



Staveley Town Deal Board

Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd October 2020, (10-12), (Via MS Teams)

Attendance

Board Members	
Ivan Fomin (Chair)	MSE Hiller
Cllr Tricia Gilby (Vice Chair)	Chesterfield Borough Council
Cllr Tony King	Derbyshire County Council
Huw Bowen	Chesterfield Borough Council
Angela Stansfield	Department of Work and Pensions
Lee Rowley, MP	Member of Parliament, North East Derbyshire
Mark Potter	Chesterfield Canal Trust Ltd
Cllr Paul Mann	Staveley Town Council
Mervyn Allcock	Barrow Hill Engine Shed Society
Toby Perkins, MP	Member of Parliament, Chesterfield
Will Morlidge	D2N2 LEP
Ian Wingfield	Springwell Community College
Melanie Pythian (Observer) MPH	Towns Hub Policy Advisor, Cities and Local Growth Unit
Officers in support	
Lynda Sharp	Chesterfield Borough Council
Lindsay Wetton	Chesterfield Borough Council
Allison Westray Chapman	Derbyshire County Council
Mark Evans	Staveley Town Council
Craig Busby	Office of Toby Perkins, MP
George Rogers	Chesterfield Canal Trust Ltd
Consultants running the Workshop	
BDP/Steer/Colliers to commissioned to assist with TIP development	Francis Glare, Christian Nielsen, Guy Gilfillan, Rob McNee
ARUP assisting with Town Deal Development	Jade Tilley

1 Apologies

Warren Manning	University of Derby
Neil Johnson	Chesterfield Borough Council
Richard Morocombe	Chesterfield College
Daron Abbott	Derbyshire Police



1 Welcome and introductions and apologies (IF)

Ivan welcomed all participants to the meeting. Apologies were recorded as detailed above.

Following the meeting, we have been advised that Richard Morcombe shall be leaving Chesterfield College, therefore, Julie Richards shall revert to interim Board Member until his replacement is appointed.

2 Declarations of Interest

IF asked for all Declarations of Interest. No declarations of interest were reported.

3 Minutes of the last meeting held on 9th October 2020 (IF)

Minutes were approved as an accurate record, subject to the following: Item 5 & 6, ARUP recognise the link from the consultation to the Vision and into the Objectives, but can only advise, therefore TIP Guidance must be reflected upon and final decisions will be made by Government following the TIP submission. All actions had been completed.

4 Revised programme for submission (CN)

CN presented a slide with key dates for Board, Check and Challenge and revised TIP submission date of Cohort 2A. IF reported that work BDP and Steer have done to date has put Staveley TIP in a good place with a workable Programme. CN agreed, and that there is more information required from Project Sponsors and it is a tight timescale for Board to sign projects off.

IF updated Board that CLG have provided a new submission date (Cohort 2a) of 11 December and proposed Staveley submit in this Cohort to allow a few more weeks to develop a robust TIP. Board agreed to submit in Cohort 2a, by 11 December 2020.

Action: M Phythian to note and confirm this to the CLG team.

TP asked if CN had sufficient project information and were there any gaps? CN confirmed information is adequate at this stage to conduct the initial sift. The purpose of today is to identify projects that pass the “gateway” creating a shortlist, reject any that do not; and fill any information gaps in order for a fair and proper assessment to be approved on 6 November Board meeting.

5 Check and challenge outcomes (Verbal update JT - Arup)

JT explained the first Check and Challenge session on 9 October was held for Part I of the TIP. A second session is planned for 13 November and a Part II session (projects) on 20 November. Feedback to date: Staveley demonstrates a good use of visuals, context to the potential investments and specific Staveley data is required and a strengthening of the evidence base to link with the chosen projects and include links to publicity and consultation will strengthen the TIP, showing a “Golden Thread” throughout. Some Cohort One TIPs have been shared to benchmark our TIP. Preston, Barrow-in-Furness, Warrington and Swindon can be viewed on line. In addition, an explanation of the prioritisation process needs to be documented and collaboration with business groups such as the Chamber and LEP and consultation with stakeholders is to be documented. Part I (the vision and strategy and Part II (the projects) needs to reflect a strong link.



6 Project information and discussion (CN)

A confidential project paper was shared with the Board ahead of the meeting and CN talked to this paper.

IF outlined that some projects are strong or middling, but require further detail. Weaker ones may also require more detail and there are ones listed that fail to meet the basic criteria. BDP will outline how they scored the projects and the purpose for today is that Board members understand this process; aim to discard projects that failed to get past the scoring criteria and proceed with a shorter list that will be appraised and presented for final consideration and inclusion on 6 November and proceed to the TIP.

CN outlined that we had 19 projects and a good outcome would be to reduce this today to 14 or 15. BDP will engage with sponsors, carry out final appraisals, see whether some can be packaged, explore whether we include larger strategic projects such as elements of the Barrow Hill – Sheffield Rail line and Station works as part of the overall Dept for Transport Programme. HB explained that CBC have engaged to see if there is an ask within the TIP as part of the SCR Strategic Business Case.

CN explained the appraisal process. Firstly Gateway Criteria, do projects align with the Strategic Objectives; is there evidence of need. Then each project was scored on Impact, Estimated Cost, Deliverability, Timeline, Risk and Covid-19 Impact.

TIP objectives have been revised slightly to reflect the aim to attract new residents. After the initial sift, projects have been clustered as those failing to pass the threshold score; ones middling and weaker where they need to engage further and strong projects. All are scored based on the information provided to BDP to date.

Following discussion about each project that failed to meet the threshold, Board agreed to dismiss the following:

- Housing betterment
- Netherthorpe School
- Norbriggs Wharf
- Trials Motorcycle Park

WM understood the points made for housing and offered support D2N2 support to articulate the housing demand data for a rounded TIP, and outlined that housing retrofit was a key regional priority but recognised no specific investment was required through the TIP at this stage on housing.

Further discussion followed regarding those “weaker projects” and Board agreed to dismiss the following: BRSA Club and Digital Connectivity.

TG outline that digital connectivity is so important that it needs to be embedded into each project and Board agreed that this was the right approach to take.

Action: Review with Project Sponsors to embed digital connectivity within each project.

PM queried the merits of the Hollingwood Hub project. MP outlined that as Staveley communities develop with new housing sites, community assets can often be overlooked and Hollingwood Hub will bring communities together as a focal point.



IF asked that once a TIP is submitted is there more scrutiny on the project financials? MPH explained it will be reviewed through an objective lens, but CLG will generally be expecting that costs have undergone a value for money assessment prior to submission. We are not asking for full businesses cases, but it's crucial that projects need to fit with the vision and evidence of need.

Broad discussion was had around the Town Centre proposal. General discussions gained consensus that for a TIP, regeneration of the town centre must be an integral part, but more specific plans need to be presented. CN outlined that more detail is required on the Market Place, Morrison, Public Realm, the cinema and that One Public Estate could see investments in a Shared Hub. PM asked that the paper be more specific.

TP stated the importance of projects that will make the transformational difference needed for the town centre and was concerned whether the current projects would do that or whether a more radical approach needs consideration.

MP added the proposal does require more work, information is a little sparse, the cinema option seems expensive in terms of viability.

Action: Board to be presented with a paper outlining the approach for the Town Centre Project at the next Board meeting.

CN explained there are two projects under Staveley Hall. PM added that some budgets could be reduced, for example; the main Hall project is top priority and if required the Wall aspect could be removed from the TIP and other funding sought.

Board agreed that Project Sponsors be asked about other funding sources and this could allow Town Deal budgets to be reviewed and budgets maximised. CN provided an example that by clustering the Canal works and Canal Basin project, wider economic, social and environmental benefits could be better realised.

CN explained it is reasonable to ask Sponsors of the Barrow Hill Housing and Memorial Hall what can be delivered in stages. More information has been requested on operating costs and revenue implications.

TG asked whether these projects are going to be viable, for example Barrow Hill housing may not meet Green Book criteria. Barrow Hill station would take people to Sheffield, for employment and shopping and is a greener transport mode. The DRIIVE project will train future engineers and aligns well with HS2.

The Barrow Hill Station also requires a further review to confirm the delivery potential within the TIP timeline and see what can be delivered in a 5 year period.

Hartington Works is a key employment site with potential for rail related industries. TG added SUON are a strong partner to get a major employer on site and is happy to support this project if it means good jobs locally.

DCC are delivering the Canal Basin which brings economic benefits of commercial space and high quality housing, which could be coupled with the canal restoration works to form a strong economic, social and environmental case.



The broad discussion raised the point that we have had a strong steer from CLG to consider applying for more than £25m. LW added that we have projects of regional and national significance and MPH added that a TIP needs to be “Tip Top” and to be ambitious, nothing will have been lost.

HB reminded the Board of the purpose of BDP and the consultant team, in that they can assess the strategic alignment, be independent and take an objective view of projects, which must meet the criteria of the TIP, align to the vision and strategic direction, have evidence of need, be deliverable, viable and credible. BDP recommend the project list and Board then needs to consider and assess these. TG added the process is not based on the opinions of elected members, but Board need to focus on a joined up TIP, taking on board the strong project recommendations. Of course there will be dilemmas, but Board’s role is to put the best TIP forward.

LR suggested all strong and middle projects go forward, he had no view on the weaker ones. A town centre project must be submitted. TG seconded LR proposal to move strong and middle projects forward to be further developed.

Board also agreed that the BRSA Community Club should not progress in the TIP and digital connectivity be built into each project.

Staveley Town Board agreed to take forward all 13 Projects within the “Strong and Middling” categories to the next phase.

Action: BDP, team and Project Sponsors to provide further information and conduct thorough appraisals for Board consideration on 6 November.

- 7 Barrow Hill line letter of support (Confidential Town Board only, not for wider circulation)

HB outline the purpose of the letter is for the Sheffield City Region business case which CBC is involved in. It is being submitted to Dept of Transport and is a strategic outline business case relating to the whole line and support for the elements relating to Staveley are being sought.

Board agreed for the letter to be sent by the Chairman.

Action: letter of support to be sent.

- 8 Any Other Business (IF)
 - a. Accelerator Fund Project Update (LJW)

LJW updated Board that contracts have been produced and signed and work with sponsors on delivery plans are in place. We applied for £590K and the offer was for £500K.

IW raised an issue of timescales for the 3G pitch at Springwell Community College and works would be complete by 31 August 2021. The Football Foundation have tight funding call schedules and won’t be able to approve before January 2021. We had been advised that AF must be spent by March 2021. Is there any way the Accelerator Funding can be retained to match fund this very important project which would not proceed without AF support? MPH confirmed that changes are possible. She asked



that changes be put in writing. Another town has had agreement to change and spend until Sept 2021. S151 Officer to confirm the change and CLG are willing to be as flexible as possible.

Other consideration is how to make the local community aware of what is happening and mitigate public perceptions of delays. People often feel nothing good is happening. MPH suggested hoardings or banners “coming soon” to gain public awareness and interest as the Town Deal progresses.

b. Logo Competition Update (LJW)

LJW updated that the logo winner was chosen by a judging panel and work to enhance it for digital and commercial quality has begun. IW added that the prizes were well received by the students. The winner received £50 shopping voucher and is looking forward to working with Staveley Design Company Q2 Creative to develop the logo.

9 Date and Time of Next Meeting

- **Friday 6 November 2020** via Teams (11:00-13:00) – Final Project List Sign Off
- **Friday 27 November 2020** via Teams (12:30 – 2:30) Final TIP Sign Off (aim to submit by 11 December 2020 in Cohort 2a)