. Could the bottom section of Victoria Street be pedestrianised to achieve better links with existing public realm?

lan – whoever owns the piece of land, we need to access it as well.

Ryan – the problem will be timeframes, there will be legal implications re alterations to land ownership and access rights.

Luke – The architects can't progress any further until we make a decision on a massing option. Are we happy to progress to Working Group's choice of Option 1? Option 2 on stilts could be cheaper to construct.

Cllr Needham – the wider site is surrounded by residential areas – how would residents feel facing it directly? It might be seen as an imposing building which seems negative. A new three storey development could present overlooking issues for nearby residential properties.

Cllr Grindell – Poundstretcher are unlikely to "play ball". We need to be finding space for start-up businesses.

Louise – planning and legal rights and covenants are separate things. If the land is owned by the Council, then Poundstretcher might have rights of way over it so that needs to be established.

Paul – the former Major Projects Officer had said they were going to look into the lease agreement with Poundstretcher. We need to make quick decisions and move forward.

Will – key to establish which is more beneficial economically and is there a significant disparity re carbon footprint?

Mel – Some car parking will need to be retained for uses of the building.

Darren Henry MP – need to create an impression with the building – needs to be more visual at the front than the back.

Luke Cairney - Pavilion Working Group

The working group are agreed that the project's objectives cannot be delivered through a larger single building. Therefore, the regnerated site would involve a two storey muilti-use community building for the benefit of community groups, sports teams and other local uses. In addition, a single storey youth centre to deliver services with separate site perimeter treatment. This is a requirement of NCC being able to continue delivering services, which wouldn't be possible through an entirely shared space.

High level design work is being carry out by architects at this point, which will help the team developing the business case also establish up to date costs. More detailed design from the architects will be presented at the next working group.

As part of the project there's also an outreach worker post who will work with alongside youth services and interact with the additional learning facility to signpost and get people into education. The job description is currently being drawn up along with determining the best way to recruit this worker. Service level agreements and how this may be approached is being considered. Following a meeting with NCC youth services, it was determined a salary for this kind of work would be in the region of circa £35k p/a.

There could be some logic in using existing delivery models for outreach workers to successfully recruit. This could involve NCC directly recruiting and employing the outreach worker with an agreed person and job specification, with the lead council and NCC agreeing a recharge arrangement for salary. The WG, NCC and BrBC need to also establish what happens to that employee after March 2026, once all Towns Fund money has been spent.

Ruth – as there are now two buildings the site can accommodate it and it reduces conflict of different types of uses, but there is concern about the finance of building two buildings instead of one?

Colin – The approach to constructing the two buildings in tandem would likely mean there is little to no saving that would otherwise be achieved through a single building development, owing to the proposed size and storeys for this project (essentially considered a small development).

Cllr MacRae – Suggested that in messaging and how we discuss the project, we should refer to it as a community pavilion rather than a sports pavilion. Not doing so could have negative repercussions with stakeholders and how the project is viewed.

Cllr McGrath – in 50 years' time the development has to be financially viable, be successful and be maintained. The WG has considered co-funding from organisations who have strategic alignment. There are further opportunities for L Leisure getting involved, perhaps to run the facility in time. Some decisions won't be popular e.g bowling and cricket club may be subject to partial or total displacement.

Luke – ongoing work with designers to ensure all current users are accommodated on site. Where the relocation of current users becomes a dependency for the proposed development to proceed, further work to accommodate those affected at other nearby facilities will need to be carried out.

Cllr MacRae – someone has got to manage it, e.g L Leisure – also there is a need to have a steering group or management committee, for the community building to ensure all those users have input.

Colin Hallahan - Traffic Management Working Group

This project has many links with the with the cycle infrastructure project Faithful and Gould are using TSK for preliminary design work on both schemes so there is crossover/tying together during FBC development.

Most of the traffic management proposals are pretty much as per those contained with the Bancroft report, which were then transferred into the TIP. The WG will be looking at this report with partners at NCC and VIA and scrutinising further. A review of costs will be sought and consideration for the individual improved elements in response to the revised project values across the programme.

Ryan – all bids need to co-ordinate and not contravene something else. Everything will be linked to everything else.

9. Government Documents (required by 27 Sept)

Luke provided an update on project return documents due for submission shortly.

Financial Profile, Annex A-1

A revised financial profile of the spend across the programme has been created and circulated to the group for comment. This was developed with the Council's finance team and s.151 officer.

It was noted that the original version submitted at HoT stage was more of an expenditure profile, however the opportunity for resubmission is actually closer to an income profile and where funding is expected to be drawn down.

The approach taken to produce this new financial profile involved taking the total £21.1 m budget and first allowing for 11.5% sum of programme management to cover costs, design challenges etc.

Excluding the Town Centre Recovery Grant project (D), the five remaining project budgets were reduced by a pro-rated amount. £25k has been allocated for the Council's Revs & Bens to issue payments to successful applicants.

There is no indication that the outputs and co-funding amounts have changed for the projects.

Mel – raised that the level of Programme Management sums CDEL and RDEL combined may be seen as being at the upper levels of that seen in Town Deal programmes and further justification as to whether these amounts were appropriate may need to be provided. By just reviewing the Annex A-1 document, it is unclear what the indicated level of capital programme management budget is required for. Advised to look at capital sums being assigned back to individual projects.

The board should not rush to make earlier Summary Document submissions with a view to deliver projects at the earliest opportunity as per the latest dates provided by Gov. The board should ask for flexibility where it's required in order to properly develop FBCs. Advised Gov have already given an extension as part of the Project Confirmation process, so it's not on the same payment run and not on the same deadlines as other town deals

Luke – the programme will receive a 5% of the £21.1m town deal, by way of a CDEL payment, once the project confirmation process has been completed. As and when projects come forward, draw down will involve 5% of the total project ask netted off, owing to the 5% programme advance. The advance 5% CDEL is designed to offer the board flexibility and capacity to deliver projects.

Other town deals are working to similar timescales, so the board need to be mindful when progressing FBCs to assurance phase, that those organisations providing assurance services have the capacity to do so and the team developing the FBCs have adequate time to address key points in any appraisal report before Project Summary Documents are due.

Ruth agreed with taking Mel's advice and be realistic about the stage we're at. Reduced grant is scalable across the projects. Keep Covid grant at £1m. It is hard to know if the money profiled for various projects is sufficient to meet demand but have to operate within that envelope.

Will – Re consultants – there is concern if we push things back do we lose their capacity? Re - New Secretary of State – will freedoms and flexibilities for s.151 officers stay or change? or will budgets go?

Mel – Gov will be doing the utmost to ensure this programme stays as it is. Programme end date is March 2026, but deadlines before then are flexible.

Will – heads of terms total up to £21.1m – not a guaranteed minimum.

Paul – do we know if there was a project which was weaker by Gov and a as a result, informed the lower £21.1 award to deliver against the TIP?

Mel – weakness in information rather than the concept of the project themselves. All projects will deliver – dropping any will dilute the vision of the TIP.

Luke – might some get shoved into the next financial year?

Mel confirmed that funding drawdowns are flexible, though there is expectation that dates will be met as per the funding schedule. Any slippage on forecast drawdowns should be communicated ASAP and will need to be justified.

[VOTE: to approve STF budget £21,100,000 and the associated timescales for drawdowns in Annex A-1 subject to the following amends:

- CDEL programme management line, to be passed back to the individual project capital lines, proportionately.
- Amends to financial year 21/22, with capital amounts (excluding project D) moved and added to the sums for 22/23. All voted in favour.]

[VOTE: to approve individual Project Confirmation documents (6 in total). The Town Centre Recovery project fund form was used as an example, though Luke noted that all other projects will use the same form, with project information extrapolated as per the TIP2. All voted in favour.]

[VOTE: to agree to defer internal deadline for submission of Project Summary Documents from a January 2022 submission, for the next submission cohort of March 2022, to allow for Full Business Case development around the more complex projects. All voted in favour.]

[VOTE: to approved the approach to completing a DRAFT M&E plan for the town deal. Town Funds M&E Indicator Guide showed on large screen as working example. All voted in favour.]

Will - offer to support Luke in appraising the 6 projects against the M&E Indicators.

10. FBC Sign-Off:

Town Centre Recovery Fund Project [D]

Luke summarised the contents of the Town Centre Recovery Project business case and process for accessing the fund.

It was clarified that any co-funding associated with the Town Centre Recovery Fund would need to be new money i.e not historically committed by the business owner for improvement. This will be made clear in the funding application documents, policy and guidance.

Cllr MacRae offered support in distributing the funding application documents to local businesses, once the scheme is confirmed.

Ruth queried the type of businesses that will be eligible to receive the grant. It was clarified that it's for existing businesses, not for new start-ups.

John raised concerns regarding businesses that are not eligible to apply for the grant, such as those outside the area of intervention. Ian advised that the geographical boundaries of the fund had been previously agreed by the Board and they could not be adjusted.

The Town Centre Recovery Fund should use that title in all official documentation and correspondence going forward. There should be no reference to Covid-19.

Applicants to the Town Centre Recovery Fund will be cross referred to other services/funds if their application is not suitable and/or to develop the quality of their proposals as required.

[VOTE: For the approval of the Town Centre Recovery Fund business case to move to assurance phase. All voted in favour apart from John McGrath who voted against because of the eligibility/geographical border issue.]

11. Work Programme (LC)

No further discussion. Look to review at next meeting, once further working group development is updated and information gaps are identified through a wider information acquisition exercise with F+G.

12. Date of next meeting (Chair)

15 October 2021 at 10:30am.

[VOTE: For Board meetings to take place every 4 weeks. All voted in favour. Cllr MacRae asked that Luke check there was no clash with the Civic Society meeting dates. All voted in favour.]