

STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 21 January 2022 at 10.00 am
MS Teams Meeting

PRESENT:

Paul Sweeney (Vice Chair)
Ian Jowett (Chair)
Darren Henry
Ruth Hyde
Ryan Dawson
Councillor Richard MacRae
Councillor David Grindell
John McGrath
Tom Spink
Will Morlidge
Sally Gill
Councillor Teresa Needham

Robert Ellis Estate Agents
WMD Ltd
Broxtowe MP
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Stapleford Community
MyPad
D2N2
Nottinghamshire County Council
Stapleford Town Council

OBSERVERS

Luke Cairney
Jonathon Little
Phillipa Ward (notes)
Melanie Phythian
Martin Burke
Aarifah Mohammed
Lisa Revell

Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Towns Fund Policy Advisor
Faithful and Gould
Faithful and Gould
Faithful and Gould

APOLOGIES:

David Brierley
Geoff Edwards

HS2 Ltd
Edwards Clegg Solicitors

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

<p><u>Agree Minutes of previous Meeting (Chair)</u></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting dated 17 December 2021 were agreed.</p>	
<p><u>Declarations of interest (Chair)</u></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
<p><u>Update on Project Working Groups and Risks (F+G)</u></p> <p>MB gave a slide presentation to provide an update for each of the Projects. He reported that good progress was being made generally and they are providing first draft FBCs in February and that further design work beyond that produced by architects could be instructed, in order to help provide some cost assurances. More focus would be required for traffic management and the cycle network schemes, as we await comments from VIA.</p> <p><u>Additional Learning Facility (ALF)</u></p> <p>The project is projected over budget by circa £300,000.</p> <p>Issues and constraints around this project include the library asset being owned by NCC. Because the works propose an alteration, NCC will want to ensure they are carrying out the necessary due-diligence. Representatives in Working Group have indicated that Arc will need to be integrated into the process in order to take the design forward to further RIBA stages, which does add further elements of risk to the programme, around cost and timetable.</p> <p>It was explained that Arc was an internal design service for NCC, but now provides external work to other authorities and organisations.</p> <p>SG advised that a report will be submitted to NCC's Economic Development and Asset Management Committee (EDAM) for consideration of the Town Deal's Additional Learning Facility. The report is recommended to be Approved by Members in principle subject to a financial business case and further understanding of legal and financial risk.</p> <p>PS asked for the outcome to be reported back to the Board.</p> <p>RH considered the project to be scaled back, if further additional costs are projected beyond those in the last review, for design work if NCC are insistent on heavier involvement from Arc by mandate. Her concern was learning for Stapleford with the library providing an ALF for the community, but also needs Outreach workers to connect to the facility for the learning opportunity and has this been costed in the project.</p>	<p>LC/SG to update Town Deal Board on outcome of NCC committees.</p>

LC confirmed that a draft Job Description had been prepared for an Outreach Worker with NCC Youth Service colleagues and an officer at Broxtowe BC to complement various projects. This required more refinement and the costs for this sat within the allocation for the Pavilion project, not the ALF.

JMcG confirmed that he would make a presentation to NCC Members regarding NCC's involvement for the library and highways, to help them to understand what hard work is being done and needs to be achieved for the town.

WM thought that it was too late in the day for NCC to announce Arc services to be given the design work for the project which should have been discussed sooner, and although NCC would need to carry out due-diligence as the project involves an NCC asset, Arc may not be the most appropriate mechanism to do so.

LC advised that a report will also be presented to the Transport and Environment Committee for approval of schemes in principle, based on Working Group and FBC development to date. He was aware of NCC's limited resources and their turnaround time has been tight, but NCC were engaging and positive, however more will be required. He confirmed that Arc would likely provide technical design sentry for the project as a minimum, as a pre-requisite of NCC/Inspire buy-in to the project, and at the appropriate time would require invitation onto necessary the Working Group or delivery board once Working Groups are dissolved.

SG was asked to determine what level of design work Arc would provide. She explained that Arc designed new buildings, but not necessarily existing buildings, but they would ensure and advise NCC/Inspire accordingly that the building could be operational.

It was suggested that should the project need to be dramatically scaled, could additional learning space be delivered within the proposed Enterprise Hub. LC announced that the first floor of the Ent Hub would provide more opportunities as business development pathway, for small businesses including those in former Police Station development. The Ent Hub based on latest plans, would offer a combination of different spaces, including an open plan office are, with a different offer to Inspire and should be retained as a commercially orientated development.

Community Pavilion and Youth Centre

MB reported that the Community Pavilion was well advanced and at a similar stage as the ALF. The project currently projected over budget by £700,00.

It was suggested further advanced desk top surveys could be instructed, to mitigate unforeseen risk later in the programme and provide some certainty on risk items such as ground conditions, as in all projects cases there is an element of the project costs apportioned to these risk items. An early draft of the business case will arrive in February for consideration.

LC explained that some of the increase in cost is resultant of the project proposing two buildings, instead of one initially proposed in the TIP development. The board will reserve the right to request co-funding from NCC towards the development of the new Youth Centre in order to preserve the project and is well justified to do so in order to reduce the project budget deficit. Further conversations in the coming weeks will be necessary with NCC's property team to look at options, which could include the sale of the existing building, which the NCC could divert proceeds into the programme to ensure the new building is delivered. An NCC report to the Economic Development and Asset Management Committee highlights the current youth centre building although well used, is no longer fit for purpose and substantial works or relocation would be needed in the next 10-15 years. Design for the new youth centre to date had been developed directly with the Youth Service to ensure user acceptance criteria.

It was raised that an EOI by the Football Club as a key stakeholder at the site, to explore co-funding opportunities from the FA, which the Council and board may not be eligible to apply for.

RH totally agreed that the facilities are too important to lose. The combination of both facilities are wanted and needed and the board needs to leverage external funding, including contributions from NCC, FA and others.

JMcG agreed that fitness was important with authorities' growing concerns over obesity.

LC remarked that we have developed designs across the board to develop business cases. He suggested using available resources, including already secured revenue and capital allocations following the project confirmation process. These resources could be used to advance designs, looking at materials and construction methods to reduce the projected costs.

Enterprise Hub

LC was disappointed that there had been no resolution to the missing lease document, detailing clauses in relation to the lease agreement between the Council and the owners of the Poundstretcher site. The Council has approached Poundstretcher and will need to open about the intentions to build near to the existing building.

PS believed it would be detrimental to Poundstretcher's reputation to try and block a positive asset for the town.

Traffic Management

MB reported that work with NCC and VIA had stalled around the initial option, as there is an internal review by VIA and assessment around priorities needed to move forward. LC and MB to arrange an update meeting with them.

LC explained that VIA recently had conversations with colleagues and their approach to Towns Deals. These conversations included briefing the Accident Reduction Teams on proposals. VIA will be carrying out a review of the two options by Bancroft and supplementary report by TSK for the purposes of business case development. As part of that review, VIA have been asked to consider how the proposals could be scaled, with scenarios of £1m and £2m capital allocations, should the board revise the current £2.8m.

LC mentioned that Traffic management options don't typically provide larger BCRs, so any scaling to the programme could be considered on this project first.

LC/JL/MeIP met prior to the meeting to discuss how gov may view the removal of a project in totality post TIP, what would happen to the apportioned capital in the financial profile for this project and the process.

It was agreed that the removal of the project wouldn't likely be agreeable, whilst retaining the full capital allocation to the programme, however, a reworked project providing a similar level outputs to currently proposed could be achieved. As the current proposals in Bancroft report are not traditional traffic management interventions, rather aesthetic improvements to existing calming measures and surfaces; a different aesthetic improvement scheme could be developed. If this was then delivered at a reduced cost, any surplus from the £2.8m could then be re-allocated.

RH agreed this was a more pragmatic approach for a longer term ambition. This approach could contribute a first step to achieve further work. RH questioned whether the scheme still referenced a 15-minute neighbourhood approach.

LC confirmed that the Traffic Management scheme would not change the cycle network as these cycle routes were on the edge of the town centre and treated as a separate project. The 15-minute approach has not yet been finalised with the working group.

JL referenced the odd synergy between the cycle project and traffic management. The review can help to make sure RH points are taken into consideration. The overall approach is extremely positive by the working group. The importance is making the street scene really attractive along the high street.

Cycle Network

MB highlighted the challenges around delays to unlock the scheme. There is a £4.2m budget for the cycle network and further development work now needed with VIA and TSK.

MB has provided the Board with a long list of surveys, both physical and desktop, which will be required in time to progress the project. Comments were welcomed as to which should be prioritised pre-FBC completion.

LC queried whether some of these costs could be capitalised or should the board look to draw on revenue budgets to progress early survey work, although revenue budgets would not be available for approved projects until June 2022 should Project Summary documents be submitted in April 2022.

MeIP advised not to change budgets now as would be problematic. She further advised that draw down in the next financial year (for approved projects) will be split into two payments:

1. April/May 2022 - Up to 70% 2022/23 project (and where relevant 70% programme management) as per the previously submitted financial profile.
2. June- September 2022 - Up to 30% 2022/23 project as per the previously submitted financial profile.

MB summarised the critical risks register to cover major projects and other risks would be regularly updated with JL/LC.

WM The theme appears to be that all project major risks rest with NCC and emphasise to them the need to get things pushed through.

Commission Co-Funding Specialist (Jonathon Little)

JL displayed a draft brief for co-funding specialists which would be circulated to Board Members following the meeting. This brief would be sent to three approved consultants for them to each provide a short report following their discussions with funders and meetings with respective Chairs of the five working groups, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Board and a senior representative from

Broxtowe Borough Council. The three tenders should be returned by 25 February 2022.

Progression of design on select projects (Luke Cairney)

LC reported that some progress could be made with a couple of projects for design work based on cost projections. The issue was obtaining funding before the new financial year. JL suggested submitting FBC for the larger projects to get the work capitalised then swap the revenue to capital.

RH was grateful to both LC for paying close attention to the money and to MeIP for her positive statement that capital funding could be released in April.

Lungfish to provide a day rate for QS work in order to breakdown costs further and look at materials being used.

LC illustrated that the funds available for FBC development had £2k surplus, which could be used to procure comms support.

MeIP raised the GrantFinder resource to address co-funding constraints - <https://www.grantfinder.co.uk/>

Town Centre Recovery Grant Scheme Update (Luke Cairney)

LC advised that we had received more enquiries than applications for the grant scheme. There had been four applications totalling £60k but will continue to promote the scheme by hand delivering guidance notes to businesses shortly.

He reported that frequent enquiries had come into the grant mailbox, related to the eligible spend items and which funding strand these were permissible under. The two strands being the Business Continuity Grant (BCG) and the Business Development Fund (BDF). This will be discussed with the Grant Scheme Working Group to make it clearer for businesses by providing separate lists for each type of funding.

The first panel will meet on 8 February to run audit checks from applicants before reporting to the Executive Board in February for possible approval. There will be another opportunity for submissions before the end of the financial year when the scheme will be reassessed and re-launched for the new financial year.

PS suggested more PR work might be needed before and after these awards. DG had been informed by a local business that they were happy with the help and support from the council encouraging businesses to come forward. RMac reported that businesses out of the area were asked to prepare their applications for submission, in

the event grant eligibility changes are agreed by the board in April, to include changes to the catchment area. He was concerned that a town councillor had made a comment to a business and will be addressing this issue directly with them to make it known that the Executive Board will make the final decision.

DH asked for an information pack that could be displayed in his constituency shop window of what is being invested in the Towns Deal including contact details and photos of the Executive Board to show the public that finally money is being invested in the town. PS was willing to hand out flyers to businesses in the town centre who might benefit.

JL considered that when the Economic Development team were at full complement they would hold a Business Breakfast meeting in Stapleford to engage successful applicants with potential applicants to keep the interest going. LC suggested providing an example of a good grant scheme application. He continued that Broxtowe BC had interviewed four candidates for two EDO vacancies and was looking to appoint fairly quickly.

AOB

1. LC advised that the letter to The Rt Hon. Michael Gove MP would be emailed by COP today with Board member signatures received.
2. A brief previously circulated to the Board to review comms support, will now request support to the programme up until 2026. The bidders key task would be to provide support until the FBC completion and for a short period into delivery phase for continuity, but then retained for comms work packages on a piecemeal approach. For interim support F+G were asked if they were able to appoint anyone through their frameworks.

Dates of next meetings (Chair)

The following dates have been scheduled although Board Members will be advised whether to meet in the Council Chamber, Beeston Offices or via MS Teams, in due course.

- Friday 11 February 2022 at 10am
- Friday 11 March 2022 at 10am
- Friday 8 April 2022 at 10am

MEETING CLOSED AT 11.30 AM