

Minutes of the Chesterfield Long Term Plan for Towns Board

Thursday 30th January 2025, 5:00pm, Chesterfield College

Board Members:			
Dominic Staniforth, Chair	Barber Harrison and Platt		
Cllr Amanda Serjeant	Chesterfield Borough Council		
Julie Richards	Chesterfield College		
Simon Wright	Banner Jones		
Jacqui Willis	Derbyshire Voluntary Action		
Mahmud Nawaz	Chesterfield Royal Hospital Foundation Trust		
Laura-Jo Owen	Adorn Jewellers		
Angela Stansfield	Job Centre Plus		
Canon Patrick Coleman	Chesterfield Parish Church		
Simon Davidson	Cheese factor		
John Croot	Chesterfield Football Club Community Trust		
Emily Bowman	Junction Arts		
Dave Kirby	Derbyshire Police		
Gavin Grainger	Bottle and Thyme		
Tom Kidsley (for Julie Richards)	Chesterfield College		
Officers in support:			
Huw Bowen	Chesterfield Borough Council		
Christine Durrant	Chesterfield Borough Council		
Neil Johnson	Chesterfield Borough Council		
Anna Sharman	Chesterfield Borough Council		
Michael Rich	On behalf of Chesterfield Borough Council		
Alan Marsden	Derbyshire County Council		
Liz Wigley	Cities and Local Growth Unit		
Apologies:			
Andrew Kelly	Parkside School		
Nicole Ndiweni	Police and Crime Commissioner		
Councillor Carolyn Renwick	Derbyshire County Council		
Kath Mitchell	University of Derby		

Item No	Item	Action (by whom)
1.	Welcome, apologies and introductions	
	DS welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked Chesterfield College for hosting the Board.	
	Apologies were noted.	
2.	Declaration of Interest	
	No declarations of interest were received.	
3.	Minutes of the previous meeting (5/12/2024) and matters arising	
	DS asked the Board to confirm that the minutes of the meeting of the Board on 5 th December, were a true and accurate record. This was agreed.	
	As matters arising, DS noted a pack containing notes from all three of the autumn Board workshops had now been circulated.	
	A press release had not yet been issued but was planned to go out following the Board meeting to confirm the funding for the programme and noting the Board is underway with shaping projects.	LS
	The communications and engagement sub-group meeting has now been arranged for 13/2.	
4.	Update on national programmes (LTPT and UKSPF)	
	LW updated the Board on the LTPT programme. A revised prospectus is still awaited and there is no date yet for its publication. She confirmed the policy will be to build on the good work that was done last year and hoped the prospectus would be out before the next Board meeting in March.	

CD provided an update on UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF). One-year funding (2025-26) had been confirmed at October budget; this will now flow through the new combined authority (EMCCA) and will (nationally) be reduced by around a third. There will be some regional allocations, for programmes like business support and inward investment, but the majority of the one-year fund will be passed to districts, boroughs and cities. Chesterfield Borough is due to receive around 60% of its previous allocation, though it will now be around 50/50 capital/revenue.

Whilst the plans are not finalised, this allocation means it is likely that support from this fund can continue for key areas of interest to the Board, namely town centre events and community safety/enforcement, albeit with reduced levels of funding. Other funding that is currently used, in particular Safer Streets and PCC funding, was still uncertain.

DB noted that the current officers deployed in the town centre have made a positive impact and would feed back to the PCC the importance of the funding to sustain current levels. Nationally there will be additional funding for neighbourhood policing, which equates to around 23 new officers across the county. There was a prospect of some of these deployed in town centres, which would complement the enforcement roles, which are still needed in the town centre.

JW asked whether there would be UKSPF funding for community grants again. CD indicated the current plans did include this, though it would be a reduced pot due to the national cuts.

5. **Proposals on next steps for the Board**

HB introduced the paper and highlighted some of the key points. The Board will need to re-shape its vision and investment plan once the prospectus is issued. It is expected this will focus around the 5 missions of the

new government, against which there is already a good alignment to the Board's priorities.

Whilst there is a delay to the main programme funding, government is encouraging the coming year to be used to shape and prepare projects, supported by additional capacity funding. Together with the allocation from the current year, this provides around £360k of capacity funding in total.

Drawing on the engagement work and workshop sessions, there are a number of early project ideas included in the paper where some initial feasibility work would be the sensible next step. In principle support was sought from the Board today, following which more detail would be brought back to the Board in March, including costed proposals specific project development work and feasibility studies.

HB also noted the other areas where the Board may wish to spend time in the coming year. There is also a need for additional capacity to drive the feasibility and engagement work. Existing council resources are not sufficient to coordinate and drive the work needed to be ready for delivery in April 2026. The Board was being asked to approve the use of funding for a dedicated post, using the capacity funding in the coming year and then the main programme funding once in place from April 26. HB also invited the Board to add further ideas as the list of feasibility work is not intended to be exhaustive.

Board members commented on the proposals for a dedicated post, recognising the need for additional capacity but noting that the costs for the role would need to increase over 10 years and that over that time this represented a significant cost to come from the overall fund. HB responded that programmes of this scale require dedicated capacity and that the funding of £20m should leverage significantly more if the programme is successful. AS noted other similar Town Boards have dedicated support and confirmed the

borough council could not simply absorb the work required.

Queries were also made regarding the terms on which the postholder would be employed, whether it would be permanent and what happened at the end of the programme or if the programme was cancelled. HB confirmed that a permanent role was much more attractive to the market and a fixed term postholder would have the same rights after two years anyway. CBC has a good record of redeployment and would seek to mitigate any redundancy, but would ultimately bear that cost if it transpired.

The Board approved the use of up to £70k p.a. for a dedicated programme role, to be drawn from the available capacity funding in the first instance.

DS invited comments on the proposals for project development. He noted the unfavourable capital/revenue split which is out of keeping with the types of project that are most needed.

PC was supportive of the list of ideas and stressed the need to think about the ongoing viability of initiatives and projects beyond the lifetime of this programme. GS asked what data there is on the reasons for people coming into the town by train and whether we could learn more about the scale of opportunity from visitors using this mode. He stressed the need for evidence to support interventions such as improving connections to the station. NJ and HB noted that leisure visitors arriving tend to be more focused on getting to the Peak District than visiting the town, and that only 8% of visitors overall stay overnight. A short break campaign is currently running to increase this and capture more spend in the town. HB also noted the use of mobile phone data that is providing a greater understanding of footfall and flows. AS suggested some of the capacity fund could be used to improve our understanding of the purpose of visits and flows of visitors.

EB suggested there was a significant opportunity, not currently captured by the list, to develop the creative sector within the town. In particular, provision of a dedicated facility could help to mitigate the challenge of empty units, respond to growing demand, create new jobs and footfall, and enhance the visitor offer. It was agreed that this should be added to the working project list.

MR

MN confirmed an interest in looking at health services within the town and indicated that this would require a number of colleagues within the trust to be included in the discussions. He noted that those services would still require running costs to be met and this will need careful consideration as part of any proposals. The example of the diagnostic centre within the Glass Works at Barnsley was discussed as a good example of how this can work. It was agreed there would be merit in arranging a visit to this for Board members interested in seeing the approach in practice.

MN also noted the opportunity arising from around 5,000 staff as well as patients and visitors coming to the hospital. If connections to the town centre could be improved, this could help to alleviate parking and congestion issues as well as driving more footfall in the town. AM confirmed that following the December workshop the county council had been in discussion with officers at the hospital trust about this. A staff survey was being considered to understand the potential demand for services.

JW outlined some of the opportunities that would come from creating a community hub, based on initial work that Derbyshire Voluntary Action had undertaken. It could include early year play and public health services, as well as engaging people creatively to increase confidence. A hub could provide space for groups that are currently struggling with funding pressures. All of this would drive much-needed footfall within the town. JC confirmed the community trust would potentially be interested in being involved with the hub and the space

	powers could also help to bring currently empty units back into use for this sort of community facility. DS noted the continued need to think about safety and security, as without people feeling safe then the projects discussed are unlikely to succeed. The Board supported the overall approach set out in the paper.	
6.	Updates on Animate Chesterfield and Derbyshire Makes NJ provided an update to the Board on two projects that align strongly with its vision to create town centre vibrancy. [slides circulated separately] The Animate programme has been funded through section 106 planning contributions and led by CBC, working closely with a number of partners, including some of the board members. There are opportunities to build on this and do more to grow and embed the creative sector. He noted that options on the use of murals to add interest to the townscape would be brought to a future Board meeting to seek a steer. AS noted that in Manchester there is a clear theme and link between the murals and street art which make the overall impact more powerful and creates a visitor trail, rather than a random approach. Derbyshire Makes has been led by the county council, with significant Arts Council funding. The main event in Chesterfield this year will be held on 28-30 th March. This will include mobile maker vehicle in the town centre and a variety of markets.	NJ NJ
7.	Any Other Business There was no other business	

8. Date and Time of future meetings

DS noted the opportunity to combine future Board meetings with relevant site visits, such as the redevelopment of Stephenson Memorial Hall and Barnsley Glassworks. The Board agreed these should be included in the future schedule.

LS

March 13th June 5th July 24th September 25th November 20th

(venues tbc)