

Stocksbridge Town Deal Board Meeting

DATE AND TIME: Tuesday 3rd August 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)
- Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal & Governance, SCC
- Graham Silverwood, Stocksbridge Training and Enterprise Partnership & Stocksbridge Community Leisure Centre (GS)
- Chris Bell, Don Valley Railway Trust (C Bell)
- Dave Cates, Redemption Media (DC)
- Howard Varns, Programme Manager, SCC (HV)

Also attending:

- Justin Homer, Area Lead, Sheffield City Region (Cities and Local Growth Unit) (JH)
- Sam Townsend, Sheffield City Region (Cities and Local Growth Unit) (STo)
- Amanda Holmes, Communications Officer, SCC (AH)
- Joy Grant, Project Support Officer, SCC (JCG)

Apologies:

- Cllr Julie Grocutt, Sheffield City Council and Stocksbridge Town Council
- Colin Blackburn, South Yorkshire LEP
- Mick Hood, Liberty Speciality Steels
- John Crawshaw, J W Crawshaw Ltd
- Tom Newman, Steel Valley Project
- Ian Sanderson, SLR Outlets
- Cassie Houlden, Amion
- Tammy Whitaker, Head of Property, SCC



Minutes

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

MD welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed by all as a true record. There were no issues arising.

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

- GS declared an interest in the accelerated funds project.

3. Item: Project Update - HV

Review of Roles and Projects, SCC Delivery Arrangements, and Impacts

HV screen shared his PowerPoint presentation:

Overview:

- HV provided a status update in terms of the Council putting together an infrastructure to provide the Board with more transparency and accountability ready for the delivery phase. The changes outlined to the Council's role would allow the Board to adopt a more strategic role and to do a proper governance role holding HV and the projects to account.

Review of Roles and Projects

Extra points not covered in the presentation:

- HV is starting to look across each project at exactly what needs to be done to complete these to the quality and level of detail required and return these to MHCLG as fast as we can.
- HV proposed a change to the current sub-group arrangements into stakeholder groups which would include professional services providers, professional project managers and an appropriate towns fund team member.
- HV asked for views on the proposal around stakeholder management in terms of adapting the sub-groups. MD/MC had prior sight of these changes and fully supported them. MC added that calling it a stakeholder group shows the Board's transparency and interest in people's views.
- The new stakeholder groups present potential conflicts of interests for 3 Board members. MC highlighted that if these 3 Board members are

lost then others would need to be brought in for representation reasons. It would mean that the Board would be too small and not representative enough if those people were to leave. GAD's initial thoughts were that there is no reason why these people shouldn't be on the Board, but they would have to exempt themselves from any conversation regarding the bit they were interested in which would make them not that useful on the Board. HV to pick this up with the individuals that are going to be more involved in the delivery and then discuss this further with GAD to see if it is workable.

- JC to have a co-ordinating role to engage with shop owners and businesses affected by disruption when the works start to ensure they are fully informed.
- HV proposed that the walking and cycling project is moved from the town centre subgroup to the health and wellbeing stakeholder group to provide more substance to that thematic area. The outputs and the benefits of those projects are health and wellbeing rather than town centre. HV to provide further feedback to CBell after the meeting.
- HV proposed that MD step down from the Town Centre sub-group. MD asked to retain his involvement with this group until such time that he is satisfied that the PM understands the project and he will then be happy to handover at that stage.
- MC added that the stakeholder groups were much more about engagement, and feedback from the community.
- HV to develop the next levels of detail, starting to get placeholders and a hold. The key issue is getting grant agreements to the partners e.g. Stocksbridge Community Leisure Centre for the cost of feasibility studies. HV's next task is to ensure that the grant agreement is flexible to all so they can draw down and commission the feasibility.

Key things:

- To ensure that the towns fund have someone on the project to keep a more detailed view on the draw off and link through other infrastructure.
- Developing and agreeing a communication and engagement strategy.
- Establish all project teams so they can start to furnish the Board in terms of who's doing what and why.

Appointments

- HV to speak to MD separately on recent appointments.

SCC Delivery Arrangements

Extra points not covered in the presentation:

- Infrastructure – SCC's Governance/Assurance and Process Management arrangement which is headed by GAD as the Senior Responsible Officer for the programme and therefore accountable for the funding. Experts on this Board will warn of any issues that SCC might have internally with delivery. GAD is a key member of this Board so she can contribute in her role to that so this will be a useful crossover. HV will be both reporting and attending that project meeting.

CIS Board

- HV outlined that more work needs to be done to understand exactly what needs to be done and if that is acceptable to the Council. The vehicle for onward development across the high street is for the community vehicle to then to start to be able to leverage that asset and with further development. More work needs to be done on that with buy in to that to get to a position where each party signs up to that as the medium-term strategy for delivering the masterplan.

A discussion took place around the concept of a CIS with the following key point:

- JH outlined that it is not a condition of the funding to say that the CIS model must be in place before the money is drawn down. MD said that realistically the money would not start coming in until practical completion. JH said that there was no urgency for this to be agreed in this current financial year. By the point that the business case is submitted it would be useful for the government to have some comfort around where the long-term proceeds are going to be put in.

Community Hub & Funicular

- Key issue is how we are going to review precisely how we feed the business case template so we can then submit internally for sign off and then to JH and STo and colleagues so that money can be drawn down. Another key action is the SCR business case in trade for land assembly. HV to instruct the PM to do a high-level review of the deliverability of the community hub and the funicular.
- HV suggested to the Board that alternative plans are considered because of the potential opportunity costs of getting further into the year and then not being able to do something differently with that money. If things can't be resolved over the Liberty Steel situation alternatives will have to be considered.

- MC suggested that HV kick off an email conversation around the Board with a couple of paragraphs on why we need to do this so people have a few days to consider other ideas which may mean looking back at those things that didn't make the final bid. These need to be put forward in writing for consideration at the next meeting. MC is in contact with Liberty Steel to see if there is any way round the current issue and if there is any way of getting a guarantee.

CPO Position

- GAD outlined that the issue is that if we were required to compulsory purchase the land, we need for the funicular then the rules around CPO would mean we need to buy the whole site to pick this up as part of the feasibility.

Finance

Extra points not covered in the presentation:

- HV outlined that internal business units have been setup where the funding is put and depending on the spend thresholds various officers have sign off. HV to inform the Board and give them a balance to understand what funding has been claimed for what. HV time to get a system in place that provides accountability and transparency to the Board. HV is responsible to this Board and GAD as the Senior Responsible Officer will ensure that this Board has transparency on spend. HV to look at past expenditure and get a position to come back to the Board with. Moving forward HV will give a monthly balance on the projects.
- MC proposed that Finance is a statutory item on every agenda, along with a Comms Item and a Risk Item so there is more of a transactional agenda.

Effective Meetings

- Paperwork to be emailed to the Board 1 week ahead of the scheduled meeting, along with pre-submitted queries and questions, and balanced statements on funding so decisions can be made on light risks. HV outlined that the body of work to enable that is to ensure that the project teams are meeting and delivering input to them to be able to be reviewed and sent to the Board to sequence works so things would need to be realigned to enable that. HV is to get reporting data to the Board in a timely manner across all the 10 projects.

4. Item: Communications Update

AH talked through her presentation which was emailed to all after the meeting. Extra points not covered in AH's presentation were:

- Consultation scheduled for mid-September
- AH to circulate a timeline.
- AH to send a couple of bullet points about what she specifically wants from the Board e.g. ideas for straplining, images etc. These should be returned to AH and anyone not present at today's meeting would also be able to contribute.
- AH to setup weekly bulletins to the Board of any comms she has picked up or the Board needs to be aware of.
- AH wants to put briefing notes together so that if a Board member is interviewed, they have got a good knowledge of any particular project, feel confident in talking about the bigger picture so that anyone who may be engaging with the press feels confident,
- AH to meet with Councillor Julie Grocutt and the library staff to confirm that their views have been considered and to see if they're happy with the drawings.
- HV urged caution as we need to get support from colleagues on specific statutory requirements around library services so we must comply with this.
- HV asked everyone to think about the products for the September meeting that we will be talking to people about (other than the masterplan for the high street and the community hub itself).
- MC suggested that once we have appointed other Board members it could be in their oversight to make sure that whatever goes to consultation is a good description of the project.
- Good material is available to show people on the town centre, but people need to be aware of the bigger picture e.g. the leisure centre consultation could be done at the leisure centre.
- Sessions at the library should be focussed on what is happening on Manchester Road.
- Everyone supported the idea of a room with all the projects on display.
- GAD outlined that there are 3 things for AH to work with us on: Communication, engagement and consultations; all 3 are required here so there are some formal consultations that we need to carry out whether it is to do with planning or the library but there will be specific requirements around formal consultation that will need to be covered off. Communication is going to be key, so there need to be a good level of information out there so there's no suspicion around what is going to be done or any concerns.
GAD recommended that AH tap into the expertise in the Council for the engagement piece and make sure that all sectors of communities are involved, all different levels of community and make sure that people

understand and feel that they own this and it's not just something this Board are doing.

5. Item: Any Other Business

Accelerated funding

- GS reported that Oxley Park is almost complete, the playground is in use but there is still a slight delay on opening the footpaths and zipline.

6. Item: Date and time of next meeting –The next meeting is on Monday 13th September, 13:00-14:00.