

Rotherham Town Deal Board
17th November 2020, 9.00am-10.15am
Teams Meeting due to Covid-19

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>Attended By:</p> <p>Neil Baxter, Engie – NB (Chair)</p> <p>Julia Bloomer, AESSEAL – JB</p> <p>Councillor Denise Lelliott – DL</p> <p>Deborah Bullivant, Grimm & Co – DB</p> <p>Simon Moss, RMBC – SM</p> <p>Lizzie Dealey, CRT – LD</p> <p>Tony De’Ath, RNN Group -TD*</p> <p>Andrew Denniff, BRCC – AD</p> <p>Duncan Armstrong-Payne, Harworth - DAP</p> <p>Andy Lock, Coalfields Regeneration – AL</p> <p>Lorna Vertigan, SCR – LV</p> <p>Lucy Mitchell, RIDO RMBC – LM</p> <p>Stuart Kerr, Wilmott Dixon – SK</p> <p>Andrew Clarke WYG – AC</p> <p>Simeon Leach, RIDO RMBC – SL</p> <p>Vicki Norman, RIDO RMBC – VN</p> <p>Tim O’Connell, RIDO RMBC – TOC</p> <p>Justin Homer, BIES/CLGU – JH</p> <p>Ray Kinsella, Great Places – RK</p> <p>SamTownsend, BIES – ST</p> </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>Apologies:</p> <p>Sarah Champion MP – SC</p> <p>Sharon Thorpe, DWP – ST</p> <p>Dan Needham, Muse Developments – DN</p> <p>Phil Hayes, Rotherham Confederation of Communities – Pha</p> <p>Tom Hawley, Homes England – TH</p> <p>Nick Bussey, Rotherham CAB – NBu</p> <p>Colin Blackburn, SCR – CB</p> <p>Steve Morris, Signs Express – Smo</p> <p>Tracey Mace-Akroyd, RNN Group -TMA*</p> <p>Lisa Pogson, Airmaster - LP</p> <p>Nikki Jones, AMRC – NJ</p> <p>Mike Smith, NHS – MS</p> <p>Joel Hamer, RIDO – JH</p> <p>Paul Woodcock, RMBC – PW</p> <p>Paul Harper, DWP – PH</p> </div> </div> | | |
| <p>Action Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Draft TIP to be circulated to the Board at the beginning of December -VN/LV/SL - Board Members to circulate links to consultation - ALL | | |
| 59/20 | <p>Apologies for Absence/Introductions and Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Apologies listed above.</p> <p>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> | |
| 60/20 | <p>Matters Arising from the Minutes of the last meeting held on the 20th October 2020</p> <p>The minutes were accepted as a true record.</p> | |
| 61/20 | <p>Accelerator Update</p> <p>SM provided an update on the Accelerator programme, confirming that the former Primark building has been acquired and is now in Council ownership. Asbestos surveys are currently being carried out throughout the building, demolition cannot start until these are completed and the asbestos removed safely. He added that the project is still on schedule for completion in March 2021, with the planning application going in next week along with a press release. Lots of positive news, but still issues to be resolved such as party walls on 3 sides, the site being on a hill, etc.</p> | |

| | | |
|-------|---|--|
| 62/20 | <p>Project List/Programme Update</p> <p>SM confirmed the bid is at an important and exciting stage and the project team aims to make the best use of the check and challenge sessions.</p> <p>The project team recently met with the team from Wolverhampton (a Cohort 1 submission). It was very useful and highlighted how watertight our projects need to be and the stage they are at indicated the bid is still on track. The Wolverhampton link was shared with the Board. There is also a portal where the links to all submitted bids will be uploaded, this was also shared with the Board.</p> <p>LV gave a presentation to the Board on the latest project list and went through Options A and B, with Option B being the larger, more ambitious programme and £48.5m. She outlined each project in detail, which were then discussed by the Board:</p> <p>SK commented on the Eastwood-Parkgate proposed bridge/link, what do we want to achieve in this area and will that project have a significant impact by itself ? NB asked what the community think? AC confirmed there has been separate meetings within Eastwood and a further meeting is planned for next week. SK he felt this would be better as a package in Option B than stand alone in Option A. DAP agreed regarding improvement of housing stock in Eastwood. Scrutiny of the costings was mentioned. AC said that high level cost plans have been provided and will stand up to scrutiny but not a forensic cost plan, which is part of the full business case stage, if the bid is approved.</p> <p>AD said it is great to receive this sort of information and asked what is the remit of the Board, how much is required of the Board, as some of the major projects appear to be crossing into other territories? LV said the Board is the catalyst that these major projects need. AC added that the town deal is a vehicle for difficult sites, not RMBC projects but Board projects, the Board needs to own these. If Board members feel these are not the right projects then they need to raise this. NB said as a Board we have got to commit to what we are bidding for “our bid”.</p> <p>JH said it is for the Board to delegate responsibility for delivery to the Council. Going forward it is members call on what extent this continues. Some TD Boards may disappear when the heads of term are agreed with the Government, it is the decision of each Board whether to keep going forward. NB said he feels the Board should keep going after all the work it has put in. SL suggested a possible review and merger of the Town Deal and Business Growth Boards post bid could be looked at.</p> | |
| 63/20 | <p>Programme</p> <p>The first Check and Challenge session is scheduled for early December, using the feedback to refine the TIP, with the second session in the first week of January, followed by refining and consulting ready for submission at the end of January. Post submission February time; the Heads of Terms, businesses cases, role of the Board etc., to be looked at.</p> <p>The Draft TIP to be circulated to the Board at the beginning of December</p> | |

| | | |
|-------|---|----------|
| | <p>with the next Board scheduled for the 8th December.</p> <p>LV confirmed that the budget is on track, with the possibility of carrying a small amount over into the project development phase.</p> | VN/LV/SL |
| 64/20 | <p>Any Other Business</p> <p>(a) RK asked if including the input of businesses i.e. time spent could be included in the bid, to show businesses commitment? LV said we can include co-funding such as housing. There is also a section on Board involvement/commitment, in the TIP, with quotes scattered throughout the document. AC said we can use complementary funding such as Forge Island.</p> <p>(b) SL stated the importance of the consultation and will be having more focused 1 to 1 meetings with Board members, to gather their thoughts/opinions. With regards to the general consultation, this is mainly through the MyTown portal and virtual exhibition, plus have spoken to stakeholders in Eastwood. Also, looking at refreshing content in due course, asking the right questions around the draft final projects. If Board members could share again with their contacts/networks to get across the messages and increase the reach of the consultation.</p> <p>https://mytown.communities.gov.uk MyTown portal https://vpc.tetrachteurope.com/rotherham/ Virtual Exhibition</p> | ALL |
| | <p>Date of next scheduled meeting: 8th December 2020, 9.00-10.15am via Microsoft Teams Meeting.</p> | VN |