

Town Deal Board Meeting - 12/03/2021

Attendees:

Jane Meek

Peter Graham

Andrew Mackay

Steven Robinson

Colin Glover

John Stevenson

John Mallinson

Cyril Weber

David Allen

Mark Boyling

Emma Porter

Ken Lau

Alison Hatcher

Sami Falou

Paul Musgrave

Julie Mennell

Purpose of the Meeting

JaM: The announcement from the chancellor on our successful bid for funding, we have received our offer letter in which we have been offered £19.7m. the meetings purpose is make sure the board were aware of the offer and work out what the options are and the pros and cons of the offer and agree what the best steps are going forward before the acceptance deadline of the offer.

EP: The £19.7m offer we've got is great despite going for £25m and we've all done a great job, we should acknowledge it's a great achievement.

Offer Letter – SR Presenting

JaM: Outlined that the board is expected to make a decision today on how we reduce the projects, the purpose of this meeting is to have a bit of discussion today as we start to work through the prioritisation and inform the final decision and discuss any questions that we do have.

Discussion

EP: Would an option be to take a programme out or would potentially businesses be able to put some funding in? it might not be beneficial to take bits off each project here and there.

SR: It's something we had to do with the future high street fund to get within the funding envelope. It's a balance between making sure we don't reduce the scope and making sure the strategy still works.

DA: Project prioritisation framework is very helpful, proposed that taking a project out would be best option but I agree with Steve that there needs to be a balance.

SR: Agree with you David, that we need to have an eye on the expected outcome.

JS: What does it mean for the possibilities further down the line, what will be the maximum benefit for the short term and long term for the city?

CG: It would be interesting to see what the government will think on removing a project, reducing each project scope by 21% is a lot and will reduce the effect of each project by too much. If the funding was reduced it 2 different areas would it make a project fall over but we

need to know what the impact would be. We need to focus on priorities and what will have the greatest impact on the City.

AH: Agree, Salami slicing of 21% would not give the right result. The prioritisation assessment should look at strategic fit, value for money and deliverability.

JaM: A good point is we need to have a sight of funding streams from other projects so when we do make a decision as a board that we are fully sighted, we will take that on board and when we do come back to make a decision we are best placed to do so.

SR: Part of the prioritisation framework we will have to look at deliverability.

EP: this meeting had to be called quickly so we could agree whether we are signing up to it, I think its fine at this point that we aren't going to have the answer today.

PG: The conversation is very positive at this point, broadly I think we need to go through it in a two stage process, When we were developing the project prioritisation we have the opportunity to go back and review the scope and deliverability, a solution may present itself when we go back to the project sponsors. Once this process is done that we can come back and get some more concrete options and share with the board.

JuM: My understanding with Barrow was that we maintained output levels, we did with our project.

AH: Barrow did the mixed option, identified where savings could be made and then a little salami slicing where it wouldn't be detrimental to a project.

DA: The measures need to mean something to local people, need to ensure we get good community feedback

SR: Part of the TIP conditions, was that we need to provide extra clarification on how we will do involve communities. Barrow had to do the same thing on private sector engagement strategy also.

Board agreed to sign the HoT and accept the funding offer.

DA: How do we ensure we link up the funding from the levelling up fund?

AH: Levelling up is one bid per local authority. Community renewal fund has no limit on number of applications, but there is only £220m available across the UK to be spent by March 2022.

JaM: we are working across the county in terms of the levelling up fund, the projects have to be delivered in a certain period of time, so they need to be ready to go.

SF: we are trying to seek clarification from colleagues if we are allowed to drop projects from the list.

Next Steps

SR: Agree the HofT which then Emma and Jason will need to respond to and then 2 months of work which we will need to sort prioritisation and discharge of conditions

DA: I think some indication of amount to be spent and whether this is the initial fund for bid development.

SR: We have what we believe is another budget to commission a package of business cases, we will need to review that but im fairly confident we have enough in our budget going forward. We feel we have enough from the first round to do that piece of work.

AM: Happy to get on the front foot, so keen to approve procurement of consultants providing we can afford it.

AM: Do we have a date for the next meeting, within the next two months?

JaM: confirmed that then next meeting date is being looked at.

Actions:

- Agree the Heads of Terms and accept funding offer
- Establish a prioritisation framework for the projects for the next board meeting.