

**Loughborough Town Deal
Member Reference Group
2nd November 2021 at 5pm**

Agenda

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Apologies | Councillor Bokor |
| 2. Notes of Previous Meeting | Councillor Bokor |
| 3. Project Update and Next Steps (presentation) | Chris Grace |
| 4. Date of Next Meeting | Councillor Bokor |

Meeting Minutes

PROJECT	Town Deal – Member Reference Group		
DATE	10 February 2021	LOCATION	Virtual meeting using Zoom

Attendees	
Councillor Bokor (Chair)	Lead Member Loughborough
County Councillor Mx Hunt	Loughborough North West
County Councillor Betty Newton	Loughborough North
County Councillor Jewel Miah	Loughborough East
County Councillor Ted Parton	Loughborough South
Councillor Alice Brennan	Loughborough Shelthorpe
Councillor Roy Campsall	Loughborough Garendon
Councillor Sandra Forrest	Loughborough Storer
Councillor Kat Goddard	Loughborough Ashby
Councillor Colin Hamilton	Loughborough Hastings
Councillor Christine Harris	Loughborough Lemyngton
Councillor Paul Mercer	Loughborough Southfields
Councillor Geoff Parsons	Loughborough Nanpantan
Councillor Emma Ward	Dishley and Hathern
Eileen Mallon	Strategic Director of Housing, Planning, Regeneration and Regulatory Services
Chris Grace	Town Deal Project Manager
Richard Bennett	Head of Planning and Regeneration
Sylvia Wright	Head of Leisure and Culture
Sally Watson	Minute Taker (Charnwood Borough Council)

Apologies	
County Councillor Jonathan Morgan	Loughborough South West
County Richard Bailey	Loughborough Outwoods

Meeting Type (Team, Board or other)
Member Reference Group
Meeting Minutes
<p>1. Welcome and Apologies</p> <p>Members confirmed that they were able to see and hear the proceedings and apologies were given as outlined above.</p>
<p>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising</p>

Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th January 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and there were no matters arising.

3. Loughborough Town Investment Plan

Eileen Mallon provided an overview of the Loughborough Town Investment Plan in its current format to enable discussion on the Plan's content before it is put before the Town Deal Board on 15th February 2021.

The group was informed that the document presented was not the final version of the TIP and that further work was ongoing in preparation for submission. The work required was predominantly accessibility, presentation, formatting and the reorganisation of existing content. It had been suggested by MHCLG that the key requirements of the TIP was factual information relating to the challenges and issues that Loughborough faced and how the expenditure of any funds allocated would help to alleviate this. In addition, it was suggested that the revised TIP should include more presentations of data and less text. There was no final decision on the funding ask at this stage, although it was likely to be the £31m figure which was previously submitted.

Comments to inform the revised TIP had been sought from a diverse range of sources, including MHCLG, ARUP, the Town Deal Board, and the Community Engagement Group.

It was highlighted that only six Towns had officially been awarded funding and that over 90 remained in the appraisal process.

The following comments were made by the Member Reference Group.

- i. Members acknowledged and complimented officers on their efforts and work undertaken on the project so far and there was recognition that this had been difficult and labour intensive.
- ii. An enquiry was made regarding the accuracy of the statistics on the percentage of Dishley and Hathern residents with no qualifications (20.3%). The Ward Councillor for this area believed this could be incorrect and asked that this information be checked. It was possible that Dishley and Hathern could have incorrectly been included within the border for the priority area.
- iii. It was suggested that the number of individual projects (17) could be too many, and that the funding and focus could be spread too thinly.
- iv. It was suggested that the Board should consider an ask of £25m as opposed to the £31m currently proposed, as this could give the project an improved chance of funding allocation.

Meeting Minutes

- v. It was highlighted that there was a grammatical error within the last sentence of the Foreword. It was suggested that this sentence be restructured as suggested within the actions agreed.
- vi. Some Members felt that the TIP had become uninspiring following the increase in factual information and presented data within the document. There had been a notable reduction in the emotive and descriptive details of Loughborough. However, it was stated that this was the result of the initial feedback received from MHCLG and that the change had been required for resubmission.
- vii. The flood risk constraints were significant to the TIP as the risk of flooding made some areas within Loughborough difficult to develop. Addressing the flood risk constraints would allow for an increase in the pace of regeneration of the Town. It was recognised that this would not solve all of the issues within the Town but that it would form part of the solution.
- viii. It was suggested that the table containing information on Loughborough Footfall be checked as there could be some inconsistencies in the data.
- ix. There was a suggestion that more detail on the demographics and diversity within Loughborough be included within the TIP, as it was felt that this was not recognisable from the content. It was stated that this information would form part of an Executive Summary, consolidating the essence of Loughborough.
- x. Members requested that they be notified following the submission of the TIP and that a link be circulated allowing access to the final document.

Actions agreed:

1. That the accuracy of statistics on the percentage of Dishley and Hathern residents with no qualifications and that the border outlining the priority area be checked.
2. That the final sentence of the Foreword be restructured as 'by continuing to work together, we are sure that Loughborough will achieve a Town Deal of which we can be proud'.
3. That the accuracy of data contained within the table on Loughborough Footfall be checked.
4. That a link be circulated to Members following the submission of the TIP, allowing access to the final document.

4. Date of Next Meeting

Meeting Minutes

There were currently no meetings scheduled for the Member Reference Group. It was stated that the meetings would continue following the allocation of funding and that these would be scheduled in due course.