

## **Stocksbridge Town Deal Board Meeting**

**DATE AND TIME:** Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2021, 14:00 – 15:00

**LOCATION:** via Microsoft Teams

**CO-CHAIRS:** Miriam Cates and Mark Dransfield

### **ATTENDEES:**

#### **Board members attending:**

- Miriam Cates, MP for Penistone and Stocksbridge (MC)
- Mark Dransfield, Dransfield Properties (MD)
- Graham Silverwood, Stocksbridge Training and Enterprise Partnership & Stocksbridge Community Leisure Centre (GS)
- Chris Bell, Don Valley Railway Trust (C Bell)
- Ian Sanderson, SLR Outlets (IS)
- Tom Newman, Steel Valley Project (TN)
- Dave Cates, Redemption Media (DC)
- Howard Varns, Programme Manager, SCC (HV)
- Justin Homer, Area Lead, Sheffield City Region (Cities and Local Growth Unit) (JH)

#### **Also attending:**

- Cassie Houlden, Amion (CH)
- Amanda Holmes, Communications Director, Dransfield Properties (AH)
- Joy Grant, Project Support Officer, SCC (JCG)

#### **Apologies:**

- Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal & Governance, SCC
- Cllr Julie Grocutt, Sheffield City Council and Stocksbridge Town Council
- Colin Blackburn, South Yorkshire LEP
- John Crawshaw, J W Crawshaw Ltd
- Mick Hood, Liberty Speciality Steels
- Tammy Whitaker, Head of Property, SCC



# Minutes

## 1. Item: Welcome and confirmation of the minutes of the previous meeting and discuss any issues arising

MC welcomed everyone to the meeting.

### Issues Arising

- MD raised an issue from the previous minutes where TW outlined that there is an allocation within the gainshare of £1.8m which he believed was not clear to other Board members and asked for clarity on this. He apologised for signing off the heads of terms as it's down as matched funding and he should have spotted the error but asked for this to be reconciled within our proposal.
- Following a discussion, MC explained that the difference between grant and loan is significant because it has been signed off by the government and we have signed the heads of terms so if there is no significant difference in the time it would take to get a grant rather than a loan so we're much better off getting a grant because that increases the budget by £1.8m and this has been approved by SCR in principal as matched funding.
- HV agreed with trying to get more money earlier rather than going through a laborious process. There was no merit in trying to convert it back to a loan as it's a bit more money if we need headroom or other specification changes.
- MD added that another disparity was that the document prepared by SCC for the place making in the town centre doesn't bear much resemblance to the document that was prepared by DPL Master planners. They calculated £4.95m for the town centre place making of which the highway work is £3.25 m. MD has agreed with HV to produce a revised development appraisal for Phase 1 of Manchester Road which will include revised bill cost figures, revised rental level and revised elevations in preparation for a preapp.

Subject to the issues raised above, everyone was happy to confirm the minutes of the previous meeting.

### Action: HV

- HV to provide a verbal update on the status of the funding from SCR at next month's Board meeting.

## **2. Item: Governance Declaration of interest – to declare any interests in items on the agenda**

- IS declared an interest on behalf of JC because on the document that has been circulated about the funicular railway there is a second alternative site at the top of the site which is owned by JC and his brother.

## **3. Item: Discussion on the different subgroups and names put forward**

- MC referred to the list of subgroups emailed to all prior to the meeting and asked for comments.
- HV commented that potentially there might be some discussions about some additions to the list. In terms of the programme and how it links up with the board and the delivery at project level, a sequence of proper meetings needs to be initiated that have substance and a matter of business including highlight reporting, issue analysis, progress and support managing the projects. If the Board are comfortable with the make-up of the subgroups, then JCG and HV to organise an appropriate level of time for progress, e.g. monthly. HV suggested that there needs to be a synchronisation in terms of him getting Managers to provide a highlight report, so the subgroups have an opportunity to interrogate. The Chairs of those subgroups would then come back to the Board in terms of progress, issues, obstacles or cries for help.
- HV outlined that the subgroups are to be run by exception and be traffic lighted with the Board picking up on any issues.
- The key task for JCG and HV is to try and describe how that might work in terms of the function in a cut down Terms of Reference or at least understand what the layers are of activities and accountability and reporting.
- MC thought that the groups are going to evolve, and they will be different for the different projects; some will be very hands on to start with and we should just be responsive to the needs of them rather than being rigid on how we set them up.
- GS felt that some people on the subgroups are relevant to only one specific project so don't need to be at every subgroup meeting so there could be one meeting split into three parts. There could then be other meetings with the SCC Lead.
- HV said that ideally the subgroups need to be strategic, but this could be harder in practice initially but there will be a confidence factor at this early stage from us all just so that the forming, starting and setting up stage is managed through agenda planning. HV suggested a 2-hour session which people could dial in/dial out as the technology we're using now gives us much more ability to work that.
- HV highlighted a key point which was the needs for consultation and engagement with the Board as the first and last stop for representing

stakeholders so it is beneficial that there is a big active and informed team because it will help initially to get set up right and then catch up with communication strategies and more dynamic communications with stakeholders.

- MC asked if everyone was happy to approve the subgroups as circulated and with the amends made. This was agreed with the following actions.

**Actions: JCG**

- C Bell's name was missed off the subgroup list. JCG to add him to the Town Centre group as a key member for the trails.
- DC asked to be added on the connected town centre hub building to join up with the post 16 hub activities in there.
- TN said that the project he is leading on is listed as Little Don Trails and it should be Little Don River.
- MD had a request from JG for her member Councillor Fran Johnson to be included on one of the subgroups in line with her interest in cycling.
- MC asked that her new Councillor Lewis be added to the health and wellbeing subgroup meaning that all 3 Councillors have been assigned to different groups.
- Andy Ireland, headteacher at Stocksbridge High School, to be part of the education and skills post 16 hubs as the lead delivery organisation. Academy Trust to get on with this and additional members can be drafted in later.

**4. Item: Loan update from the LEP/timeline**

- This item was covered earlier under issues arising. HV added that he had been through the process with a colleague for getting this money from the Mayor and it is a laborious public sector gateway process but designed to develop business cases to provide detail on schemes to be able to add proper risk analysis. CB of SCR had informed HV that the July agenda was full so the next one would be September. HV to sit down with MD to get land assembly in June for decision in July/August. The next stage is the tender process in December/January with the Final Business Case in February/March.
- GAD and HV have had discussions with the Council's S151 Officer and the Director of Finance and are to do a briefing for them next Wednesday. They will also talk to SCR's Officer to see if a different arrangement could be made regarding the process. The aim is to get a scheme that is developed and certain enough to be able to assemble the land in readiness.

## 5. Item: Any Other Business

### Branding Issues:

- C Bell has been contacted by Sustrans who are working up elements of the trails which will link into our overall network, so they want to know how to message and brand those. HV needs to have a conversation about the identity of Stocksbridge and the Council will have a strong view in terms of making sure that Sheffield has a brand nationally and internationally e.g. outdoor city. HV was unsure whether it would be a towns fund brand or an outdoor city brand or it could be different, or we could do something special.
- MC said that C Bell had raised an important point about liaison with Barnsley because there is an interface here and proposed the following action.

### Action: MC

MC to broker a meeting with C Bell, Greg Challis, and his Barnsley equivalent official to make sure they know what we're doing and to find out if they've got any plans in the same space. TN/C Bell put forward Sarah Ford and Mandy Loach as potential contacts.

### Political Changes:

- HV reported that following the change in composition of the leadership of the Council that JG is currently acting Deputy Leader which is a very useful position to have on this Board and could work in our favour.
- If things are not sorted out politically following the AGM of the Council next Wednesday, it could be difficult for us in terms of Cabinet reports and getting the £1.5m project development money because there won't be a decision-making process.
- HV has a draft Cabinet report ready for sign off asking for the £1.5m from the Council to pay for project development for the next year to get Final Business Cases to government. If things don't come off for our 10 projects, then the Council won't get that proportion of money back in terms of the government funding so there is a bit of risk.

### Stakeholder Management

A special subgroup will need to be set up to start working on the comms and stakeholder management and engagement strategy because of the potential for changes and for friction and misunderstanding on this journey. It would be easier for these projects to have an evidential stakeholder management with more direct messaging.

## **Ways of Working**

HV's understanding is that the way in which this Board will work with the community and the client is that we will take on more of a delivery role. HV wanted the Board to know that it is quite a different way for us to work in terms of how the funding will happen and how change will happen which may take some continual reminding to colleagues and may not be accepted by all. Many people will have things to contribute, and we need them to work with us and we all need to collaborate, but the ultimate decision will be made up high.

MC said from a government point of view she thought that this was a good pilot to be given a pot of money from the ground up. Community wise it is a good idea rather than everybody having to compete and tick boxes. If we can make it work, it's a good pilot scheme for other areas. She was delighted to have HV on board and relayed that the Board would extend as much patience and sympathy in terms of the new ways of working.

## **Seed Fund Budget**

MC has received a letter back from the Minister, Luke Hall. He thanked her for raising the issue and even though there is no progress it is reassuring to realise that other authorities have raised the same issue which means they will have to come up with solution. MC will continue to report and to chase a response.

## **Next Scheduled Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for next Thursday, but it was agreed by all to cancel this meeting subject to HV and team completing the confirmation statements and templates ready for submission to MHCLG.

**Action:** HV

MD asked for a copy of the submission. If a Board member has an issue this can be raised via email. HV to send the 10 project confirmations to everyone.

- 6. Item: Date and time of next meeting - Monday 28 June 2021, 13:30 – 14:30**