



A place to start,
to stay, to grow!

Staveley Town Deal Board

Minutes of the Meeting held on 6th November 2020, (11am-1pm),

(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
Sajeeda Rose	D2N2 LEP
Ian Wingfield	Springwell Community College
Peter Dewhurst	University of Derby
Julie Richards	Chesterfield College
Kara Butler	Derbyshire Police
Observer	
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
Michael Rich	Chesterfield Borough Council
Allison Westray Chapman	Derbyshire County Council
Mark Evans	Staveley Town Council
Craig Busby	Office of Toby Perkins, MP
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



**A place to start,
to stay, to grow!**

Apologies

Warren Manning	University of Derby
Neil Johnson	Chesterfield Borough Council
George Rogers	Chesterfield Canal Trust Ltd

1. Welcome and introductions and apologies (IF)

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

IF reported changes to personnel of the Board Representatives. Richard Morcombe has left Chesterfield College, therefore, Julie Richards shall revert to interim Board Member until his replacement is appointed. Daron Abbot is replaced by Kara Butler, new Police Inspector and Peter Dewhurst shall represent the University of Derby to replace Warren Manning.

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 23rd October 2020 (IF)

Minutes were approved as an accurate record. All actions had been completed or within the TIP workplan.

IF asked that discussion planned for Agenda Item 6 be brought forward. IF felt that it would help discussion at the meeting if we could understand the outcome of Town Deal cohort 1 submissions. IF advised that he was particularly interested in the outcome for those areas that requested above £25 million and that he was keen to understand the additional scrutiny that would be required of such an ask. MPh advised that the Government had made announcements on some Cohort 1 Town Deal submissions on 27th October 2020. Deals for 7 towns were announced and that further are expected shortly. Only 1 of those announced to date had an award of grant of over £25 million. This was Blackpool. In terms of additional scrutiny, MPh advised that this took the form of a “challenge session” with Ministers. MPh advised that regardless of the size of the ask within the Investment Plan, it is key that a credible case needs to be made for the level of investment requested. For larger asks it will be key to show the value of additional funding to be invested in the plan from the public and private sector stakeholders. It will also be key to demonstrate alignment with government strategies and initiatives. MPh advised that the TIP needs to be a “Tip Top TIP”, that fully meets all of the assessment criteria. Another key element is ensuring the Board has undertaken prioritisation between projects, to show clearly that the final ask has tested thoroughly and is not because the Board didn’t seek to prioritise. It is also advisable to give consideration to the scaling of projects. The final offer made by Government may be less than the ask and again, scaling back projects will be key to successful TIP delivery. MPh confirmed that at Heads of Terms stage, funding would be awarded to the overall Town Deal not project by project, and therefore it would be for the Board to determine how to manage any shortfall in funding across the projects.

IF thanked Melanie for her input.



**A place to start,
to stay, to grow!**

4. Approach to progress the Staveley Town Centre Project (MR)

MR presented the paper submitted to the Board on the approach to progressing the Town Centre project. MR stated that the Council would undertake actions to progress a refresh of the Staveley Town Centre Masterplan whilst developing the details of the projects contained within the project proposal. Chesterfield Borough Council would seek the ongoing views of the Board and ask that they engage fully in planning and thinking around proposals for the Town Centre.

TP commented that he was happy with the additional work undertaken and with proposals outlined in the report. He reiterated the importance of a Town Centre project as a key project within the Investment Plan.

IF asked Board members to vote to confirm they were accepting of recommendation in the report. The Board voted strongly in favour of proposals. The recommendation was approved.

5. Final List for approval and progress update on the TIP preparation (CN)

CN presented to the Board. He advised that the purpose of his report was to enable the Board to agree the final list of projects for inclusion in the TIP. Work would still be required after the meeting, and prior to final TIP submission to refine the projects. Additional focus needed to be given to how the projects can support the delivery of key themes around low carbon agenda/digital etc as this work has not been fully reflected to date. There will be a further “Check and Challenge” session on the 20 November 2020, with Arup’s. He suggested that an additional Board meeting be arranged for the 4th December 2020, to allow the Board to sign off the final Town Investment Plan.

CN advised that at the last meeting 19 projects on the long-list had been shortlisted down to 13. These projects have now been appraised. The total ask from the Town Deal stands at £35 million for projects with a total value of £383 million. There appears to be a good mix of projects across intervention themes, by geography and a balance of projects with local, regional and national significance. CN showed the Board 4 options for consideration that balance the total financial ask against individual project requests, suggesting where projects could be scaled as appropriate. In concluding the presentation, CN confirmed that BDP/Steers and Colliers were recommending Option 3. This would mean that the TIP would be submitted with a £25 million ask to Government and that it would include scaling back of the financial ask of the Hartington Works, Town Centre, Chesterfield Canal and Staveley Hall projects.

IF thanked CN for his presentation and advised that it was important to understand the views of the Board. He sought to ask each Board Member in turn, for their views with regards to the recommendation made to pursue Option 3.

TG thanked BDP/Steer and Colliers for the work undertaken since the last meeting, reflecting that the details on the projects had come along way. She is supportive of the recommendation and feels that the projects put forward are good and are reflective of the needs of the local community. As a result, local people will feel listened to. TG suggested that financial ask should stay close to £25 million as she would be concerned that additional scrutiny may mean a strong project falls if the total ask was above £25m. TG feels that we have a duty to put forward a strong TIP with good coverage for the area.



**A place to start,
to stay, to grow!**

MPh advised that the Board could consider additional scrutiny as a positive, it would be a presentation in the form of a “challenge session” that could be considered as an opportunity to sell our ask for Staveley, making it more compelling.

TP advised that his over-riding view was supportive of the recommendation. There is a strong pool of projects. His view was that we stick to the £25 million ask and submit a good bid with credible projects. He asked for more information from the Canal Trust as to the impact of the proposed cut in funding allocated to this project to its deliverability. He suggested that other funding could be made available but wanted to fully understand the consequences of a lower amount of funding.

LR confirmed that he agreed that Option 3 seems to be the sensible approach and wanted to express thanks to BDP/Steers and Colliers for getting us to this point. With regards to asking for more than £25 million, LR said that on balance, looking at what had been allocated to larger towns than Staveley, any case made would have to be extremely strong and it may appear that we had not adequately prioritised. He suggested it may be appropriate for this to be considered further outside of the meeting.

Action CBC to discuss with CLG to review impacts of asking for in excess of £25 million.

PM confirmed he supported the recommendation to pursue options 3 and that it is important to not look too greedy. It would also be key to not ask for too much and then disappoint people. As project sponsor for Staveley Hall, he advised that they could scale back the ask for the wall and garden elements of the scheme.

MP speaking as a project sponsor, advised the Board that a reduction of £4 million would not allow the delivery of the canal. Funding of £6.25 million would be required as a minimum. The allocation of £4 million would render the project unfeasible.

HB advised that he had undertaken a thorough sift of the projects and that he felt the recommendations to pursue option 3 was reasonable. It would provide good geographic coverage and a good range of types of projects within the TIP. However, he is keen that further scrutiny is undertaken on the projects prior to submission of the TIP so that the Board has assurance that all the projects stack up and that they are deliverable with issues such as future sustainability taken into account. If projects fall away because it isn't fully deliverable, it could make way for additional funding for other projects such as the Canal. HB also added with 11/12 projects, CBC and the Board need to be mindful of the number of projects that they would have to client to get through heads of terms, full business case and beyond to delivery stage. HB also asked the Board to give consideration to the need to have projects that are scalable. If we are not awarded the full amount of funding, we need to be able to prioritise how we would scale projects back and still be able to deliver outputs and outcomes. With regards to the Canal, HB was keen that as part of the assurance and testing, that consideration be given to where additional funding could be secured from.

TK confirmed that he agreed with the views shared at the meeting. He asked that consideration be given to strengthening the projects with private sector leverage as this would strengthen the TIP.

MA confirmed that he was in agreement with the recommendation to pursue option 3 and with the points made by other Board Members. He was keen that the Board are careful and that the ask is around £25m to avoid further scrutiny. As a representative of the Staveley community, he confirmed that the projects as proposed would benefit people locally.



**A place to start,
to stay, to grow!**

JR advised she felt that there was a good mix of projects proposed and that she was willing to endorse option 3 as recommended. She would like to see links made to the employment and skills agenda and aligned with COVID recovery plans. The key for the projects such as DRIVe and the Construction Skills Hub will be on how they can link with other initiatives and mainstream skills funding to ensure sustainability. She highlighted the recent investment at the College in a Construction digital Skills Hub, suggesting positive links could be made.

SR advised that she echoed points made by JR and that it is key to ensure linkages between projects to ensure sustainability. She highlighted that the Board may wish to focus on what contingency is in place if projects, subject to further scrutiny don't stack up? She suggested developing a project reserve list. With regards to the Canal project, SR advised that it was a significant investment in one project that was not delivering significant outputs and therefore it is difficult to demonstrate value for money.

AS endorsed the points made previously and that she felt there to be a good project mix. AS feels that DWP's role comes later when the TIP is live. They have a Job Centre in Staveley and will engage proactively to support upskilling of the local community, work with investors and can also assist in volunteering for initiatives like the Canal. She confirmed her support of the recommendation to options 3.

IW advised that he was happy with options 3 as proposed. There is a good mix of projects and that they would help create an environment for local teenagers, coming through the educational system who may want to stay and work in the area. He highlighted that this was a key part of the agreed vision for the area – a place to stay!

KB advised that she felt unable to comment as it was her first day in her new role. She would prefer to observe at the meeting. IF said this was fine and welcomed KB to the Board.

PD also advised that this was also his first meeting and like KB felt it appropriate to leave it for others to decide. He added that it was a fascinating list of projects that would hit lots of buttons such as the green agenda.

TG confirmed, referring to an earlier comment, that she had said that there was public and private sector match (in projects such as DRIVe and Hartington) identified within the TIP. She was instead referring to the difficulty in achieving further match in the time period required.

MP said that the Board need to be aware of the risk in pursuing option 3 is that it could mean that the Canal project, would be undeliverable. He was keen that the Board referred back to the Staveley vision and the consultations that have been undertaken. He felt that he wasn't sure this has been fully taken into account. PM queried if other public funding could be brought forward to support the Canal if option 3 is agreed. For example, through the housing developments that are being delivered in the area. This extra leverage could be used to support projects like the Canal. TP stated that he felt the Board were keen to see the Canal happen. He wondered whether the £4 million could be used to attract other funding? Further, in the coming weeks when further scrutiny is placed on the other projects fall away, that the Board agree to allocate the funding to the Canal project.

HB advised that the point made by TP links to the need for further testing and assurance of projects prior to the TIP submission. HB said that there are two projects of national significance within the



**A place to start,
to stay, to grow!**

proposals and it makes sense that funding from projects considered to be un-deliverable or sustainable be re-allocated to these projects of national significance. HB suggested a separate meeting to discuss options around the Canal. With regards to PM comments with regards to funding from housing investments HB advised that it wasn't a simple process. Funding is already set aside through Community Infrastructure Levy and allocated to health provision, educational provision.

IF asked the Board to vote on the recommendation as proposed in the paper presented by BDP/Steer and Colliers. The Board voted who voted strongly in favour. It was agreed that Option 3 as presented by BDP/Steer and Colliers be pursued for final TIP submission.

MPh commented that with regards to having a project pipeline, that at this stage she felt it was up to the Board. A precedent has not been established. However, it is standard practice for Local Growth Fund programmes to have flexibility in scheme delivery, with any changes being agreed formally.

IF advised the Board that consideration needed to be given to how the Town Deal process is managed beyond submission of the TIP. Further thought will be given to this and the Board will be consulted at a future meeting.

JT asked the Board to remember to ensure as part of the project testing and scrutiny prior to submission that care is taken to ensure projects are delivering against Town Deal aims and objectives.

6. Any Other Business (IF)

a. Accelerator Fund Project Update (LW)

LW updated that CBC had issued contracts to all accelerator projects. CBC were in active procurement for the CCTV and park project. She is also in active discussions around the Springwell Community College project to change the delivery timescales with MPh. Planning permission has been submitted for the Staveley Miners Welfare 3G pitch project and negotiations are ongoing in relation to DRIIVE land purchase.

b. Update from Round One Town Deals (MP)

MPh advised that a webinar is being held on 11th November 2020, that may be helpful to officer supporting development of the TIP. It is centred on lessons learned from cohort 1 submissions.

7. Date and Time of Next Meeting

It was agreed that an additional Board meeting on 4th December 2020 would be required. LW suggested that the meeting for the 27th November 2020 would still be useful to give Board members full sight of the outcome of additional project scrutiny. This was agreed. Several Board members remarked it was difficult to fit in extra dates at short notice; but recognise the importance of Board meetings as we reach submission date. IF noted the comment and that the process for TIP submission was almost achieved which would ease time demands moving forwards.

Action: LW to arrange a Board meeting for 4th December 2020 to sign off the TIP prior to submission.



**A place to start,
to stay, to grow!**

Date of Next Meeting

Friday 27 November 2020 via Teams (12:30 – 2:30) review final project list post additional scrutiny and sign off to the draft TIP.

Friday 4th December 2020 (2-3pm) via Teams (Provisional if required for Final TIP Sign Off (aim to submit by 11 December 2020 in Cohort 2a)