

Carlisle Town Deal Board

Minutes

Friday 23rd April 2021, 10:00-12:00

MS Teams Meeting

No.	Item	Time	Owner	Paper
1	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>Attendees:</p> <p>Emma Porter (Chair) - Story Contracting Cllr John Mallinson – Carlisle City Council Cllr Colin Glover - Carlisle City Council Cllr Paul Nedved – Carlisle City Council Alison Hatcher – Cumbria County Council John Stevenson MP Elaine Herbert - DWP Rob Brittain – Castles and Coasts Housing association Cllr Cyril Weber- Cumbria County Council Jane Meek- Carlisle City Council Mark Boyling – Carlisle Cathedral Julie Mennell– Cumbria University Paul Musgrave – Cumbria County Council David Jackson – Lanes Shopping Centre Andrew Mackay – Tullie House Jon Power– Cumbria LEP <i>Deputising for Jo Lappin</i> Rosie Jenkins- Cities and Local Growth Unit Peter Graham – New Skills Consulting Helen Joicey- New Skills Consulting Steven Robinson – Carlisle City Council Jenson Kemp – Carlisle City Council</p> <p>Apologies:</p> <p>Jo Lappin- Cumbria LEP David Allen – Cumbria CVS</p>	10:00	EP	N
2	<p>Minutes from previous meeting</p> <p>-Agreed</p>	10:05	EP	Y
3	<p>Progress update</p> <p>SR- Heads of Terms agreed and sent back to government, received offer letter back signed confirming the offer and outlining next steps.</p>	10:10	EP/JM	N

	<p>Meeting with ARUP around developing business case and how they can support this process, SR will be discussing this with project sponsors regarding what they need- this is part of the Town Fund Delivery Partner programme</p> <p>Large amount of work has gone into putting assessment framework together and completing stage 1 review.</p> <p>Starting work on specification for business case support.</p>			
4	<p>Prioritisation stage 1 overview</p> <p>PG- aim of reducing budget by 5.3M.</p> <p>Stage 1 working to identify reducing the request for individual projects, through identifying greater match, reducing scope or cost engineering.</p> <p>Sponsors have filled in new project proforma for identifying savings and reviewing the outputs. If full savings cannot be found through this process, then would need to initiate stage 2- re-prioritisation of projects against the TD objectives and removing lowest scoring projects (or descoping)</p> <p>Reduction of 2.8 M found- good progress but leaves savings of 2.4 M to be identified. Most of this has been from reducing costs, little match funding has been identified in addition to those that already exist. £210,000 match funding identified.</p> <p>Match funding of whole programme is 8%, meaning town deal intervention is high, at 92%.</p> <p>Lighting up Carlisle- reduction of 33% to £620,000, additional £70,000 match has been identified. Some sites have been taken, small reduction in outputs, still strong VFM.</p> <p>Market Hall, reduced by 1M, 25% reduction.</p> <p>Tullie House- reduced by 9%</p> <p>Citadels Business Infrastructure- still working to review the costs of this project, no savings identified.</p> <p>Digital Community Learning Hub- reduced by 500,000 (18%) reduced revenue costs, and capital costs by reviewing timeframe and bringing some service delivery in house.</p> <p>Southern Gateway- 143,585 (2%) reduction removing short section of resurfacing- now 7,806,415 total revised costs, potential to look again to identify further savings.</p> <p>Start with the Park- reduced by 832,576 (21%) reducing scale of cycling and walking route and public space delivery.</p> <p>EP- Asks Board members and project sponsors to consider whether further cost reductions can be secured, to avoid taking out a project.</p> <p>JuM- Citadels TD project has a strong link with citadels university campus project, notes that this project has a link to a wider scheme of £72 Million.</p> <p>JeM- Keen to review this process to avoid cutting a project from the package.</p>	10:20	PG / SR	Y

	<p>AM- Tullie House project is a part of a wider scheme, and savings have been completed by a QS so while savings are small, they are accurate.</p> <p>JS- asks board to consider identifying a small number (2-3) projects where this should be fully funded, and then consider as a board which projects should be removed.</p> <p>CJM- view that any further cost reductions could start reducing the scope of the key projects at this stage.</p> <p>AH- what exercise shows is that this is difficult to find 5 M from wider scope, Southern Gateway could be reduced further but this would impact on the outputs significantly. View that Board needs to discuss which are the essentials and which are non-essential which can then be re-assessed.</p> <p>DJ- questions whether the Market Hall is potentially whether this is the weakest project due to the retail environment is currently.</p> <p>JeM- This project is about repurposing this building rather than maintaining the current retail offer.</p> <p>RB- Need to consider what the deliverability risks are, which would help the Board make an informed decision.</p> <p>JeM- suggests considering the stage 2 process as a way to consider how this</p> <p>CW- needs to look at strategic implications as well as the opportunity to find funding from other sources, endorses the approach given by JeM</p>			
5	<p>Stage 2 project assessment framework</p> <p>PG- highlights that undergoing this independent process is useful as different board members may have different priorities on what is the most strategically important project.</p> <p>Projects will be assessed by strategic fit, deliverability, and private sector growth notes RB's points and agrees that any project with significant deliverability risks be removed.</p> <p>EP- highlights that projects relating to skills and retaining young people are key given the context of Carlisle</p> <p>AH- priorities look strong, raised concern that this is a relatively long form and it may be a bureaucratic burden for sponsors.</p> <p>PG- notes this and this is a fair point, wanted to ensure objectivity by asking sponsors to complete this rather than using the information held already, but can consider this approach if sponsors would prefer.</p> <p>CW- asks if Council has considered feasibility of market hall repurposing without the Council taking ownership of the site.</p> <p>SR- we have looked at this option but the underlease the City Council has precluded it from doing this.</p> <p>EP- can we look at the existing project proformas and then discuss what our priorities are.</p> <p>AH, JuM and AM abstain from southern gateway, citadels, and tullie house discussion</p>	11:10	PG / SR	Y

	<p>The Board members highlighted their priority projects as follows:</p> <p>Most mentions</p> <p>Citadels Southern Gateway Tullie House</p> <p>The other projects received fewer mentions</p> <p>Digital Community and Learning Hub Market Hall Start with the Park Lighting Up Carlisle</p> <p>JeM useful to see priorities clearly emerging, and these align closely with the original priorities.</p> <p>EP- Asks if there is potential for citadels business hub and digital and community learning hub be aligned and combined?</p> <p>PM- could be looked at but noting that these are different offers, and original offer involved a hub and spoke model for</p> <p>RJ- may need to look at doing a project change form if projects where to be combined.</p> <p>After discussions Board agreed that the best way forward would be to reassess all projects, including the top 3, taking into consideration the preferred projects as this would ensure a full evidence base is provided for the board to make an informed decision.</p> <p>EP asks whether we can also consider reducing the scope of southern gateway as well as these considerations.</p>			
6	<p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commence stage two project assessment, will use the assessment criteria working with project sponsors to complete forms, all projects will be re-assessed but the top 3 will inevitably have a stronger weighting. Review costings for Southern Gateway, bringing a reduced scope version back to the board as part of the options assessment. Present results of stage 2 process and options for boards consideration for the next board meeting on the 10 May 	11.40	EP	N
7	<p>AOB</p> <p>EP- noted this was David Jackson's last meeting before retiring, chair thanked David's contributions as a board</p>	11.50	ALL	N

	member, but also for his wider contributions in helping make the city what it is.			
--	---	--	--	--