

# **STOCKSBRIDGE TOWN DEAL BOARD MEETING ACTION NOTES**

## **MEETING OF MONDAY 14<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2020**

**09:30 – 11:30**

**via Zoom**

### **Board members attending:**

- • Mark Dransfield, Dransfield Properties (MD)
- • Dave Cates, representing Miriam Cates MP for Penistone and Stocksbridge (DC)
- • Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal & Governance SCC (GAD)
- • Cllr Julie Grocutt, Sheffield City Council and Stocksbridge Town Council (JG)
- • Colin Blackburn, South Yorkshire LEP (CB)
- • Graham Silverwood, Stocksbridge Training and Enterprise Partnership & Stocksbridge Community Leisure Centre (GS)
- • Chris Bell, Don Valley Railway Trust (C Bell)
- • Mick Hood, Liberty Speciality Steels (MH)
- • Ian Sanderson, SLR Outlets (IS)
- • John Crawshaw, Crawshaw's Butchers (JC)
- • Tom Newman, Steel Valley Project (TN)

### **Also attending:**

- Justin Homer, Area Lead, Sheffield City Region (Cities and Local Growth Unit) (JH)
- Sam Townsend, SCR, (Cities and Local Growth Unit) (STo)
- Cassie Houlden, Amion (CH)
- Amanda Holmes, Communications Director, Dransfield Properties (AH)
- Kate Clark, Senior Project Officer, SCC (KC)
- Mandy Aitken, Steel Valley Beacons Arts (SVBA) MA)
- Dan Timmins, SVBA (DT)
- Graham Elliott, SVBA (GE)
- Joy Grant, Project Support Officer, SCC (JCG)

### **Apologies:**

- • Miriam Cates MP for Penistone and Stocksbridge (MC)

	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION NOTES</b>	<b>Action Owner/s</b>
	Presentation by Steel Valley Beacons Arts	The team from Steel Valley Beacons Arts welcomed the opportunity to present their vision for arts in the valley.  SVBA put forward a case for an arts and culture centre in the heart of the town and community to enrich, enhance and inspire all areas of the community. As a team they bring a wide range of skills and experience. This presentation is to reinforce and add to the information which was emailed to everyone prior to the meeting.	

# :: Meeting Action Points::

		<p>SVBA outlined in their document 6 strands which they believe will have a positive impact on local businesses and the economy and will underpin the success of a culture and arts centre in Stocksbridge.</p> <p>SVBA are happy to use their experience and track record as a well-known group in the valley to support any plans the Board has for developing art in the valley.</p> <p>MA outlined that what they would envisage is a black box theatre space with movable chairs which could be adapted to combine the use of the space for other activities. The space would need to include advanced technology such as digital mapping equipment and 3D cinema equipment, rehearsal rooms and changing rooms that would be used at other times.</p>	
		<p>MD asked MA to provide the Board with a brief of their actual requirements so that this can be built into our projects to create an area that can be multi-purpose. MA to submit this to MD by the first week in January 2021. MD will then circulate this to everyone.</p>	<p><b>MA of SVBA</b></p> <p><b>MD</b></p>
1	<p>Welcome and confirmation of the minutes of the previous meeting and discuss any issues arising</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MD welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed. There were no issues arising.</li> </ul>	
2	<p>Governance Declaration of interest – to declare any interests in items on the agenda</p>	<p><b>Governance:</b></p> <p><b>Declaration of Interest:</b></p> <p>GS declared an interest in the accelerated funds for SCLC.</p> <p>TN declared an interest in Oxley Park.</p>	
3	<p>Update on towns fund budget and commissioned work GAD to outline the updated situation with the “seed fund” budget</p>	<p>GAD reported that there was no change since the last Board meeting. The most recent expenditure was on the public consultation. The balance remaining is £55,895.37.</p>	
4	<p>List of preferred projects – MD to outline the list that board members would like to take forward in the bid. A vote to be taken on the projects</p>	<p>A discussion took place around the key projects:</p> <p><b>Rail:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funicular railway has been given an estimated cost of £350k but MD suggested building in a contingency of £150k to bring it up to £500k.</li> <li>CH highlighted that the railways bid was the subject of various meetings this week and the towns fund might not</li> </ul>	

# :: Meeting Action Points::

		<p>be needed for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If RYR bid was unsuccessful then Bloor have a time limit of 7 years to retain the site at Deepcar for future use as part of the S106 agreement. MD suggested that the time limit should be extended to 10 years. GAD to discuss this with her Officers to check the wording of the proposal in the S106</li> </ul>	<b>GAD</b>
		<p><b>Highway works</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CH outlined that the scheme for the whole stretch from Fox Valley to Johnson Street could act as a stimulus for future development. The public realms work could stimulate private sector investment.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MD requested the figures for the highway work. CH reported that she had a high-level breakdown which showed that of the £5m, £3.25m was for the Manchester Road highways public realms work. CH to contact Greg Challis for a more detailed breakdown.</li> </ul>	<b>CH</b>
		<p><b>Manchester Road:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was suggested in the chat that the funicular could be built into the Manchester Road public realm aspect of the bid as it was the most logical place for it to link potential parking to the high street. It could then be referred to as Fox Valley/Manchester Road linkage.</li> </ul>	
		<p><b>Skatepark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal was for another site to be considered for the skatepark such as at the youth centre with the 4G pitches however JG explained that the funding available was for Oxley Park and it would therefore provide match funding to the Towns fund. Agreed that the Oxley Park phase 2 would include the skatepark.</li> </ul>	<b>KC</b>
		<p><b>6<sup>th</sup> Form</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6<sup>th</sup> Form Hub may be a more appropriate tag and more detail is required.</li> <li>The post 16 educational provision should form part of the Manchester Road Phase 1 as it will be provided within this community space.</li> </ul>	
		<p><b>Multi-User Sports Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GS reported that there was still a lot to be discussed and developed with various groups to resolve and bring this forward to an actual project.</li> <li>GS to work with JG to represent a few organisations including the Town Council so this is seen as a collaborative type project.</li> <li>JG/GS to get together to seek further guidance from CH re the multi-user sports facility which has been allocated £2m.</li> <li>CH supported the idea of 2 locations with the pros and cons being assessed. Clubs could be brought together to develop core sustainable interventions rather than competing smaller scale interventions.</li> <li>Involve wider Stakeholders such as the Football</li> </ul>	<b>GS/JG</b> <b>GS/JG</b>

# :: Meeting Action Points::

		<p>Foundation and Sports England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GS to discuss this further with Matt Dixon from the MP's office and TW as the provision will be on Council owned land.</li> </ul>	<p><b>GS</b> <b>CH/GAD/TW</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JG to liaise with GS/CH re the liaison exercise and to help to mitigate any concerns people may have.</li> </ul>	<p><b>JG/GS/CH</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CH emphasised that the vision contributes to the principles that all town fund projects embody e.g. sustainability, health and wellbeing and the cross-cutting themes so they are not stand-alone projects in this respect.</li> </ul>	
		<p><b>Green Corridor Connections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycle route to connect with the national cycle network to include the missing links and to the Bloor housing development.</li> <li>Discussion with Yorkshire Water re the issues at reservoirs which could be addressed by investing in walking and cycling routes up to the reservoir.</li> <li>New link from a potential car park at Liberty Steel to the cycle path.</li> <li>CB felt that further clarification was needed to reorganise projects to include Underbank reservoir.</li> <li>CH suggested joining up with what YW want to do to create connections with the countryside.</li> <li>CH to send through an extract to CB on work that has been done. CB to review this and send any comments back to CH.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CH/CB</b></p>
		<p><b>Phase 1 – Manchester Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery of Phase 1 is low risk if it only includes SCC land i.e. the library site and therefore is likely to be successful as part of the bid as it is deliverable. However the aspiration is to develop a larger area divided into phase 1a, b &amp; c with the first part being the Council owned library site.</li> </ul> <p>The concern is that if this is not deliverable then the bid may fall, therefore the proposal is to offer two alternatives, the development of the larger site with a fallback position if additional properties are not successfully acquired within the timescales.</p> <p>MD has written to all landowners to test their appetite for sale.</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MD suggested that the bid should focus on 1a, b &amp; c + the public realm and funicular and then private investment may follow.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion about the inclusion of residential within Phase 1 Manchester Road bid. CH emphasised that not all residential has been approved by the towns fund unless it works for the location and is viable and deliverable.</li> <li>JH highlighted that some places are looking at market renewal e.g. clearance, preparation of site, acquisition of small housing pockets but it would need to be demonstrated why the towns fund is required when there</li> </ul>	

# :: Meeting Action Points::

		<p>doesn't appear to be housing market failure in Stocksbridge. The assessment would look at this. JH suggested that a conversation with Homes England to get their view might be beneficial.</p>	<p><b>JH</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH suggested that the risk needs to be reduced so that by having a 1a which looks as though it could be delivered, even if the wider land couldn't be acquired, is really important and it needs to be considered what would happen if it was just the library site so that is the fallback position and also what a smaller scheme would look like if the limitation was just that site.</li> <li>• GAD highlighted that we do not need a pre-app or Heads of Terms prior to the submission of the bid but we need as much certainty as possible that projects are deliverable. SCC will have to consider whether it is reasonable and appropriate for it to be taking the risk on this.</li> <li>• CH emphasised the need to demonstrate stakeholder support as evidenced by the consultation. The feedback was that Manchester Road is a priority. SCC's position is important as a key stakeholder that is going to be responsible for submitting the bid and holding the money when it comes so they need to be comfortable with this.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH suggested that MD/IS look at elements on the development of the report so they can have input and help from that. CH to forward report to them.</li> <li>• IS suggested that a wider map of Stocksbridge and the wider area will show in a comprehensive way how the money can be used.</li> <li>• CH to supply each Chair with documents for them to review their content and provide any comments. These should be returned to CH (AH to be copied in) by the first week after Christmas.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CH</b></p> <p><b>CH/AH</b></p> <p><b>CH/Chairs</b></p>
		<p><b>Presentation of the Bid:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH to talk to Council Officers tomorrow about the graphics and the idea of a map is a good idea for publicity and where everything is and how it connects. AH to be involved in this meeting.</li> <li>• DC with his IT expertise to help with the detail of this.</li> <li>• GAD emphasised that the balance of £55k is needed for the business cases for projects but a sum of money could be allocated for this visual work. GAD/CH to look at this element and come back to the Board with the costings.</li> <li>• JH posted in the chat that the way the TIP looks may be as much about the Board's ongoing engagement and taking it all forward locally. Maps, visuals, and infographics can say 1000 words (given the word limit overall).</li> </ul>	<p><b>CH/AH</b></p> <p><b>DC</b></p> <p><b>GAD/CH</b></p>

# :: Meeting Action Points::

<p>5</p>	<p>Accelerated funding project – Oxley Park – Final Business Case – Kate Clark</p>	<p>KC screen shared the update on the accelerated funding projects which are delivering the improvements across the leisure centre and Oxley Park and bring together the car park, cycle parking, new play facilities, and footpath network in the park.</p> <p>KC reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The detailed designs are complete</li> <li>• Planning permission has been submitted for the leisure centre for approval on 18 January 2021.</li> <li>• The playground works are out to tender and these are due back on Friday so will be evaluated next week.</li> <li>• The costs include the footpath costs and the total for this business case is £45,827.78.</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks and Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timescales – the main concern being around the ground conditions of the playground.</li> <li>• Drainage works to protect the leisure centre</li> <li>• Funding gap – the final costs for the play area (when available) will determine if it is over budget.</li> <li>• KC has a meeting tomorrow with Legal and Property to look at the lease area and to be totally clear about where it is to establish if a variation to the lease is required and then look at the options.</li> </ul> <p><b>Final Business Case approvals required:</b></p> <p>The final business case which needs to be approved today is for the elements that link the leisure centre car park, and playground with the car park through to the other areas of the park.</p> <p>The Board formally approved the first final business case for the footpath work around Oxley Park by a unanimous show of hands.</p> <p>The final business case for the playground and the leisure centre will be brought to the January Board for approval.</p> <p>GAD thanked KC and her team for all their hard work which was really appreciated. GS also endorsed the huge amount of work that has been carried out and really appreciated the work done.</p>	<p>KC</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Amion update – Cassie Houlden</p>	<p>CH screen shared the list of projects which totalled £24.79m of the £25m allocated. The outline for the TIP was important in terms of an allowance for programme management because there is no separate budget for this so each project must have built in a programme management fee which will then go to the overall management and delivery of the programme i.e. accountable body costs that the Council has to bear covering regular reporting to government and monitoring costs.</p>	

# :: Meeting Action Points::

---

<b>7</b>	Consultation update – feedback to the public following consultation process	GAD reported on the feedback from the Towns hub saying that the TIP should explain how the Board should continue to engage with the public and business and also that we should consider how the project reflects the public consultation outcomes and expand on what we've got where necessary.	<b>CH</b>
<b>8</b>	AOB	MD to re-convene the meeting with the Town Council for the first week in January to expand the public engagement work.	<b>MD</b>
<b>9</b>	Date of next meeting:	Wednesday 13 January 2021 at 10 a. m.	