

## Meeting Notes

<b>PROJECT</b>	Town Deal – Community Engagement and Consultation Group		
<b>DATE</b>	23 September 2020	<b>LOCATION</b>	Virtual meeting using Zoom

<b>Attendees</b>	
David Pagett-Wright	Chair
Kathy Phillips	Loughborough Heritage Forum
Alison Oliver	Youth Sports Trust
John Hardwick	Federation of Small Businesses
Alan Leather	Canal and River Trust
Kirsty Green	East Midlands Trains
Stephen Marwood	Environment Agency
Jill Vincent	Charnwood Arts
Sue Blount	Kinch Bus
Alison Barlow	Loughborough University
David Ellard	Great Central Railway
Ian McKellar	LATi
Lisa Brown	Love Loughborough
John Byrne	Youth Sport Trust
Michael Wilby	Bell Foundry Trust
Wendy Dalrymple	Rector
Mark Greenwood	NHS Property Services
Chrissie Van Mierlo	Bell Foundry Trust
Ross Ingham	Bell Foundry Trust
Eileen Mallon	Strategic Director of Housing, Planning, Regeneration and Regulatory Services
Richard Bennett	Head of Planning and Regeneration Services
David Marlow	Third Life Economics (Consultant)
Sally Watson	Minute Taker (CBC)

<b>Apologies</b>	
Gosia Khrais	Loughborough Campus
Chris Grace	Loughborough Town Deal Project Manager
Sylvia Wright	Head of Leisure and Culture (CBC)
Mike Roberts	Communications Manager (CBC)

<b>Meeting Type (Team, Board or other)</b>
Community Engagement and Consultation Group
<b>Meeting Notes</b>
<b>1. Welcome and Apologies</b>

## Meeting Notes

Apologies were noted as above and members of the group introduced themselves.

### 2. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 17th July 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and there were no matters arising.

### 3. Project Overview and Update

Richard Bennett provided an overview of the status of the project including information on timelines and deadlines, Board decisions, the Investment Plan, the Upfront Capital Projects Funding and an updated risk register.

It was highlighted that the financial ask of the four schemes selected for the Upfront Capital Projects funding equated to more than the advised allocation of £750,000. He advised the Council will use deliverability and value for money as key indicators in the selection process and further procurement work would be undertaken in order to establish the final costings.

**Recommendation Agreed:** That the Community Engagement and Consultation Group noted the content of the report.

### 4. ARUP 'Check and Challenge' Report

Richard Bennett provided an overview of the feedback obtained from ARUP, one of the Government provided advisors to Towns in the Town Fund process, on the part 1 Town Investment Plan for Loughborough, which covered vision and strategy only, not the projects themselves. It was noted that the focus of the second 'check and challenge' session, which would take place on 5th October 2020 would be the projects themselves. Detailed business cases on each project would then need to be developed over the following months from submission of the TIP.

It was highlighted that although the Council was the co-ordinating authority, the basket of projects were not owned by the Council. The Council was in an appraisal process to determine the viability of the projects submitted.

**Recommendation Agreed:** That the Community Consultation and Engagement Group notes the content of this report.

### 5. Town Deal TIP – Project Prioritisation Process

Richard Bennett introduced the report providing an update on the progress made towards the production of Loughborough's Town Investment Plan. A presentation was delivered by Consultant David Marlow, providing an update on project proposals which had been received from stakeholders and the wider public and outlined the arrangements for prioritising projects.

It was considered that Loughborough as a sub-regionally important place should be the focus in a post-pandemic environment as a stepping stone to a longer term vision of Loughborough being an 'Active Healthy Living' demonstrator.

## Meeting Notes

The deadline for project submissions was 31st August 2020 and on 4th September 2020, 25 submissions had been received, amounting to £57.4m of capital and around £3m of revenue. The total package with leverage was £116m. A new submission template had been devised by Government and project owners had been asked to resubmit their bids using this new template. following this. It was anticipated that an appraisal and prioritisation process would be required and that the Town Deal Board would need to endorse this. There was also an expectation that capital and revenue asks would need to be significantly reduced.

Projects that had been submitted included the following;

Project	Outline	Project	Outline
Charnwood Campus	Refurb and equipping three buildings. No real match. Needs a lot of work and scaling back	POD ZERO4	BID scheme – driverless cars in TC. Could go with Electric or Living L'boro. Needs legislation
Cattlemarket	Redevt of Sital and Ashe House(s) sites. Needs a lot of further work - possible Developer Accelerator contribution?	Employability & Life Skills	Youth Services Trust. Strong proposition to connect Sports Park tenants with local disadvantaged YP
Sports Park 4	LUSEP building – possibly now funded by LLEP Getting Building Funding	Observatory	LU evidence and policy hub. Liked a lot by Govt Delivery team. May be able to increase UKRI match
CBC Asset rationalisation	CBC redevt of Limehurst, Southfields and Town Hall – possible Developer Accelerator contribution?	LU Wayfinder	LU Business Accelerator – related to TC Careers & Jobs Hub – revenue ask unclear
Nottingham Rd Corridor	CBC application but may need LCC delivery	Public Realm	Canal Path (C&RT applicant), Lanes, Bedford Square, Queens Park and Rectory Garden (CBC)
Connected Loughborough	LU application for smart sustainable corridor – but may need LCC delivery. Revenue requirement tbc	Heritage Quarter	Bell Foundry, Generator and GCR – 1 <sup>st</sup> two very HF match dependent
Living Loughborough	BID-led TC improvements – needs budget breakdowns and revenue clarity	Early Wins 2020/21	Limehurst demolition and TC Careers & Jobs Hub (College applicant)
College Digital Skills Hub	Strong scheme with good match. Highly deliverable	<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	
Flood Protection	Environment Agency – strong, deliverable scheme and important for town resilience	<b>DEVELOPER ACCELERATOR</b>	<b>Balancing item/device to pump prime devts like Cattlemarket, EVOLVE, CBC Asset rat'n etc</b>
Electric Loughborough	EVs, charging points etc. Might include CBC Granby scheme. Electric Blue applicant.	<b>MICROPROJECTS</b>	<b>A small grants scheme for community projects, retail repurposing and SME relocations</b>

Some of the themes identified through the projects submitted included;

- Enterprise projects (Charnwood Campus, Sports Park 4, Loughborough University Wayfinder)
- Urban regeneration development projects (Cattle market, CBC Asset Rationalisation)
- Transport and corridor projects (Nottingham Road Corridor, Connected Loughborough)
- Town Centre revitalisation projects (Living Loughborough, POD ZERO4)
- Skills projects (College Digital Skills Hub, Employability and Life Skills)
- Foundation projects (Flood Protection, Observatory)

## Meeting Notes

- Clean and Green projects (Electric Loughborough)
- Heritage and Culture projects (Heritage Quarter)
- Public Realm projects (Public Realm)

A Developer Accelerator grant had also been put forward in order to encourage private sector schemes to participate who by virtue of the pandemic had not been able to fully develop proforma.

It was suggested that projects were assessed by Charnwood Borough Council Officers against the criteria set by Government. These assessments would then be reviewed by a Town Deal Board sub group of Co-Chairs and the Chairs of the Member Reference Group and the Community Consultation and Engagement Group and the LLEP and County Council Board representatives. The minimum assessment criteria was outlined and it was emphasised that each criterion had an equal weighting;

- Alignment with the Government intervention framework
- Strategic, evidence-based, place focused rationale – including the Loughborough four pillars.
- Scale of outputs and outcomes, realism of theory of change
- Deliverability, risks and match funding
- Cost comparison (value for money presumably compared to other Town Deal TIPs)
- Contribution to post-Covid 19 recovery plans and mitigation of recovery risks.

With regards to 'exceptional' bids for higher funding, it was stated that some Towns were more suited to this level of funding due to population sizes. It would be communicated to Government that there had been a substantial appraisal and prioritisation process, and should the Board consider the projects to be suitable, then a higher level of funding than £25m could be requested. However, there would be no certainty that this request would be successful. The Council would need to demonstrate credibility in the appraisal process and the focus should be on compiling the most compelling and deliverable programme.

The concept of aggregating projects where appropriate was possible. Loughborough was required to articulate a plan for review by Government and if there was value in aggregation then this was encouraged.

Negotiation timeframes between Government and the Council were anticipated to take place towards the end of the year, as part of the second tranche of submissions. Following this, there would be a maximum of 12 months to compile a business case. It was recognised that it would be beneficial to demonstrate a good level of ambition at the point of submission, as there would be feedback provided by Government, and an opportunity for some reconfiguration.

**Recommendation Agreed:** That the Community Engagement and Consultation Group note

## Meeting Notes

the progress made so far on the TIP and the proposed arrangements for prioritising projects.

### **6. Any Other Business**

There were connectivity issues and the meeting ended during this item.