

Public Report  
Improving Places Select Commission

---

**Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting**

Improving Places Select Commission – 14 December 2021

**Report Title**

Findings of IPSC Spotlight Review on External Funding – 12 November 2021

**Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?**

No

**Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report**

Jo Brown, Assistant Chief Executive

**Report Author(s)**

Katherine Harclerode, Governance Advisor  
katherine.harclerode@rotherham.gov.uk

**Ward(s) Affected**

Borough-Wide

**Report Summary**

To summarise findings from the IPSC spotlight review which met on 12 November 2021 to scrutinise external funding sources for regeneration and transformation.

**Recommendations**

1. That the findings and slide presentation be noted.
2. That the ambition of the service in submitting bids be commended.
3. That the feedback from the government regarding the Dinnington and Wath bids for Levelling Up Funds be circulated when available.
4. That the governance advisor liaise with the Regeneration Strategy Manager to coordinate upcoming scrutiny work on markets with a view to feeding into future bids involving markets.
5. That efforts to ensure Rotherham receives its fair portion of gainshare or “single pot” funds from the Mayoral Combined Authority be noted.

**List of Appendices Included**

A - Slide deck – Transforming Rotherham

**Background Papers**

None

**Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel**

None

**Council Approval Required**

No

**Exempt from the Press and Public**

No

## **Findings of IPSC Working Group on External Funding – 12 November 2021**

### **1. Background**

- 1.1 The Council has submitted various bids for funding from a variety of sources to fund regeneration and transformation projects around the Borough. Several bids have been successful, while others have been denied. A presentation was requested to illustrate the status of bids and funding packages and the relevant projects that will be delivered.

### **2. Key Issues**

- 2.1 Clarification was requested around Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA) funding and assurances were requested that Rotherham receive its fair share of the money in these Sheffield City Region pots.
- 2.2 Clarification around plans for a new mainline station was also requested. Discussions were currently underway around a new station that would directly connect to places like Birmingham, making this a completely different offer than that which was currently available. Current conversations around transport are in motion to enable this station, and the Government has given assent.
- 2.3 Regarding the Levelling Up Fund, it was wondered if there were additional projects going on in the background which were also considered for bids. The service was continuing to do master-planning work in Dinnington and Wath so that when future funding is secured, these plans will be ready. The Maltby project had been deemed lower value, which meant it was not chosen in the end to receive this funding. Some projects that were not quite ready in time for this funding envelope. Gainshare bids and lining up local priorities will be crucial for those projects that have not been able to pull down funds from national government. The term in use for these plans is “blueprint,” and it was noted that the local blueprint planning will be prepared. “Gainshare” is the term for the single pot of funds designated for the Sheffield City Region.
- 2.4 Although it was not possible to speculate around the Dinnington and Wath projects, as far as deliverability, Members requested more information around bid suitability. In other words, were these projects ever likely to be successful Government bids, or were they likely to have to rely on Gainshare and local funds from the outset? Officers provided more information around the history of the projects, having been started from an early stage and prepared for submission via officers’ sustained and ambitious effort. The desire to submit three bids from standing start by June 2021 was acknowledged a risk. The ambition and drive had been there, however, and the view was that it was worth trying. The initial round had used gainshare funds, but the government was going to allocate £125,000 for the second round, which had not been available in the first round.
- 2.5 Officers provided details of an upcoming feedback session that had been agreed, which affords until the springtime to respond to the feedback and prepare the projects further. With the feedback, it was hoped that the really strong bid will result in round two. The feedback which will be delivered to the

service in the week commencing 13 December, was not available in time to be appended to this report but will be provided to Members when it becomes available.

- 2.6 Clarification around active travel locations was requested to be included in the full Active Travel update report coming to IPSC in spring 2022.
- 2.7 Members observed that physical infrastructure alone will not bring about “levelling up”; rather, real advancement and growth requires an array of factors linking together to achieve this, including for example, education and connectivity.

### **3. Options considered and recommended proposal**

- 3.1 The discussion included some possible ways to strengthen bids in the next round including sharing with the service the outcome of upcoming spotlight review on markets.

### **4. Consultation on proposal**

- 4.1 The working group is effectively a consultation with Members, as elected representatives of the residents of Rotherham, around the ongoing efforts to secure external funding.

### **5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

- 5.1 The timetable for implementing any recommendations from this report is a decision reserved to the directorate that houses the relevant services.

### **6. Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications**

- 6.1 There are no financial or procurement implications beyond those described in the main sections of the report.

### **7. Legal Advice and Implications**

- 7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

### **8. Human Resources Advice and Implications**

- 8.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

### **9. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults**

- 9.1 There are no implications for children and young people and vulnerable adults arising from this report.

### **10. Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications**

- 10.1 Members have regard for equalities and human rights concerns in forming the recommendations summarised in this report.

## **11. Implications for CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions and Climate Change**

**11.1** There are no implications for emissions and climate change arising from this report.

## **12. Implications for Partners**

**12.1** There are no implications for partners arising from this report.

## **13. Risks and Mitigation**

**13.1** Members have regard to the risks and mitigation factors associated with the services under scrutiny and have made recommendations accordingly.

## **14. Accountable Officer(s)**

Emma Hill, Acting Head of Democratic Services

*Report Author:* Katherine Harclerode  
Katherine Harclerode, Governance  
Advisor

*katherine.harclerode@rotherham.gov.uk*

This report is published on the Council's [website](#).