

**ROTHERHAM TOWN DEAL BOARD
Wednesday 4 August 2021**

- 9 NOTES OF THE ROTHERHAM TOWN DEAL BOARD MEETING HELD
ON 4TH AUGUST, 2021 (ATTACHED)**

Rotherham Town Deal Board

Microsoft Teams Meeting due to Covid-19

4th August 2021, 8.45am-10.00am

<p style="text-align: center;">Attended By:</p> <p>Neil Baxter, Engie – NB (Chair) Simon Moss, RMBC – SM Lizzie Dealey, CRT – LD Andrew Denniff, BRCC – AD Simeon Leach, RIDO RMBC – SL Tim O’Connell, RIDO RMBC – TOC Steve Morris, Signs Express – Smo Paul Woodcock, RMBC – PW Lorna Vertigan, RIDO RMBC – LV Ray Kinsella, Great Places – RK Mike Smith, NHS – MS Deborah Bullivant, Grimm & Co – DB Justin Homer, BIES/CLGU – JH Paul Harper, DWP – PH*** Joel Hamer, RIDO – Jh Tracey Mace-Akroyd, RNN Group -TMA Jacquie Falvey, Sarah Champion’s office – JF*</p>			<p style="text-align: center;">Apologies:</p> <p>Sarah Champion MP – SC* Phil Hayes, Rotherham Conf. of Communities – Pha Nick Bussey, Rotherham CAB – NBu Tom Hawley, Homes England – TH Julia Bloomer, AESSEAL – JB Nikki Jones, AMRC – NJ Colin Blackburn, SCR – CB Duncan Armstrong-Payne, Harworth – DAP Lisa Pogson, Airmaster – LP Dan Needham, Muse Developments – DN Sharon Thorpe, DWP – ST*** Andy Lock, Coalfields Regeneration – AL Stuart Kerr, Wilmott Dixon – SK Peter Hill , HMP Bespoke Construction Ltd – PH Vicki Norman, RIDO RMBC – VN Lucy Mitchell, RIDO RMBC – LM Councillor Denise Lelliott – DL Karen Hall, DWP – KH***</p>		
<p>Action Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any Board Members interested in joining a working group to speak to the Chair or any member of the Project Team – ALL - NB to circulate notes from future Chair’s meetings - LV to share reprioritisation tool with board - LV to provide more detail around what the specific drop in outputs is going to be - Communications as a standing item on the agenda - VN 					
17/21	<p>Apologies for Absence/Introductions and Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Apologies listed above.</p> <p>SM declared an interest in signage. MS declared an interest in Magna, where he is a Trustee. AD declared an interest in buildings on High Street, adjacent to the proposed Accelerator site.</p>				
18/21	<p>Matters Arising from the Minutes of the last meeting held on the 16th June 2021</p> <p>The minutes were accepted as a true record.</p> <p>Any other Board Members who wish to join a working group as we move forward, please contact NB or a member of the project team</p> <p>NB fed back on recent Chair’s meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First meeting was facilitated by Arup with board chairs for Goldthorpe, Stainforth and Doncaster. Introductory meeting where info was shared about bids. Should have met again on Monday but that was cancelled due to a covid issue. • Second meeting was a national meeting including around 25 chairs all 		All		

	<p>at different stages in their bids. Interesting information coming out about prioritisation. Must ensure what we are putting forward can be delivered within the period. Important to have a plan in place for each scheme with a clear governance process and using the standard business case template – key focus on additionality in business cases. Sign off is by 151 officer and only a summary will go to MHCLG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NB will circulate notes from the meetings when they happen 	NB
19/21	<p>Reprioritisation – Response to Heads of Terms</p> <p>We received a lower offer than we bid for and as such must respond MHCLG with how we will address that shortfall.</p> <p>LV – We are now in project confirmation stage and as such need to respond to the offer we received, which contained two conditions around the station: One is to do with timetabling trains to stop at the new station and second is around whether the chosen site is the only site. LM has been working with TfN around this.</p> <p>Reprioritisation is how we are going to manage the shortfall in the award. We have used a tool provided to us, by Arup, to objectively assess each project under several different criteria. The tool then ranks the projects in order of importance, to assist in working out how to reprioritise to meet the budget. Tool to be shared with the Board.</p> <p>We think it is unwise to reduce costs across the programme keeping outputs the same. We also think it is unwise to request further public sector funding at this point. So, the suggested approach is to rescope the riskier projects:</p> <p>Erskine Road – we were not entirely sure about the future of this site for residential and as such it is quite an easy saving win to simply acquire the land at the current time.</p> <p>Demonstrator (Eastwood) – Of all the projects this is probably one of the riskiest. We do not want to pursue CPO for residential properties and as such it relies on acquisition of neighbouring properties, which could prove difficult. As such it is recommended this project is not pursued at the current time.</p> <p>Satnam and Royal Mail Acquisition – The funding doesn't achieve the full purchase and development of the Royal Mail site. There are other sites further down the river which may be less risky and less costly meaning we could reduce costs and still do something impactful.</p> <p>Outputs will not be impacted too heavily if we can work out a better way to achieve outputs on the riverside.</p> <p>RK – has the LA looked at selling some assets to close the gap? PW – We have looked at closing the gap, but there are no concrete plans for this. A lot of schemes have been increasing in costs and so we have chosen to do a certain number, and do them well, rather than spread ourselves too thin. NB – There were other options that were given that may be worth highlighting? LV - We did look at other options. One looked at wholly match-funding through an MCA pot we have identified for another project – this was discounted due to needing to find public sector funding at some point down the line. Another option relied upon private sector match-funding</p>	LV

	<p>such as reducing the Templeborough allocation and looking to private sector bodies in Templeborough to fund. Some other options to split demonstrator in half and acquire properties but look to a provider to do the project. All of them were felt to have high risks</p> <p>DB – I know there are other funds coming out, could those that are coming off the table be kept in mind for these other funding streams that are coming through?</p> <p>LV – Certainly with the riverside it is a huge priority, and we need to produce a delivery plan for it for when other funding comes online. They aren't lost, they are still priorities.</p> <p>JHom – The only project that has been really queried is the railway project and so it might be worth emphasising what this will deliver for the town. Useful to explain why that £10m must stay on the station. It may not be as simple as just pulling out projects.</p> <p>The other point is around match-funding, is the city region match funding not happening for the Post-Office site now as they will query this – do you lose money from city region by not going forward?</p> <p>LV – There have been no discussions but there has never been a firm commitment.</p> <p>PW –we considered risks so that we don't water down too much what we send back to MHCLG. In particular, the Post Office carried a huge amount of risk.</p> <p>Board agreed to proceed on the basis agreed above</p>	
20/21	<p>Stage 2 – Assurance & Business Cases</p> <p>LV – We have 12 months to formulate business cases for each project and submit a summary document to MHCLG, although we can submit them earlier. Aim for 6 or 7 but need to discuss how to cluster projects together. As part of the project confirmation, we need to say when we are going to submit these. Need to be signed off by Council's Section 151 Officer and Board Chair.</p>	
21/21	<p>Project Management – Resource Update</p> <p>Just to reassure the board that where we have been quieter with regards to the Town Deal, as we were working on Levelling Up but are now up and running on TD again. LV informed the Board that Council staff had been focussing on the Levelling Up Fund after the TIP was submitted, but Town Deal was still very much a top priority.:</p> <p>Resourcing: Looking to recruit 3 posts to ensure we have sufficient capacity</p> <p>Funding: Some money has been identified internally, and government will release 5% of the total which can be used for development of business cases or project delivery – likely it will be a bit of both. This will allow us to move at a much greater pace than we thought possible.</p> <p>Governance: The Town Deal Board will continue but with project delivery groups sitting under it. Board members are needed to sit on these groups as "Project Champions."</p>	
22/21	<p>Any Other Business</p>	

	<p>AD – We have achieved a lot in a small amount of time, but business cases are going to take until next June, we want to make sure we the public aware that progress is being made</p> <p>RK - We haven't talked much about how we will communicate and demonstrate to the public that progress is happening and that various things need to be planned and discussed before things begin to happen on the ground. We need to think about expectation management to ensure criticism doesn't come before we have even started.</p> <p>LV – Developing a comms strategy To ensure that positive news is disseminated on a regular basis</p> <p>.</p> <p>JHom – Other LAs putting communications as a standing item on their town deal board agendas. VN to add to future agendas</p>	<p>VN</p>
	<p>Date of next meeting: 15th September 2021 (9.00-10.15am)</p>	