

**ROTHERHAM TOWN DEAL BOARD**  
**Wednesday 26 July 2023**

- 1 NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE ROTHERHAM TOWN DEAL BOARD  
HELD ON 26TH JULY, 2023**

**Rotherham Town Deal Board**

Microsoft Teams Meeting

**26 July 2023, 8.45am-10.00am**

<p><b>Attended By:</b></p> <p>Neil Baxter, NB (Chair)  Councillor Denise Lelliott – DL  Ray Kinsella, Great Places – RK  Steve Morris, Signs Express – StM  Carrie Sudbury, BRCC – CS  Mel Besford, DWP – MB**  Keely Beighton, Never Average Marketing – KB  Nikki Jones, AMRC – NJ  Ryan Shepherd, SCR – RS  Joe Mothersole, Turner Townsend – JM  Jackie Sharpe, Turner Townsend – JS  Gary Chow, Turner Townsend – GC  Paul Woodcock, RMBC – PW  Tim O’Connell, RIDO RMBC – TOC  Lorna Vertigan, RIDO RMBC – LV  Megan Hinchcliff, RIDO RMBC- MH  Simon Powell, RIDO RMBC – SP  Catherine Davis, RIDO RMBC – CD  Rory Battye, RIDO RMBC – RB  Behzad Hadavand, RMBC – BH  Dejan Ajzenkol, RMBC – DA  Lauren Roe, RMBC – LR  Maria Smith, RIDO RMBC – MS  Eleanor Bainbridge, RIDO, RMBC - EB  Josh Turner, RIDO, RMBC - JT  Andy Boulton, Neighbourhoods, RMBC - AB</p>		<p><b>Apologies:</b></p> <p>Sarah Champion MP – SC*  Jacquie Falvey, Sarah Champion’s office – JF*  Lisa Pogson, Airmaster - LP  Raife Gaile, Muse Developments – RF  Deborah Bullivant, Grimm &amp; Co – DB  Chris Wood, OVO Spaces – CW  Lizzie Dealey, CRT – LD  Paul Harper, DWP – Pha**  Stuart Kerr, Wilmott Dixon – SK  Tracey Mace-Akroyd, RNN Group -TMA  Peter Hill , HMP Bespoke Construction – Phi  Helen Revitt, AHR – HR  Lara Thornton, Counter Context – LT  Harriet Knowles, Counter Context – HK  Simon Moss, RMBC – Smo  Simeon Leach, RIDO RMBC – SL  Rachel Ellis, Comms RMBC – RE  Lucy Mitchell, RIDO RMBC – LM  Vicki Norman, RIDO RMBC – VN  Justin Homer, BIES/CLGU – JH</p>
<p><b>Observer(s):</b></p> <p>Sam Townsend, BIES/CLGU – ST</p>		
<p><b>Action Points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting of the stakeholders/partners of new format of Board to be arranged – NB/LV/VN</li> </ul>		
31/23	<p><b>Apologies for Absence, Introductions, Declarations of Interest and Confidentiality Reminder</b></p> <p>Apologies listed above.</p> <p>Members were reminded of the confidentiality of the information discussed at these meetings.</p> <p>NB thanked Andrew Denniff, who has now retired from the Chamber, for all his work on this Board.</p>	
32/23	<p><b>Matters Arising from the Minutes of the last meeting held on 7 June 2023</b></p> <p>NB confirmed that a meeting was held, to discuss the <b>High Street Task Force</b> report, with Sharon Kemp, on how to move forward and what to do in terms of some of the issues that were raised within the report. The outcome is that Sharon is going to report back to the Rotherham Together Partnership and Chief Exec Group with a proposal that we hold an event with all partners on the visions and ambitions of Rotherham to develop a place marketing strategy and that to be held sometime late September or October. Currently</p>	

	<p>awaiting confirmation on this. It was a really positive meeting and one in which everybody got behind the proposed event, which would include all stakeholders, not just current ones, but also to try to include some other organisations/groups that aren't necessarily represented at the moment within Rotherham. So, it is an inclusive place marketing strategy that we would be looking to develop.</p>	
<p>33/23</p>	<p><b>Pathfinder:</b></p> <p>LV said Pathfinder is a pilot that has been introduced by the Government, it is specifically for just 10 towns across the country, Rotherham is one of these towns. There are 10 places who have attracted the Future High Street Fund and Levelling up round one, does not include later fund rounds of levelling up and town deal monies, and the principle behind it is around trying to give authorities more flexibility and more control over those funds to allow them just to make it easier for them to implement, it brings all the funds together into one pot.</p> <p>We will receive one payment and do one set of monitoring, whereas now we do three sets of monitoring. It will allow us to locally assured level to move money between projects to adjust outputs between projects if that becomes necessary, up to a certain amount, we are just waiting for some clarity. There was a suggestion that being either a percentage of the outputs or an amount of funding either between £5 million or 30%. Either way, it's quite considerable amount of money before we have to report into government, whereas at the moment any changes to outputs, any changes to projects or significant moving of money, we have to report that to government, which can be quite a lengthy process.</p> <p>It also would adjust the time frame, so we would bring all the time frames for all the programmes into one. For example, at the moment town deal is March 2026 for delivery and Future High Street fund and Levelling up fund are March 2024. It would allow us to push that deadline back so it essentially gives us another couple of years to deliver the projects, which again is a huge benefit for us. Other towns are not getting that benefit, it is all positive news, and we received the offer and have accepted. We can at any point back out we have until the 8th of August to reprofile all our outputs, spend and programme.</p> <p>There are some changes for the Town Deal Board and the government requires us to set up one board that will oversee all three of the funds. It is recommended that we use the current Town Deal Board to do that, if the town deal board functions well, so our proposal is that the town deal board extends its remit.</p> <p>The Board already covers all town centre levelling up projects, many of them are intertwined with each other anyway, so in addition to what you already cover, it would also include the future High Street fund projects; Riverside Gardens, some of the public realm work we already report on in the town centre. The biggest addition is going to be the markets regeneration and library. It is a big project so we would be spending time talking about that and projects outside of the Town Centre, such as the leisure economy projects.</p> <p>Country parks, which is led by the Council and then partner projects Wentworth, Maltby Academy, Gullivers and Magna, which aren't currently</p>	

	<p>covered by this board, and which are currently led by our partners. So, all of those would come in to report into this board.</p> <p>We are suggesting that we need to probably look at expanding the remit of the board and expanding the membership to cover the leisure economy. Request to discuss this and see how we feel as a board as to whether or not that's something that we want to do or whether we're happy with the way that it works at the moment.</p> <p><b>We were proposing that from the next Board meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September, we also start to report on the new projects as mentioned above. We might need to think about making the meeting a little longer, just to cover off some of the extra items.</b></p> <p>The Pathfinder and new Board was discussed by the group.</p> <p>PW said that when this Board was originally set up, we invited Sarah Champion MP to attend she has not been able to attend but is kept up to date on progress. We would also have to invite the other 2 local MPs to future meetings.</p> <p>NB suggested a face to face get together of all the partners/stakeholders to understand what all these projects mean to help achieve a level of understanding, which would mean a longer session initially. Equally it is also an opportunity for members who feel that they don't want to be involved any longer to withdraw. We need the right people on the board with the right skill sets. It may be that we need to look at how the board is structured so that it serves all of what we are looking to understand.</p> <p>Does anyone object to a face-to-face meeting in the next couple of months, where we have a presentation to understand what exactly we are going to be taking on as a board and how it might operate.</p> <p>This was agreed and decided was the way forward.</p>	<p>NB/LV/ VN</p>
<p>34/23</p>	<p><b>Project Updates:</b></p> <p><b>Riverside Residential Quarter</b> JM reported we are just moving through the preconstruction services agreement with Esh, detailed design phase. The key updates are surveys are complete now. We have done quite well in terms of ground contamination. There was a hotspot of asbestos that we were worried was going to extend further into the site, but it is just a hotspot and can be dealt with during the construction work, so that is positive. Probably the biggest issue in terms of site conditions is the extent of Japanese knot weed, we have got some within our red line boundary, we are developing a proposal to deal with during the construction works, but it does extend into the site as well, working with partners to resolve. There is some diverging work that will be required with Zayo, which are a comms provider sort of similar to Virgin and BT. We are going to need to move a BT pole and are obtaining quotes from them for those works.</p> <p>That is the site conditions and big milestone is that planning was submitted this month at the start of this month. We are awaiting, formal validation of the application, but it's in there now which is good news and might start to</p>	

generate some public interest and comments through the planning process. The detailed design is ongoing.

Meetings been held with Yorkshire water, arranging meetings with Highways and in terms of cost, we are on track for a price submission and the program from ESH on the 21st of August. Completion planned for April 2024. Not reached an agreement with Royal mail as yet.

**Leisure & Cultural Quarter** No. 30 the bank building, as reported previously, some difficulty in engaging with the private sector owner. It is with both legal teams now, we are in the process of getting an options agreement together and a schedule of works, which will then go into the funding agreement.

No. 4 Corporation Street, the former Wilko building which has been demolished, is likely to be used for a compound for some of the projects over the next couple of years.

Riverside Gardens went out to tender, but unfortunately the tender process failed, we received 4 tenderers, 4 contractors interested, three of whom dropped out during the process. Only one of whom remained. Unfortunately, they came in significantly over the advised cost, which actually put us over the threshold, which meant we cannot proceed with that tender anymore.

That obviously gives us some concerns in terms of just the amount of money that was required to deliver that project and the estimates that we've had from our consultant and the deliverability generally and the time it's going to take for us to go out again and get a new contractor, the way in which we're going to deal with this is we are going to go back out to what will be direct to a contractor to do the stage, to build up the design in a little bit more detail.

In the meantime, we will be looking at value engineering and what we can deliver within the budget that we have got and potentially looking at some options for other additional money that might come into it. What we will end up with is a range of options of something that's deliverable within budget, but may be less outputs than we'd originally anticipated up to, something that that may need some additional budget. We may incorporate the works for Corporation Street. The public realm works within that contract as well. We had experienced some delays in the development of that project and had wanted to push ahead with Riverside Gardens given its proximity to Forge Island. But now we're thinking with this delay, actually, we might wrap them all up together, and that might be more attractive package for the market, it will be a bigger contract. Fortunately, the timeframe extension that we will get through Pathfinder is going to allow us, we hope, to still deliver it within the time frame, but the costs are a big concern to us at the moment.

NB said I would be interested to know why the other three contractors pulled out and the reason, I am mindful of the fact that over the last couple of weeks, there are two significant UM construction partners within the East Midlands and in Yorkshire that have that have gone into administration. I am also aware that a number of organisations now are not prepared to price fixed priced contracts because of the escalating cost prices and where they are prepared to price fixed price, the ones that I've spoken to are including significant estimates of what the cost increase has may be, which may not necessarily be delivering best value for us.

But we've had a discussion around that I'll be keen to find out from the three that pulled out just to their rationale behind it and without it being challenging or whatever, it's more a question of are we actually getting the best results that we can do by sticking to purely fixed price when the construction industry is taking a pound in at the moment.

LV said this was also brought up at the conference that we attended that people are struggling to get contracts as it is a contractor's market. The input that we have had from the three contractors, is quite mixed and is raising some questions about the process that we need to deal with internally.

There were some concerns around the risk that was included in the designs that perhaps they were given were not as well developed as we thought they were as we had expected them to be, and a late arrival of some information from this particular consultant that we used in this case. It is something that we are looking at, but also feedback about how difficult the market was. It was quite a range of information that we received back, but it is something that we need to act upon and make sure this doesn't happen again because it is a big delay for us and something that we are keen to avoid going forward.

**3-7 Corporation Street (burnt out buildings)** MS said Nos. 3 to 7 have been derelict since 2007. Moving well since made the CPO in April, the owner has come to the table again and an offer has been agreed with the owner to purchase the property. We are currently going through an officer delegated decision to authorise and make that transaction. This means now we must confirm that offer and we are also continuing negotiating rights with other property owners on Bridgegate. That means if the owners objection to the CPO and the objection from the property on Bridgegate owned by Betfred is removed, we can then self-confirm the compulsory purchase order in line with what the Planning Inspectorate. We will continue to work on this over the next few weeks to try and get those objections removed, and then we will be in a position to self-confirm and go ahead with exchanging contracts.

In light of that, we are preparing a procurement business case to work with a development partner on the site and to inform this we've been undertaking soft market testing. We are hoping we can get some information from that soft market testing to support our case and we're encouraging local developers working up to the Homes England delivery partner framework, which is the mechanism procurement recommended we go through to secure a delivery partner.

We hope to present to the next meeting an updated programme for taking this forward.

**Templeborough** EB showed images on the Templeborough Magna projects, stating there is a final stage three design, with six light industrial units at the back of the Magna building onto Sheffield Rd, the two food and beverage units and extensive improvements to landscaping in the public realm. It will link to the industrial heritage and Magna, we are almost in a position to submit for planning.

She added we are just putting together the final documents and had the stage 3 cost plan back which is over budget and this has been approved as a variation internally and we are seeking additional funds from SYMCA to fill the gap in funding. But until we get to stage 4 cost plan, we will not know

exactly what the gap is. We are hoping the contractor can come up with ways to make the programme shorter and make the construction more efficient. For example, Boden, methods of construction, where you build things off site and bring them onto the site. We have also gone through the procurement business case and we are hoping to appoint the contractor by the end of the month, which is on track according to our programme.

StM asked if there has been any progress with the tram stop being implemented at Templeborough?

EB replied there are coordination meetings now with SYMCA on the tram train stop and they are still aiming for a start on site February next year. Looking at an 8-month programme to build. They have appointed a contractor for the tram train stop, and there will be a separate contractor for the park and ride function.

**Essoldo Chambers** MH said at the last board we reported our disappointment on this project that the latest cost planned came in over budget, since then, we have been looking at options. What we can do to take the project forward, there is a meeting this week to discuss further, and we should be able to update further at the next meeting, hopefully good news.

We are looking at other options, including what other buildings might be appropriate, but this is the second building that we've looked at, if we can prevent having to outlay on all the surveys etc again, then that would be good. But we could look at a building that needs less work but still can deliver the outputs. Other options will be looking at whether we can reallocate the funding for that project amongst the other projects in the programme.

**Eastwood/Parkgate Bridge** Looking at refinance, looking to complete that process during the next month in terms of deriving to these options, also looking at the complexities associated with the buildability of the bridge and surrounding areas, looking at the adjacent project to how the benefits could be fulfilled, and it could be that we need to speak to our colleagues from the mainline station about that.

Due to the existing Network Rail infrastructure, major constraints and the existing geometry of Parkgate and the roads adjacent to it. Replacing any of the existing infrastructure will really push the budgets higher and the cost will increase significantly.

We will talk to our colleagues to see whether there are adjacent schemes as part of some master planning which offer similar benefits that this scheme would offer, in which case that could be a good way to provide some benefits and not just disregard the scheme.

**Mainline Station** MS updated saying the station format for the site at Forge Way has now been agreed with the master planners. A diagram was shown to the group, highlighting the main line station platforms at the top of the station building, potential development plots, car parking and down at the bottom the tram train platforms.

This has been consulted on with teams internally and partners, and this is the preferable option for the site layout and alongside the master planning Team, Network Rail, also been looking at timetable capacity analysis. This

	<p>was always going to be the challenging element as the rail system is already full in terms of network facility.</p> <p>The first analysis conducted was not too positive and we were struggling to get those two or three stops an hour at Rotherham. We are now going back to Network Rail with some sort of alternative suggestions. This involves looking at wider country rather than regional changes to timetables, Network Rail are working on this at the moment and those results are due back in August, which will hopefully give us more options going forward related to the master plan we have now appointed the Network Rail design team. They will come on board looking at this station format and working with the Master Plan team to design things which are of standard in stations; platforms, bridges, clock towers, all that sort of essential infrastructure ,also looking at signalling.</p> <p>A cabinet report is due to go in September for formal agreement on the change to the land acquisition parcels.</p> <p>There was reminder on the confidentiality of this project.</p> <p><b>Pocket Park</b> TOC updated saying the designs have been completed both with and without staircase and priced by the contractor. The good news is that it is affordable with the staircase, so we are looking into this and engaging with a fabricator at the moment.</p>	
<p>35/23</p>	<p><b>Spend Profile and Programme</b></p> <p>SP presented the programme, highlighting the relevant points. In light of the project updates we have received, and as things currently stand, there have not been any sort of substantive changes to the programme, but it's probably worth bearing in mind obviously that under the new Pathfinder pilot, the end date will be extending through to March 2026.</p> <p>NB commented that he would be cautious about extending all projects through to 2026 as that gives us nowhere to go. He added that the fact that Rotherham is being given the opportunity to be part of the Pathfinder would make us more determined to succeed in what we are trying to deliver, to reinforce all of the good work and the good reputation that Rotherham has.</p> <p>LV said it will be quite a pragmatic approach. We will not push everything towards the back of the programme, but where we know we are struggling with projects such as Riverside Gardens, we will be taking advantage of that. But obviously we have still got, aside from the funding, the political dimension to this and all the other promises that have been made about delivering this programme. We don't want to take advantage too much and start just arbitrarily pushing everything back. There will be some pragmatism against it, like you say it is, it is a good opportunity for us to do it. At the same time, it's thinking about priorities for certain spends. A lot of these projects come with a package of funding, some don't, we just need to think about where we need to spend some of that money first for other funding deadlines such as the MCA.</p> <p>SP to look at reprofiling and report back to the Board.</p> <p>LV said the team are conducting a review across all of the projects, looking at the town deal and where we have a risk of failure. Looking at what we are</p>	

	<p>doing about mitigating some of that risk. Although that is not necessarily going to be ready in time for the Pathfinder, it is being done at the same time as the Pathfinder, so we are again looking at some of the challenges for some of the project managers, a bit of peer review essentially on whether or not we really do think we can meet all of these aims and if not, what are we going do about it.</p>	
36/23	<p><b>Town Centre Regeneration Promotion</b></p> <p>CD updated on the latest comms and marketing.</p> <p>New Forge Island hoardings are now up on the former Wilko site following completion of the demolition. The footbridge was installed in June 2023 and a video is being put together to show this which will be circulated to the board.</p> <p>The steel structure is now in place for the cinema building. The Name the Crane competition is complete and signage will be going up on the railings on Market Street (opposite Kepple Wharf) where people are generally gathering to look at the Forge Island site.</p> <p>The Chamelia sculpture is now in place in All Saints Square and Yorkshire Day celebrations will take place on 1<sup>st</sup> August with Rotherham hosting. Rotherham Show will take place on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> September.</p>	
37/23	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>There was no further business.</p>	
	<p><b>Date of next meeting:</b></p> <p>20<sup>th</sup> September 2023</p>	