

Loughborough Town Deal Board

15th February 2021

10.00am Virtual Meeting, Charnwood Borough Council, Southfields, Loughborough

Agenda

Item	Subject	Page #	Action
1	Apologies	-	
2	Draft minutes of the previous meeting & matters arising	2 - 6	
3	Declarations of Interest	-	
4	Loughborough Town Deal Investment Plan – REPORT TO FOLLOW		
5	AOB	-	
	Future meeting dates: 26th March 2021	-	

Meeting minutes

PROJECT	Town Deal		
DATE	22nd January 2021	LOCATION	Virtual meeting using Zoom

Attendees	
Board Members	
Cllr Jonathan Morgan (Co-Chair)	Charnwood Borough Council
Cllr Jenny Bokor	Chair of MRG
Prof. Tracy Bhamra	Loughborough University
Lez Cope Newman	Loughborough BID
Jane Hunt MP	MP for Loughborough
Jo Maher	Loughborough College
David Pagett-Wright	Chair of CECG
Cllr TJ Pendleton, CC	Leicestershire County Council
Andy Reed	LLEP
Martin Traynor	Economy & Skills Group
Officer Attendees	
Rob Mitchell	Charnwood Borough Council
Eileen Mallon	Charnwood Borough Council
Richard Bennett	Charnwood Borough Council
Chris Grace	Charnwood Borough Council
Mike Roberts	Charnwood Borough Council
Sylvia Wright	Charnwood Borough Council
Helen Harris	Leicestershire County Council
Mandip Rai	LLEP
Jo Dexter & David Wright	BEIS
Nicky Conway	Minute Taker (Charnwood Borough Council)

Apologies
Dr Nik Kotecha, Tom Purnell (Helen Harris acting as substitute)

Meeting Type (Team, Board or other)
Board Meeting

Meeting minutes

Meeting Minutes
<p>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed as a correct record.</p> <p>Matters arising – item 6 – Future resources for delivery of a Town Deal – it was noted that officers would submit a report to the Board setting out the status of each project when it was more appropriate, as it would be premature to do so at this stage in the process.</p> <p>All other matters arising were confirmed as complete.</p>
<p>3. Declarations of Interest</p> <p>none</p>
<p>4. Loughborough Town Investment Plan (item 4 on agenda)</p> <p>Eileen Mallon introduced this report and shared a presentation detailing the changes between the original submitted plan and the current one in draft. She drew the Board’s attention to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• that the draft of the Loughborough Town Investment Plan (TIP) was still in development but it was important for the Board to see the structure of the draft plan and what had changed from the original submission.• that the written feedback received had been concise and further discussions had occurred with BEIS and ARUP; a ‘check and challenge session’ had been arranged for 5th February 2021.• the document would be professionally designed before submission which would neaten the diagrams and charts.• some areas still required completing, such as ‘Loughborough in context’ to include communities and socio-economic detail. However, the focus had been to ensure the structure of the document was clear and flowed well, with the ‘golden thread’ more evident linking projects to the vision. Initial feedback from BEIS and ARUP suggested the flow of the document and the clarity of the ‘golden thread’ had significantly improved.• a range of successful TIPs had been reviewed and although it was complex due to the different nature of the towns submitting plans, examples of good practice had been utilised in the Loughborough TIP.• it was important to understand that the consultations that had been completed, and the projects included in the original draft could not be altered, but the new structure of the document enabled the information to be presented more clearly.• the TIP was in its final stages of development and further enhancement now would hopefully score extra points although it was worth noting that the scoring criteria had not been shared. <p>Board Members raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether there would be further enhancements to the project information and inclusion of more detail for each project. It was important to be clear with the outcome for each project and how they would impact the town, how they linked to the golden thread and mitigated some of the issues in the town. It was understood that some of the projects were

Meeting minutes

conceptual and included less detail and there was still more work that could be carried out, in particular the Summary list would be expanded. The projects would be linked clearly back to the SWOT analysis and woven into the document to give a direct link to the vision.

- although it was noted that the healthy living strand was no longer central to the TIP, it could be further highlighted and strengthened in all projects. In relation to the Theory of Change diagram, the projects linked to poor health indicators in areas of deprivation appeared to be weak. It could be beneficial to itemise how other projects (not included in the TIP) would also support the healthy living strand.
- that the Theory of Change diagram was much improved and better than its predecessor, in particular in relation to the public realm projects and how the outcomes were now clearly identified.
- that the shape of the draft was more user friendly and comprehensive, the vision was clearer and the golden thread more evident.
- the 'global status' concept from the original submitted TIP had been perceived as too ambitious, it was necessary to describe Loughborough clearly and where it was located in the area as the assessors would be reviewing many documents and were unlikely to have visited the town.
- In relation to the feedback to provide the 'TIP on a page', more detail could be included in the Summary of Projects chart around what the project was, what the costs were and how it would impact on Loughborough and that it might be more appropriate if it was in landscape. This would set out clearly what the TIP was requesting and how it would solve identified issues. Although the wording below the Summary of Projects chart did explain in more detail, it would be easier if the information was located in the chart only, placed earlier in the document which would show how proud and confident Loughborough were in asking for the funding. It was noted that the chart was still in development, and once the document was professionally designed the diagrams and charts would be more prominent. Officers would review the best location for the diagram once the TIP was close to final but understood how it could provide a 'TIP on a page'. Jo Dexter from BEIS noted that having assessed other TIPs, it could be really impactful to have the chart at the front of the document and as the passion of the Board for the town was evident, it should be clearly highlighted in the TIP.
- it needed to be clear what the return on investment was in the Foreword. More data could be collated behind the scenes and this could be completed by Loughborough College. It was key to be concise about what was being asked for and what the funding would deliver. Match funding also required including.
- it was vital to formulate a cohesive university 'sport' element in the TIP. It was noted that the 'sport' element did not just relate to playing sport but also included excellent research, and how this benefited the whole town should be clarified in the TIP. As Loughborough University was ranked the world's number one for sports and members of the public would link sport to the town, it would be disappointing to not emphasize this in the TIP as part of the uniqueness of Loughborough.
- the Flood alleviation scheme required further clarity and it was noted that the flood zone matched closely with the areas of deprivation in the town. With regard to the Observatory project, this was under discussion with the University to ensure the benefits to the town were highlighted.
- that the use of phrasing and words in the TIP was key to its success; a sentence in the Foreword was highlighted as an example.
- it would be beneficial to tabulate other funding also obtained.

Meeting minutes

Eileen Mallon stated that she appreciated the support she had received already from Board Members and that further contributions would be most welcome. She explained that the TIP, as seen by the Board, would be circulated to the Member Reference Group and Community Consultation and Engagement Group after the meeting. Members of these groups would be asked to provide written feedback which would in turn be shared with the Board at its next meeting.

Board members thanked officers for their hard work and effort in amending the TIP. The Board noted it had not been an easy task but the draft presented at this meeting was significantly improved and easier to read and understand.

Jo Dexter (BEIS) stated it was important to acknowledge all the work done and that the current draft was more accessible, the Theory of Change diagram much clearer and a key part of the plan. Also it would be important to include funding that had already gone into Loughborough sport and map these projects in addition to proposed projects.

Rob Mitchell stated the meeting had been very positive and it was good to get the Board Members input. He endorsed the comments made by the Board and was encouraged that the plan was on the right track. He reflected that the work carried out by officers had been against the backdrop of a pandemic, flooding issues and fulfilling day to day work.

Recommendation Agreed:

1. That agreement is given to the overall approach being taken to re-draft the TIP;
2. That the new structure and amended vision for Loughborough contained within the TIP first re-draft is agreed;
3. That, subject to recommendations 1. and 2. above being agreed, the redrafted TIP is referred to the Member Reference Group and Community Engagement Group for their observations; feedback to the Board to be provided by the Groups' Chairs.

5. AOB

In response to a request by a member of the Board, Jo Maher provided an update on the Careers and Skill Hub. She shared a plan of the ground and first floor of the building and explained what was being done for each area. The project was on track and had not been delayed due to COVID as the building was currently empty. The first tranche of money for fitting out the ground floor was being managed carefully to see if equipment could be purchased to fit out the upstairs as well. A pilot of different opening times would be run to prioritise footfall. Rob Mitchell stated that more work than expected had been required on the roof but that the project was within expected costs.

Helen Harris requested that the Town Investment Plan be shared with Leicestershire County Council before the next meeting if feedback from the Highways Department was required.

Meeting minutes

6. Date of Future Meetings

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 15th February 2021.

Follow up actions

ITEM 4 – Loughborough Town Deal Plan

1

That Board members continue to provide suggestions for amending the draft Town Investment Plan, and that in particular:

- Jo Maher to review the BID to simplify if possible, using her BID writing expertise and as fresh pair of eyes,
- Tracy Bhamra to provide wording around the University excellence in sports research,
- Cllr Pendleton to provide wording as mentioned in the meeting for amending in the Foreword.