

Loughborough Town Deal Board

2nd October 2020

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

Agenda

Item	Subject	Page #	Action
1	Apologies	-	
2	Minutes of the previous meeting & matters arising	2 - 9	
3	Declarations of Interest	-	
4	Project Overview Update	10 - 15	Decision
5	Revisions to Board Terms of Reference	16 - 24	Decision
6	Arup 'Check and Challenge' Report	25 - 36	Decision
7	Project Appraisal Process	37 - 38	Decision
8	Final Draft Town Deal Investment Plan	39 - 40	Decision
9	AOB	-	
10	Future meeting dates 27th November 2020, 22nd January 2021, 26th March 2021	-	

Meeting minutes

PROJECT	Town Deal		
DATE	24 July 2020	LOCATION	Virtual meeting using Zoom

Attendees	
Board Members	
Dr Nik Kotecha (Co-Chair)	Morningside Pharmaceuticals
Cllr Jonathan Morgan (Co-Chair)	Charnwood Borough Council
Cllr Jenny Bokor	Chair of MRG
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
Richard Taylor	Loughborough University
Officer Attendees	
Rob Mitchell	Charnwood Borough Council
Eileen Mallon	Charnwood Borough Council
Richard Bennett	Charnwood Borough Council
Sylvia Wright	Charnwood Borough Council
Mike Roberts	Charnwood Borough Council
Chris Grace	Charnwood Borough Council
Helen Harris	Leicestershire County Council
David Marlow	Third Life Economics (Consultant)
Nicky Conway	Minute Taker (Charnwood Borough Council)

Apologies	
	Leicestershire County Council
Professor Tracy Bhamra <i>(Richard Taylor acting as substitute)</i>	Loughborough University
Tom Purnell <i>(Helen Harris acting as substitute)</i>	Leicestershire County Council
Mandip Rai	LLEP
Andy Reed <i>(Dr Nik Kotecha acting as substitute)</i>	LLEP
Peter Sutton	BEIS/Communities
Martin Traynor	Economy & Skills Group

Meeting Type (Team, Board or other)
Board Meeting

Meeting minutes

Meeting Minutes

2. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed as a correct record and there were no matters arising not covered by future items on the agenda.

3. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest. However, during item 7 (Upfront Projects Funding), Jo Maher declared a conflict of interest in this item.

Cllr Trevor Pendleton noted that his register of members Interest form required completing.

4. Project Overview Update

Chris Grace (TD Project Manager) presented this update. He drew the Board's attention to the key points in the report and stated the following:

- several project proposals from CECG, other stakeholders and the public had been received by the cut-off date of 10th July but some organisations had submitted proposals after this date. On 13th July a decision was made by the Co-chairs to submit the Town Investment Plan in the second cohort (by end of October 2020).
- The meeting with ARUP had been very encouraging about the approach being taken by Loughborough.
- a review of the Towns Fund guidance from the Government suggested that the approach being taken was consistent with the objectives of the Towns Fund. Town Deal locations were required to take into account the COVID impact on the local economy and to show evidence in the plan how projects would support economic recovery.

Board Members raised the following points:

- whether submission of the plan in cohort 2 would potentially require additional documentation as the town fund approach was further clarified by the Government – this was unlikely, the meeting with ARUP had made it very clear that there was no advantage to submitting in earlier cohorts, it was more critical to have a robust investment plan which would be considered on its own merit.
- that submitted plans in cohort 1 could be of an experimental nature and the numbers proposed for submission to that cohort were low. If the Loughborough investment plan was finalised before the end of October it could be submitted earlier.
- that the MRG had considered it advantageous to submit the plan in cohort 2. The plans submitted in cohort 1 could be available to the public for viewing and it was possible that they could inform the Loughborough plan going forward.
- that the Board wished to explore the opportunities offered by the Government indicating there was £50million available in the Towns Fund to bid for.

Recommendations Agreed:

1. That the Board considers the content of this report and agrees that early discussions are held with the Towns Hub support function in order to develop a plan of key

Meeting minutes

milestones for submitting the town investment plan before 31 October 2020.

2. That Endorsement is given to the decision to submit Loughborough's Town Investment Plan in Cohort 2 by 31st October 2020.

5. Public Consultation Activity and Outcomes

Mike Roberts (Communications Manager) presented this report. He drew the Board's attention to the key points in the report and highlighted the key outcomes from the MEL Research report attached at appendix 1. He noted that the findings as summarised would be used to formulate the Town Investment Plan.

David Marlow noted that he had attended all 6 Focus groups, the Virtual Chat session and 2 CECG meetings. He stated that two distinct views had been identified; those who wished to see the town return to its "sleepy market town" persona that they had grown up with, and others who saw Loughborough as a modern dynamic forward-thinking location. It was necessary to reconcile these perspectives to capture the intimacy and comfort of the historically provincial town with the dynamism of a forward-thinking centre that pushed boundaries.

The Chair of CECG updated the Board with key points from the last meeting of the Group. He stated that:

- CECG had raised concerns about the need to address COVID recovery issues but not to distract from the long-term regeneration plans for the town.
- it was important to understand how COVID had affected different business sectors but acknowledged this would difficult to predict at present.
- green technology projects would be a good return on investment and that the arts and heritage projects submitted were more robust.
- other funding sources should be considered for match funding, in particular, the Government's Arts, Culture and Heritage funding.
- there was a concern that the shortfall of number and value of projects submitted could reflect a need for assistance by organisations in finalising their project plans to meet the requirements of the Town Deal fund.

The Chair of MRG explained that the Group considered there were limited employment opportunities identified and run-down areas of the town had not been included in the proposals. It was important to achieve a balance between proposals for physical regeneration and for investment in people to ensure that social mobility issues and employment gaps were addressed. Eileen Mallon confirmed that the town deal funding was primarily designed for capital investment schemes with elements of revenue and although capital investment projects could be included, the added value, benefits of investment for individuals and improvement in areas would need to be demonstrated.

Board Members raised the following points:

- the report was very extensive and although some of the comments were negative, the majority of comments showed good support for the plan. The Board acknowledged the conflicting views highlighted by the consultation outcomes.

Meeting minutes

- that businesses in Loughborough were anxious about surviving after COVID. Reassurance was sought that long-term projects would be balanced alongside additional help with short term post COVID issues. The government guidance was clear that the plan had to demonstrate the impact of COVID and provision of support for economic recovery.
- that meetings between charities in the East of Loughborough and the College had been initiated. Feedback had suggested that a user-friendly location in the town centre for careers, employability and enterprise support would be beneficial. The College considered this to be critical to their role of supporting post COVID recovery and would be funding this project from its own revenue, potentially with some external capital funding support. It was noted that Loughborough Councillors would welcome the creation of a job advice and training Hub in the town centre.
- that there were employment and networking opportunities through the HS2 project.

Recommendations Agreed:

1. That the outcomes of the public consultation were welcomed as a useful part of the town deal process;
2. That Third Life Economics utilises the consultation outcomes in formulating the drafting of the Town Investment Plan.
3. That the draft consultation outcomes report produced by MEL Research is approved as the formal consultation report which will inform the Town Investment Plan.

6. Town Deal Investment Plan

Eileen Mallon introduced this report and stated that the Council had been working with David Marlow to refine the next stage. A review of the proposals received so far indicated there were some gaps, particularly from certain organisations and private sector investors. There was an opportunity to work with the County Council regarding cycle ways and green infrastructure projects.

The Board were updated with key themes from the recent meeting with ARUP as follows:

- that there was a real sense of enthusiasm about the Loughborough bid and that Loughborough had progressed significantly further than other town deal bids.
- the range and depth of the consultation process and the structure used for engaging with stakeholders was welcomed, in particular, the extensive engagement of the community with the process despite the difficulties presented by social distancing rules.
- that the projects would be subject to greater scrutiny if the Town Investment Plan wished to be ambitious and bid for the maximum of £50million.
- there was a need to ensure the Town Deal was part of a wider strategic solution and framework. As the Town Deal linked strongly with the Town Centre Master Plan, the Council's Local Plan and other partner strategies this indicated that the ambition of the Town Deal was robust.

David Marlow showed a presentation to highlight the salient points of the Town Investment Plan (TIP) process (attached to these minutes) and drew the Board's attention to the following:

Meeting minutes

- the unique selling point of Loughborough was active healthy living which resonated with the activities in the town.
- the town's assets and capabilities tended not to be in the town centre, it was a challenge of the plan to link the College, the University and Enterprise Zone with communities and the town.
- there was a need to improve the town centre and its distinctive character, noting that the town had national and regional significance and was the only Town Deal location with a top 10 university.
- although short of £25 million, the proposals received were from good applicants, with a strong foundation and breadth of project schemes represented.

Board Members raised the following points:

- that as the Government had recently announced extra funding for cycle routes, it would be advantageous to access this funding source. A project for cycle ways would need to be submitted by local towns or parishes to the County Council and it was critical to have the County Council's involvement.
- this presented a fantastic opportunity to develop a green agenda for the town. Suggestions included cycle paths along Alan Moss road to the train station, linking the university to the town and transport locations, creating a green bridge over Epinal way and using active landscaping to create a green corridor. A wildflower verges scheme was being initiated by the County Council. It was noted that two projects submitted by the Borough Council (the Lanes and Bedford Square project) included connectivity through the town for pedestrians and provided an opportunity to explore the town's cultural heritage.
- there were opportunities to encourage more private investment through the East Midlands Engine, Western Power and Regional Cycling groups. In addition, third party investment in the University Campus could be leveraged to support private investment in the town.
- the importance of the narrative and strategy in this bid to stand out from others - it was noted that the narrative for active living, green agenda and connectivity was compelling and that the town should bid for £50million. Recent data released relating to obesity suggested the relevance of a health agenda.
- there was a need to have clear terminology in the investment plan and to be sure of its meaning. Although it was acknowledged the audience for the plan would be Government officials, the plan should be understandable by everyone and it was recommended that an easy to read guide was created online.
- an explanation of what the Town Deal Observatory project involved was given. It was noted that although a small project it could be particularly relevant for other towns and work as a pilot.
- that the feedback regarding the town centre looking tired and unsafe would be taken on board in the assessment of the project proposals. It was noted that most short-term solutions were revenue based and there was a need for caution in encouraging more footfall in the present circumstances. However, the long-term plan, with support from businesses, was to create a vibrant night-time economy with a broad range of people in the town centre from early evening until late.
- that the discussions relating to green agenda, smart innovation and healthy living aligned with the LLEP strategy.

It was noted that a future meeting between the Borough Council, the County Council, the

Meeting minutes

College and the University would be necessary to consider projects such as cycling routes, linking the University, town centre and train station and the traffic flow issues on Epinal Way. It was agreed that the Board should look at the area around the Train station and how to link it easily with the Town centre.

Recommendations Agreed:

1. That the approach being taken to further develop the Town Investment Plan as described in this report and at Appendix 2 be approved;
2. That an evaluation of project proposals is carried out by Third Life Economics and sent to the Board for its comment, prior to a further draft of the Town Investment Plan being submitted to the next Board meeting on 25th September 2020;
3. That the Board comments and provides further shaping on the narrative they wish to see supporting the Town Deal and forming the contextual and strategic backdrop to specific project proposals;
4. That Lessons from Cohort One Town Deal proposals and subsequent advice from Government should be applied when developing the criteria which will be used to assess which projects should be included with the Town Investment Plan.

7. Upfront Projects Funding

Chris Grace and Eileen Mallon introduced this report and stated that, as a Town Deal location, 'upfront' grant funding had been allocated to Loughborough to help kick start economic recovery and get shovel ready projects underway. The allocation of £750K was based on the town's population size and the schemes had to be completed by March 2021.

The short timescale was challenging, and the Council was required to inform the Government if it wished to accept the money by 14th August. Projects identified had to demonstrate a link to the Town Investment Plan and be consistent with thematic priorities. Projects already submitted and others that the Council were aware of would be considered to see if they could be delivered within the timescale. An example of a scheme was a careers and enterprise hub which like all other projects would be appraised against its fit with the Town Deal priorities. It was noted that projects that added value in terms of jobs and careers to aid COVID recovery were likely to take precedence. Appraisal criteria would be designed to enable the Council to demonstrate why certain projects had been chosen. Any projects which pushed the capital above the £750K would be put forward as a TIP bid.

Consultation with Board Members regarding projects would occur via email and any comments they wished to make in this meeting. It was noted that final approval of how the grant would be spent was the Council's responsibility.

In response to a question by the Board, it was explained that ideas not yet converted into shovel ready projects would not be considered due to the requirement to fully deliver projects by 31st March 2021. However, organisations with ideas not fully realised were encouraged to submit a proposal to the TIP. It was vital that projects were delivered within the timescale and related to the categories stated in the letter from MHCLG or in the Towns Fund guidance

Meeting minutes

Intervention Framework.

Before the recommendation was agreed Jo Maher declared a conflict of interest and didn't vote as the College was involved in one of the project proposals.

Recommendation agreed: That the Board welcomed the availability of the grant and asks the Borough Council to consult closely with the Board in deciding which project or projects should potentially be eligible for the grant funding.

8. Projects Resources Update

David Marlow left the meeting at this point due to the discussion around the extension of the contract period for Third Life Economics.

Richard Bennett introduced this report and highlighted its key points. It was noted that the extension to the contract of Third Life Economics would be within the original £64,000 allocated, which had included a contingency element.

In response to a question by the Board, officers stated that there was no expectation that expenditure on capacity for delivering the town deal project would go beyond £162K and the project was still within the budget envelope. However, as no further capacity funding had been allocated by the Government beyond 31st March and it was likely that some projects might still be ongoing at this date, additional resource could be required going forward. The Chief Executive suggested that towards the year end it would be beneficial for the Board to review the situation.

Recommendations agreed:

1. That the commitments and expenditure against the budget are noted;
2. That an additional £8k of capacity funding, to extend the secondment of the current post holder in the role of Town Deal Project Manager from 31 July 2020 to 31 March 2021, be approved;
3. That the intention to extend the contract period for Third Life Economics beyond 31 July 2020 be noted.

9. Date of Future Meetings

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 25th September 2020.

10. AOB

It was noted that proposals for the Limehurst Depot linked with environmental agency projects and flood mitigation. It was part of the Council's project portfolio but as there were concerns about making the site viable for development due to flooding issues, it was unlikely to be a priority for the upfront projects funding.

Follow up actions

Meeting minutes

Follow up actions	
1	<u>ITEM 3 – Declarations of Interest</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to forward copy of Register of Members’ Interests form to Cllr Pendleton for completion.
2	<u>ITEM 6 – Town Investment Plan</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future meeting to be arranged between the Borough Council, the County Council, the College and the University to consider highways, cycling and green corridor projects, (Cllr Pendleton to liaise). • Rob Mitchell to discuss the Council’s licensing strategy with regard to how best to encourage the Town Centre’s night-time economy with Cllr Bokor. • Officers in consultation with the Board to explore linkage between the Train Station and the Town Centre with the County Council.
3	<u>ITEM 7- Upfront Projects Funding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane Hunt MP to encourage organisations in contact with her with ideas to submit a bid to the Town Deal.

LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN DEAL BOARD

2nd October 2020

Item 4 – Project Overview Update

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report gives an overview of the current status of project activity which is in place in order to produce Loughborough's Town Investment Plan.

Recommendation:

That the Town Deal Board notes the content of this report and the revised milestone activities and dates.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Loughborough Town Deal Board is responsible, in conjunction with Charnwood Borough Council as Lead Council, for securing a Town Deal for Loughborough, worth up to £25 million. In 'exceptional circumstances' the Government will potentially agree a deal worth up to £50 million. Production of an Investment Plan and its submission to Government will complete Phase 1 of the overall Town Deal process.
- 2.3 The Covid-19 pandemic has affected all elements of society and this included the ability of government to issue further Towns Fund guidance on the timeline originally planned and to get the Towns Hub function up and running. Work on the town deal has been progressing in the context of the pandemic and not being able to engage with the public, stakeholders, consultants and project sponsors in the ways which would normally be efficiently deployed.
- 2.3 Since the Board last met on 24th July, there have been many areas of action, much work has been undertaken and further guidance and advice has been received from the Government and its Towns Hub support function. This report highlights what has been happening.

3. Timelines and Milestones

- 3.1 The Town Deal Board agreed at its meeting on 29th January 2020 that an investment plan should be produced and recommended for approval by 31st July 2020.

- 3.2 Following the meeting of the Board on 12th June 2020 and the approval of the investment plan proposition draft a period of consultation took place. Stakeholders and the wider public were also asked to put forward project proposals which could potentially be suitable for the investment plan. They were asked to complete a project proforma by no later than 10th July 2020.
- 3.3 On 13th July 2020 a decision was taken to submit the Town Deal Investment Plan in the second Cohort before 31st October 2020. That decision was endorsed by the Town Deal Board on 24th July 2020.
- 3.4 A proposal for the vision and strategy of a Town Investment Plan was considered by the Town Deal Board on 24th July 2020. The approach was approved.
- 3.5 On 24th August Officers shared the emerging draft of the investment plan with Arup, one of the government's Towns Fund Delivery Partners commissioned to provide help and support. As part of that support package Arup provided the first of two 'check and challenge' sessions for the emerging Investment Plan on 27th August. A report on that meeting is provided at item 6 on this agenda. The second check and challenge session is planned to be held on 5th October 2020.
- 3.6 On 23rd September 2020 the Cities and Local Growth Team of MHCLG contacted the Council to advise it of a governance audit it had undertaken along with a review of the website. The audit found areas for improvement and these are addressed in the report at item 5 on this agenda.
- 3.7 The table below shows the current updated key milestones which lead to the investment plan being delivered. Changes have been made to project milestones to accommodate partners' desire for more time to refine project proforma submissions and to build in a process to assess projects against prioritisation criteria as agreed at the Board meeting in July 2020.

Objective / Activity	Deliverable	Indicative Programme	Responsibility
Inception Meeting (virtual)	Contract signed off	w/c 20 April 2020	Consultant / CBC COMPLETE
Desktop analysis and engagement with stakeholders, other consultants and CBC		22 April – 22 May 2020	Consultant(s)

Objective / Activity	Deliverable	Indicative Programme	Responsibility
officers. Evaluation of projects ideas.			COMPLETE
Draft Investment Plan Proposition submitted to CBC	Draft Investment Plan Proposition Document	1 June 2020	Consultant COMPLETE
Draft Investment Plan Proposition considered by Board for approval		12 June 2020	CBC COMPLETE
Consultation seeking comments from Board, stakeholders, Member Reference Group, Community Engagement Group and wider public		15 June – 3 July	Consultant(s) / CBC COMPLETE
Revisions to and development of Investment Plan document, informed by the consultation feedback		6 July – 30 September 2020	Consultant COMPLETE
Deadline for submission of bids for consideration		31 August 2020	Consultant COMPLETE
First 'Check and Challenge' session with ARUP (part 1 TIP – vision and strategy)	Report	27 August 2020	Consultant /CBC COMPLETE
Proposed draft Investment Plan document submitted to CBC officers for comment	Proposed Draft Investment Plan	30 September 2020	Consultant COMPLETE
Town Deal Sub Group meet to consider project prioritisation	Final list of projects for the TIP	30 September 2020	Consultant /CBC COMPLETE
Presentation of draft Investment Plan to Board for approval, subject to revisions required following ARUP second check and challenge session	draft Investment Plan	2 October 2020	Consultant / CBC
Second 'Check and Challenge' Session with ARUP (part 2 – projects)	Report	5 October 2020	Consultant /CBC
Final Investment Plan approved by Chair and Co-Chair for submission to	Final Investment Plan	12 October 2020	Consultant/CBC

Objective / Activity	Deliverable	Indicative Programme	Responsibility
MHCLG			

4. The Board

- 4.1 The Town Deal Board last met on 24th July 2020 and the minutes and matters arising are included at Item 2 on this Agenda.

5. Member Reference Group

- 5.1 This Group last met on 21st September 2020 and the minutes have been published on the Loughborough Town Deal Website.
- 5.2 The Member Reference Group received a summary of the Arup first 'check and challenge' session. There was a discussion about the feedback including the opportunities to further integrate the university into the town. They also received a presentation from Third Life Economics summarising the submitted TIP projects.

6. Community Engagement Group

- 6.1 The Community Engagement Group met on 23rd September 2020. The Group received the same reports as the Member Reference Group.

7. Investment Plan

- 7.1 Consultant David Marlow of Third Life Economics has continued to engage with a wide range of organisations and individuals to identify and refine projects which could form the foundations of the town investment plan. The deadline for project submissions was extended to 31st August 2020 although submissions were accepted up to 4 September given the bank holiday.
- 7.2 The headlines are that at 25 September 2020, 25 project proforma with a collective 'ask' of £57.2m in a total programme of nearly £120m. £53.8m in capital and £3.4m in revenue. This amounts to a very significant basket of projects that exceeds even the government's definition of an 'exceptional bid'. It should be noted a number of submissions were made beyond 4 September and the project team has done its best to accommodate these.
- 7.3 In line with the Board decision at its meeting in July 2020, lessons from Cohort One Town Deal proposals and subsequent advice from

Government have been applied in developing the criteria used to assess which projects should be included in the Town Investment Plan. Officers from the Project Team met on 25th September to assess projects and made their recommendations to a Sub-Group of the Town Deal Board on 30th September. This is described in the report item 7 on the agenda.

- 7.4 David Marlow of Third Life Economics Ltd has continued to refine the part 1 TIP in line with advice from ARUP, lessons learned from Cohort 1 and government advice. The draft investment plan will be presented to the Board on 2nd October seeking its endorsement. This version of the TIP will be shared with ARUP for the second check and challenge session on 5 October and any further revisions required will be made in consultation with the Chair and Co-Chair of the Board. The TIP will then be finalised for design and print before submission to Government by the end of October 2020.

8. Communications and Public Engagement

- 8.1 The town deal website was launched in June 2020 and can be viewed at www.loughborough.co.uk
- 8.2 Consideration is being given to the format and design of the printed version of the TIP.
- 8.3 The forward strategy for communications includes the following milestones:
- | | |
|--------------|--|
| October | Finalise design of Town Investment Plan |
| Late October | communicate to stakeholders and wider community, via Council and partner channels and the media, the final Town Investment Plan. |
| Nov-Dec | Update stakeholders and wider community about the bid's status |
| Nov-Jan 2021 | Develop communications and engagement plan for Loughborough Town Deal to ensure community is engaged as projects take shape and are delivered. |

9. Upfront Capital Projects Funding

- 9.1 All Town Deal locations were notified by MHCLG on 30th June 2020 that they will receive an upfront grant to be spent on capital projects linked to their Town Investment Plan.
- 9.2 The notification comes as part of the Government's overall response to the impacts of Covid-19 on the economy. The intention is that town deal locations should benefit from upfront funding which will help kick-start recovery and enable the delivery of 'shovel-ready' schemes.

9.3 Loughborough’s grant award of £750,000 is based upon population size.

9.4 The council was advised by the Secretary of State on 25 September that grant of £750k had been awarded to the Council and reminded it must be spent before the end of March 2021.

10. Risks

10.1 The following risks have been identified:

	Risk	Impact	Mitigation
1	Ongoing Covid-19 regulations prevent face-to-face meetings	Difficult to exchange knowledge and views	Increased use of emails, phone calls and video conferencing
2	Community does not engage in the process	Failure to gather the knowledge and experience of those living in the town	Ensure the communications strategy is followed
3	Absences from work caused by Covid-19 related illness and / or self-isolation / quarantine	Delays in progressing project work	Ensuring close working between officers and consultants and sharing of access to documents where possible and appropriate

LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN DEAL BOARD

2nd October 2020

Item 5 – Revisions to Board Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This paper advises Board of the outcome of a review of the Loughborough Town Deal website by MHCLG.

2. Recommendations:

- a. The revisions to the Town Deal Board Terms of Reference be approved as indicated in appendix 2 to this report and published on the Loughborough Town Deal Website;
- b. Town Deal Board members sign the code of conduct contained in the revised Terms of Reference without delay

3. Background

- 3.1 At the Board meeting on 29th January 2020, Board approved a governance structure for the Loughborough Town deal. That structure included terms of reference for the Town Deal Board and a code of conduct for its members.

4. Governance Audit

- 4.1 On 23rd September 2020 the project team was advised by the Cities and Local Growth Team of MHCLG that they had undertaken an audit of the Loughborough Town Deal governance structure and website to check if mandatory requirements have been met.
- 4.2 The audit found examples of best practice including the publication of Board members' interests and meeting minutes on the website, membership of the local MP and the publication of her profile, and the establishment of a community consultation and engagement group to provide wider diversity of views. However they also found some weaker areas that they advise should be improved before a more formal assessment is undertaken ahead of the TIP submission. A copy of the audit is attached as appendix 1.
- 4.3 The audit findings require the following:
- the terms of reference should be revised to ensure they are explicit about the role of the chair and co-chair, that the code of conduct is founded on the Nolan Principles of Public Life and the register of members' interests will be maintained and published on the website. A copy of the revised terms of reference are contained in appendix 2.

- The website meeting calendar should be populated with meeting dates;
- Meeting agenda, draft minutes and final minutes are published in line with stated requirements

4.4 The audit also recommends:

- that Dr Kotecha OBE and Andy Reed are noted as being LLEP Board members within their online profiles.
- The town deal boundary map is published on the website to improve transparency

5. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Town Board Governance Checks – Loughborough 18 Sep 2020

Appendix 2 – Revised Terms of Reference

Appendix 1 - Town Board Governance Checks – Loughborough 18 Sep 2020

A box in orange indicates there is an issue that needs addressing to ensure mandatory requirements are demonstrably met. A box highlighted in grey indicates that a little more information would represent best practice. Unhighlighted boxes indicate mandatory and best practice requirements have been met.

Mandatory Requirements	Current Position
<p>Your Town Board has a Private Sector Chair and their profile has been published</p>	<p>Private Sector Co- Chair – Dr Nik Kotecha OBE – Chief Executive of Loughborough based Morningside Pharmaceuticals Ltd – a full list of Board members, the organisation they represent, their role on the Board and a short bio has been published on the Charnwood Borough Council website</p> <p>Loughborough Town Board</p>
<p>Your local MP(s) has a seat on the Town Board and their profile(s) has been published</p>	<p>Local MP – Jane Hunt – is listed as a Board member</p>
<p>Your Town Board membership also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All tiers of local government for the geography of your town • The Local Enterprise Partnership • Local businesses and investors • Community/local voluntary community sector representatives • Other relevant local organisations, such as FE colleges or Clinical Commissioning Groups <p>Profile of all your Town Board members have been published</p>	<p>Board membership includes the relevant tiers of local government and the LEP and also includes:</p> <p>Andy Reed, OBE - Director of SajelImpact</p> <p>Lez Cope-Newman – Chair of Loughborough BID</p> <p>Martin Traynor- Chair of Charnwood Together</p> <p>Professor Tracy Bhamra – Loughborough University</p> <p>Jo Maher - Principal and Chief Executive at Loughborough College</p> <p>David Pagett Wright - Solicitor and Practice Manager at Moss Solicitors LLP, Chair of Loughborough Town Team</p> <p>To note both Co-Chair Nik Kotecha and Andy Reed are Board members of LLEP. (Chair and Vice-Chair respectively) – it would be helpful for this to be noted within their profiles.</p>

<p>Your Town Board governance arrangements have been produced and have been published on your website covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remit of the Board including terms of reference • Decision-making processes • Board membership and roles • Chair/vice-chair term and responsibilities • Board structure including sub-committees and reporting arrangements • Accountable Body arrangements 	<p>A draft terms of reference document for the Board was tabled at the Jan 2020 meeting, however the agreed version of this document is not directly available on the Town Board web-pages.</p> <p>The draft document was not explicit about the role of the Co-Chairs and also indicated that reliance be placed upon members adhering to the Code of Conduct of their own organisation. The document was not explicit about Registers of Interest being maintained, however these are available on the web-pages</p> <p>The ToR need to be published and need to address the mandatory requirements.</p>
<p>Your Town Fund boundary has been agreed</p>	<p>A Town Fund boundary map has been agreed but not published on the Charnwood Borough Council website, publication of the map would improve transparency.</p>
<p>Your Town Board minutes and papers are being published in line with the stated requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meeting papers to be published on your website 5 clear working days ahead of the meeting • draft minutes of meetings to be published on your website 10 clear working days after the meeting • final minutes to be published on your website 10 clear working 	<p>The Town Board web-pages include a meetings calendar – but there are no current entries.</p> <p>Agendas are published ahead of meetings (unclear on position regarding meeting papers).</p> <div data-bbox="655 1700 1399 1928" data-label="Image">  </div> <p>Work is required to ensure the mandatory requirements for publication continue to be met.</p>

<p>days after having been approved by the Town Board</p>	
<p>Registers of interest have been completed by all your Town Board members and are available on request</p>	<p>Registers of Interest for each Board member are published on the Charnwood Borough Council website – a best practice example.</p>
<p>All Town Deal Board members have signed up to a code of conduct based on the Seven Principles of Public Life (the Nolan Principles)</p>	<p>The draft ToRs indicated that reliance would be placed on the Code of Conduct of the representative organisation (which presents a particular risk with private sector Board members). We would strongly recommend that all Board members sign a Code of Conduct relating specifically to the Town Board and for a copy of that Code of Conduct to be published on the Town Board web-page.</p>
<p>Your Town Board minutes clearly note any declarations of interest</p>	<p>Towns Board minutes include members declarations of interest as a standing agenda item. Publication of Registers of Interest make for complete transparency on this issue.</p>
<p>Your Town Board membership should reflect the diversity of your town and its surrounding area</p>	<p>At its January 2020 meeting the Board recognised the risk of not being fully representative of the community and has subsequently convened a Community Engagement Group with a wider membership.</p>



Appendix 2

Loughborough Town Deal Board

Terms of Reference

Membership

Co-Chair - Cllr Jonathan Morgan, Leader of the Council
Vice Co-Chair – Nik Kotecha, Business Community

Executive Board Members

Jane Hunt MP
 Cllr Trevor Pendleton LCC
 Lex Cope Newman, Loughborough BID (or other Loughborough BID representative)
 Andy Reed LLEP representative
 Martin Traynor, Chair, Economy and Skills Group, Charnwood Together
 Tracy Bhamra Loughborough University
 John Doherty, Loughborough College

Non-Executive Board Members

Chair - Member Reference group
 Chair – Community Engagement and Consultation group

Officer attendees

Rob Mitchell - CBC
 Eileen Mallon - CBC
 Tom Purnell LCC
 Mandip Rai – LLEP
 Others as invited for specific agenda items

Co-Chairs

Having Co-Chairs shows the strength of partnership between the public and private sector representatives. Their role is to combine their individual strengths and experience to maximise the support to the Board.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

The Co-Chairs will remain in office for two years from election unless re-elected by majority vote of the Board. Should either step down during their tenure a new representative will be elected at the next available Board meeting.

Board Responsibilities

- To provide support and advice to the accountable body (Charnwood Borough Council) in developing a Town Deal bid in line with the Government prospectus.
- To maintain strategic oversight of the Town Deal Bid and set the direction of the investment plan.
- To approve the annual delivery plan and monitor the delivery of targets in the plan.
- To oversee the establishment of the programme team.

- To ensure that the programme team has sufficient resources, knowledge and capacity available to deliver the objectives.
- To make representation to government departments for advice and assistance as necessary.
- To ensure the necessary liaison arrangements are in place to maximise resources across the range of partners, and to work collaboratively to deliver the shared objectives.
- To receive representation from the Member Reference group, and consider the views of Members, ensuring adequate liaison with the group.
- To ensure the views of the community are represented and considered through the Community Engagement and Consultation group, and the communications strategy
- To ensure all the necessary governance matters within the remit of Charnwood Borough Council are identified and progressed effectively.

Professional and Administrative Support

Charnwood Borough Council shall act as the accountable body for the Board in respect of financial matters, and its financial procedure rules will apply in this context. Committee management and administrative support to the Board will be provided by Charnwood Borough Council.

Quorum

The quorum for meetings of the Board will be five voting members, including the Chair. If there is no quorum at the published start time for the meeting, a period of ten minutes will be allowed, or longer, at the Chair's discretion. If there remains no quorum at the expiry of this period, the meeting will be declared null and void.

If there is no quorum at any stage during a meeting, the Chair will adjourn the meeting for a period of ten minutes, or longer, at their discretion. If there remains no quorum at the expiry of this period, the meeting will be closed, and the remaining items will be declared null and void.

Frequency of Meetings

Meetings will be held every two months in the first instance. The frequency of meetings can be varied following a discussion and vote of the Board, at the discretion of the Chair.

Conduct

~~Board members representing public authorities shall be bound by the Code of Conduct of their nominating body.~~

The Loughborough Town Deal Board will be based on collaboration and business will be conducted in the spirit of partnership working and abide by the Nolan principles. All Board Members are required to sign up to the Code of Conduct set out at Annex 1 and to declare any personal or pecuniary interests. These records will be maintained by the Lead Council and published on the Loughborough Town Deal website. All decisions will be made in accordance with the following principles:

- Due consultation will be carried out where appropriate (including taking relevant professional advice from officers);
- There will be a presumption in favour of open and transparent decision making;

- There will be a clarity of aims and desired outcomes;
- All decisions will be taken as members of the Loughborough Town Deal Board and not on behalf of specific organisations or areas;
- If a board member persistently disregards the ruling of the Chair, or person presiding the meeting, by behaving improperly or offensively or deliberately obstructs business, the Chair, or person presiding the meeting, may move that the board member be not heard further. If seconded, a vote will be taken without discussion.
- If a board member continues to behave improperly after such a motion is carried, the Chair, or person presiding the meeting, may move that either the board member leaves the meeting or that the meeting is adjourned for a specified period. If seconded, a vote will be taken without discussion.

Formatted: Font: +Body (Arial), 11 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Font: +Body (Arial), 11 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

Notice of and invitations to meetings

At least five clear working days before a meeting, a copy of the agenda and associated papers will be sent to every member of the Board. The agenda will give the date, time and place of each meeting and specify the business to be transacted and will be accompanied by such details as are available.

Voting

Board members commit to seek, where possible, to operate on the basis of consensus. Should it not be possible in a specific instance to find a consensus, the decision will be made on the basis of a simple majority. Only Executive board members are able to vote. The Chair will have the casting vote.

Matters which are the responsibility of the Accountable Body, will be reserved to Charnwood Borough Council.

Minutes

The Chair will sign the minutes of the proceedings at the next suitable meeting. The Chair will move that the minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record.

The minutes will be accompanied by a list of agreed action points, which may be discussed in considering the minutes of the previous meeting should they not be specifically listed as items on the agenda for the meeting.

Minutes will be made available to the public.

Annex 1

Loughborough Town Deal Board - Code of Conduct

As per the Towns Fund Prospectus, the Government expect that Town Deal Boards align with governance and policies of the Lead Council (Charnwood Borough Council). This includes the Members' Code of Conduct (incorporating conflicts of interest), Officers Code of Conduct, Whistle Blowing policy, and Protocol on Member/Officer relations (incorporating complaints).

Charnwood Borough Council expects employees and its members to adhere to the Nolan Principles of public life. Therefore, members of the Loughborough Town Deal Board, the Community Engagement Consultation Group, the Town Deal Member Reference Group and Town Deal Programme team are expected to adhere to those same principles of:

1. Selflessness
2. Integrity
3. Objectivity
4. Accountability
5. Openness
6. Honesty
7. Leadership

Although the Government expects that The Boards' Code of Conduct must align with that of the Lead Council, there may be elements of the Lead Council's Code of Conduct and associated protocols that are not applicable to board members, in relation to the Loughborough Town Deal Board and its function.

Members of the Loughborough Town Deal Board are required to declare any interests, gifts or hospitality which they have or receive which could influence any decisions they may make as Board members.

If a complaint is received by The Board, the matter will be referred to the Lead Council and dealt with under the Lead Council's complaints policy.

Copies of the Lead Council's applicable policies, within its own Code of Conduct can be obtained via the website:

https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/part_5_codes_and_protocols/Part%205%20Codes%20and%20protocols.pdf

Failure to adhere to the Loughborough Town Deal Board Code of Conduct could result in removal from the Board.

I agree to abide by the principles as detailed above

Signed:

Date:

Name:

Organisation:

LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN DEAL BOARD

2nd October 2020

Item 6 – Arup ‘Check and Challenge’ Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report gives an overview of the feedback obtained from Arup on the part 1 Town Investment Plan for Loughborough.

Recommendation: That the Board notes the content of this report.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Government has created a Towns Hub involving teams from across the Cities and Local Growth Unit in MHCLG and the Towns Fund Delivery Partnership. The purpose of the Hub is to provide help and support to Towns preparing investment plans. The Towns Fund Delivery Partnership includes consultancies appointed by MHCLG to support access to the Towns Fund including joined-up support, advice and tools to develop the Town Investment Plan (TIP) and business case across a range of environmental, social and economic disciplines.
- 2.2 On 24th August, officers shared the emerging draft of the investment plan with Arup, the lead consultancy for Loughborough. Arup met with officers and Third Life Economics on 27th August to provide the first of two ‘check and challenge’ sessions for the emerging TIP. The second session will be held on 28th September.

3. Overview of Arup advice

- 3.1 A copy of the Arup ‘check and challenge’ report is appended. The report is based on the proposals for a Town Deal considered by the Town Deal Board on 24th July 2020. These part one proposals cover the vision and strategy elements of the TIP with part two setting out the projects. The main themes to draw out from the Arup part one review follow.
- 3.2 The submission was felt to be compelling, coherent and ambitious. The ambition is welcomed, as it is important to demonstrate proposals that will be long lasting. However, that ambition will need to be supported by evidence and the projects selected should contribute to and deliver the vision.

- 3.3 Arup advised against getting hung up on the value of the basket of projects and instead encouraged the focus to be on outcomes, leverage of match funding and how the vision will be met.
- 3.4 Loughborough sits within a wider geographic context and it is important to show how the proposals relate to the wider region, for example the Midlands Engine and Midlands Connect (including the proposals for HS2 station and related development at Toton), the Strategic Growth Plan and the local plan. Weight will be given to the strategic fit of proposals and so the evidencing this will be important.
- 3.5 In the same way as the strategic fit is important, being able to show how proposals fit with other areas of government policy is also advantageous. Examples given included the desire to reduce carbon and delivery of the Local Industrial Strategy.
- 3.6 The proposed vision for a Loughborough Town Deal that was an 'Active Healthy Living Demonstrator' was enthusiastically received as this appeared to reflect the desire for TIPs to be ambitious, visionary and cross cutting. However, Arup felt the vision could be explained more clearly in the proposals as the 'golden thread' in the narrative was less clear in places.
- 3.7 In terms of evidence supporting the proposals, Arup felt more could be offered in terms of tables, pictures and maps than in the current narrative. They identified a number of areas where they considered evidence was lacking or could be improved including footfall, crime and ASB, and commuting levels.
- 3.8 The observatory idea was welcomed and would be a useful means to monitor the outcomes of a Town Deal.
- 3.9 While the proposals recognised the impact of the Covid pandemic Arup felt it was important to paint the picture of a pre-Covid Loughborough and the challenges facing it then. This would make it clear what additional pressures the pandemic has added.
- 3.10 Arup advised us to consider in the submission how all sectors of the community can benefit from the ambition set out in the TIP and how that ambition changed in light of feedback following consultation. Further reference to the track record of engaging with the private sector might be helpful. A stakeholder engagement plan should be included.
- 3.11 The value of the project basket was not seen to be as important as understanding how it delivered the ambition and the priority of the projects. If projects were not well-developed, had less certainty or had dependencies, be clear about this and the reasons.

4. Appendix - Arup Tip and Challenge Review

TIP 'CHECK AND CHALLENGE' REVIEW

LOUGHBOROUGH

Overarching comments

The document from the onset sets out a limitation in that the document is only section one of the TIP (context and strategy). This leaves out context of the TIP details and therefore leaves the document feeling incomplete and without a 'further actions' step.

In terms of context, the document provides a compelling reason why, and sets out the Loughborough objectives and reasoning for investment thoroughly. The Unique aspects of Loughborough are highlighted clearly in terms of how they would be used to accentuate the further goals of the town. Furthermore, reasoning is clearly defined for governance, and how strategy was developed. However, the document emphasises the long term goals of Loughborough in forming a 'technopolis' and that the Towns Fund provides an initial stepping-stone in this process. This therefore may take away from the goal of the TIP as the document serves to convey the future aspirations of Loughborough to Government rather than focus on current TIP goals.

Although this is not at business case stage yet, the draft TIP has been considered with the business case in mind, i.e. to what extent will the information provided support the business case. At this stage there is naturally a focus on the strategic case. The information in the TIP seems well developed and useful. Thinking about some of the things that will be needed for the strategic case within the business case:

- **Is there evidence of the case for change and need for investment?** – the TIP provides useful information on what works well and what does not in Loughborough, and why there is a case for investment.

In the section that provides economic data, given the importance of the university to Loughborough's economy it would be interesting to see what the rate of graduate retention is, how this compares with suitable benchmarks and the extent to which this would play a part in achieving Loughborough's future targets.

- **Are relevant policies identified?** - At business case stage, Loughborough would benefit from setting out specific policies at local/regional/national level that are relevant to the proposed investment.
- **Is there a clear vision with objectives identified?** – Yes, the TIP identifies objectives and targets.
- **Are the objectives SMART?** - A set of indicators has been set out, and as the business case is developed it will be beneficial to firm these up into SMART objectives and explain how they will be monitored and evaluated (it is positive to see that there are plans to set up a Loughborough Observatory to do this).
- **Is there a summary of options developed and assessed?** – at business case stage, it will be beneficial to see a discussion of the options considered and why these ones have been taken

forward.

- **Is the proposed investment is clearly defined?** – not in the draft TIP, but this will follow in the business case.
- **Is there a clear theory of change of how the proposed investment will achieve the desired objectives?** – yes, a theory of change has been developed. This may need to be refined as the project progresses.
- **Are key risks, constraints and interdependencies identified?** – this is something that will need to be considered as the proposed investments are developed further.

1. Potential impact

1.1 Evidence level of need

Primary comments:

- Details of (un)employment, income levels, deprivation and wellbeing. – Details have been captured in the section '*Headline economic and demographic statistical context*'. Unemployment levels are not clearly defined but areas of focus and deprivation are highlighted with context. Indication of four neighbourhoods of key focus which form part of the most deprived 20% within England are highlighted.
- Low-quality employment. – The impact of employment is captured within '*A disproportionate post-COVID19 risk*'. The document also highlights the dependency on education and manufacturing and that the town centre does not form part of the main attractions of the city.
- Details of town transport challenges (e.g. insufficient links to existing assets, congestion and air quality issues). – Details are captured in the section '*A town centre with dynamics towards hollowing out*'. It describes transport routes as being insufficient and list further problems in the town's development.
- Town centre vacancy rate and footfall. – Vacancy rates in the City centre are mentioned as increasing, but no specific details are provided. Information regarding footfall is not provided.
- Business growth challenges. – Details are captured in the section '*Headline economic and demographic statistical context*' which indicates areas of weakness in business growth including ICT, professional and business services. The document then goes on to describe potential opportunities for business growth, indicating the town is highly accessible and that it is uniquely placed to form an area of high value for knowledge-based growth and manufacturing.
- Land and development challenges. – The challenges to land and development have not been clearly identified.
- Skills shortage and low educational attainment. – The section '*The town's assets and strengths*' highlight that Loughborough University is a top-10 UK university and that this should be an area of emphasis for the town development plan. The document goes on to mention that there is an outward-facing issue with the town, meaning a low skill retainment and increasing pay gap within the town population.
- Crime and anti-social behaviour. – The section '*Loughborough as an archetypal struggling Midlands sub-regional centre*' describes a skills gap and the outward looking nature of Loughborough, which takes away from a town focus. This means that the town centre is often left neglected and looks poorly. No specific description of crime and anti-social behaviour is provided.

Other observations:

1.2 Scale of opportunity

Primary comments:

- It would be helpful to start to develop out the thinking of the allocation of towns fund monies against the overall capital requirement of the interventions and how private funding will be raised to increase the scale of what can be delivered.
- Revenue funding is touched upon but is it certain that this is eligible for Towns fund monies. Was this referring to the revenue funding in development of the bid?
- Population of the tables of the opportunities, funding requirements and how monies shall be used. In determining a longlist and filtering to shortlist of interventions, a clear project prioritisation strategy. The table which brings together the themes needed to support the active healthy living demonstrator (e.g. infrastructure, culture and heritage, etc) is good.
- Has any thinking taken place around the private sector funding and soft market testing for potential sources of investment.
- Likely to benefit from capital funding towards: urban regeneration, planning and land use; skills and enterprise infrastructure; and connectivity. – The headings of the benefits have only been captured in the ***'Towns Fund request and short summary of projects' section, which describes the projects being put forward for funding. It would be beneficial if the benefits are linked to the specific projects put forward in the TIP.***
- Demonstration that project proposals address/ capitalise on the major challenges/opportunities in the town. – Described thoroughly in the section ***'Key Opportunities for the town and evidence of need'***.
- Details of local commercial/industrial demand. – Local feeling captured in the governance and decision making process within the section ***'Community priorities and building a widely supported TIP'***.
- Level of private-sector co-funding. – Funding elements are captured in various sections. *'Synergies and alignment'* describes that funding is matched to at least a 1:1 ratio. Funding partners are also described in the section *'Business involvement'*.
- Evidence that the differential impacts of proposed interventions have been considered. – The specific impacts of proposed interventions of projects not clearly defined. Consideration of the public opinion has been described in the *'Community priorities and building a widely supported TIP'* section. It also highlights how opinion is divided in how the town should position itself for the future, and how the proposal will be used to address the needs of the whole community. But specific mention of the impacts of the proposed interventions are not mentioned.
- Potential impact e.g. jobs created, GVA increase. – The impacts are described in the section *'Headline economic and demographic statistical context'*.

Other observations:

- Like the idea of change (active healthy living demonstrator) and bringing the population of Loughborough with these ambitions. Engagement will be key in terms of the repositioning of the Town and ensuring residents buy into the idea given the scale of change.
- Science park needs to be key to these plans and promoting how this can contribute to the plans. Clarity for the life sciences park on the Charnwood Campus on remit and how it can attract and grow the organisations currently in situ with a focus on the excellent access routes. Clarity around what exactly will the creation of the technopolis/Life Sciences piece will bring and how it will compete?
- Key to ensure that the vision can convert into outcomes that bring regeneration to the deprived wards noted as well as attracting people from outside the town to live and work. Clarity into how the town centre can tap into the plans so that we don't have a surrounding ring of growth with a

town centre which doesn't enjoy the knock-on benefits. There are some challenges hence need to consider how the golden thread can align to this. Natural heritage, retail, night-time economy needs to be a focus in enticing people to want to spend time and money in the town.

- Connecting with the University is key and breaking down the natural boundaries of the campus. Combining this with the College and attracting business so that students seek employment and believe they have choices in the town upon completing their courses.

2. Strength of strategy

2.1 Strength of vision and realism of its economic narrative

Primary comments:

- Overall an exciting, ambitious vision and case for investment is well evidenced has been set for the Town.

Other observations:

We hope the below will be helpful and constructive in helping make the TIP really robust:

- Headline economic analysis provides good, exciting opportunities but also highlights challenges well.
- It is recognised that COVID-19 will likely have an impact on the Town, but a lot of this is still to be determined. In the Executive Summary, it could read that the TIP is needed just because of COVID-19. Maybe provide more baseline analysis, such as socio-economic challenges, and why assets have not been performing fully, and then what the added challenges of COVID-19 may be.
- Possibility to bring out quantifiable outcomes that the vision will seek to deliver, which are in Page 14. This could consider the number of new jobs, skill development, socio-economic benefits, new businesses, GVA growth?
- How does the TIP support and align with the long term drivers / goals for Loughborough and the wider borough?
- The 'active healthy living demonstrator' needs to be introduced as what it actually is.
- On the boundary map there are the grey areas on the edges – are these additional areas or the focus of the investments?
- Consider having a map highlighting the area, where the TIP interventions are planned, other key assets, to build up a powerful visual.
- On accessibility, is there any data to back up being well connected? Levels of commuting from other areas, rail usage growth, levels of active travel, bus patronage? Any analysis how Loughborough will benefit from connectivity to HS2?
- Really interesting to hear the Cambridge / Oxford comparison – but maybe should introduce why these are comparators more? What is the level of change required? What are their levels and why are they important?
- Is there more opportunity to align the outcomes of the TIP with national policy, such as decarbonisation policy, Industrial Strategy and LIS, DfT Policy?
- Vision for the future that is built around the town's unique circumstance with alignment to the objectives of the fund. – This is clearly captured in the section '*Key Opportunities for the town and evidence of need*' which provides a SWOT analysis and highlights key strengths of the town and how they are used to build the vision. Additionally, the '*Town vision, headline outcomes and targets for 2030 and beyond*' link the unique circumstances of the town to the long term vision for Loughborough. It also provides the KPI's to measure success. The '*Objectives, targets and priorities*' section indicates in a table format how objectives are all linked to the town's overarching strategy.

- Clear use of local knowledge to produce an investment plan grounded in its context. – Local knowledge is captured clearly in the ‘*Strategy*’ section of the document.
- An indication that the process followed to prioritise interventions has included an element of spatial analysis, with a clear explanation of how the strategy will benefit the town centre. – The evidence is not clearly identified, perhaps this will be further expanded on in section two of the TIP.
- Reference to wider strategic plans including (but not limited to) housing, transport, local growth and the Local Industrial Strategies. – This is captured with the ‘*Objectives, targets and priorities*’ section. The underlying target of ‘Active Healthy Living’ is consistent throughout the strategy narrative and how unique attributes of the town are linked to a wider strategy. A table breakdown of how objectives are linked can also be seen in the strategy section of the document.
- Evidence of learning from good practice i.e. an evidenced-based investment plan which is clearly informed by sound knowledge of local growth investment, formed through a process of clear and rigorous prioritisation and backed by sophisticated analysis. – This evidence is not clearly indicated. This may be expanded in section two of the TIP.

2.2 Coherence of TIP – strength of linkages and rationale between need/opportunity, vision, strengths and projects

Primary comments:

- Regarding the Evidence of Needs and TIP Opportunities, possibly consider linking the two presentational. There are some opportunities potentially align with more than one opportunity.
- The vision may be too long – can you fit it in a tweet (i.e 280 characters) therefore keeping it punchy and focused.
- Potential to consider more strongly the golden thread between the vision – principles – themes.
- The themes and principles are really interested, but could do with being better introduced.
- The ‘15 minute city’ is mentioned – a good, powerful concept, but should it not be a ‘15 minute town’?
- Presentational there are opportunities to theme the targets and priorities.
- There are some great targets and statistics on annual GVA growth and how the TIP can support this, but you have to wait to Page 14 to find this, maybe consider bringing these out sooner.

Other observations:

- A clear rationale for the vision in its context. – The rationale has been clearly identified throughout the document. The executive summary provides an overview of how the TIP is being positioned to develop Loughborough as the UK’s ‘active healthy living demonstrator’.
- Coherent set of proposals forming a broader strategy which clearly addresses the challenges identified in section 1.1. (e.g. local housing shortage and high rate of empty retail units that could be addressed by mixed-use developments). – The proposals and rationale forming the strategy has been clearly defined in the ‘*Town vision, headline outcomes and targets for 2030 and beyond*’ section.
- Logic models developed for each project proposal, including a comprehensive set of inputs/resources, outputs and outcomes/impacts, setting out clearly the assumptions and external factors (context). – Logic models are not clearly defined. This may be expanded on section two of the TIP.
- Wider strategy that is geared towards alleviating private-sector-investment bottlenecks and/or targeting the most disadvantaged groups. – The wider strategy addressing bottlenecks and/or targeting the most disadvantaged groups has not been expanded upon. The areas of deprivation

within Loughborough have been mentioned in the narrative, but further expansion and linkage to strategy is not evidenced.

2.3 Capacity and alignment of proposed projects with existing and ongoing initiatives and match funding

Primary comments:

- Details of how the proposed vision would complement existing and planned work in the town and wider region. – The details are clearly defined in the ‘*Strategic Plan*’ section. There is a slight overlap with wider region benefits being described in the ‘*Key Opportunities for the town and evidence of need*’ section. **This describes that a population of 2m+ can benefit by being with a 30 mins drive catchment of Loughborough.**
- Demonstration of the additionality of the intervention. – Additionality is unclear, this may be included in section two of the TIP.
- Details of co-funding for intervention proposals. – The details regarding the interventions are still required, this may be included on a later draft or section two of the TIP.
- Delivery capacity and accountability arrangements – Governance structure, engagement and delivery are clearly defined in the ‘*Engagement and delivery*’ section. The section describes how the governance structures were formed and how engagement was managed. It also highlights the hierarchy of decision making. Accountability may need further description.

Other observations:

- The interventions are introduced too early – consider moving these to after the strategic plan is introduced to improve the follow and golden thread
- When the TIP interventions are agreed, the descriptions and outcomes can join up the golden thread
- Once the interventions are developed, possibly explore synergies between schemes (does a cycle / active corridor connect with a growth hub?) – but also what other planned investments outside of the Towns Fund are complemented by the TIP interventions to capture wider benefits.

3. Local partnership and collaboration

3.1 Strength of past and planned collaboration with local communities and civil society

Primary comments:

- There may be merit in describing some of the earlier (pre Towns Fund) engagement that has taken place over recent years as this may provide background evidence for the development priorities that have been set out.
- There is good evidence of recent engagement and consultation – specifically around the vision and priorities set by the Towns Fund Board with online surveys and follow up surveys and focus groups. The findings are set out very comprehensively within the linked documents.
- It would be helpful to understand how some stakeholders were selected to participate or if there were any targeted efforts to engage with residents from the different neighbourhoods and/or hard to reach etc
- The findings of the recent consultation exercises suggest that some of the view expressed did not fully match the original proposals. It would be good to set out if any of the vision or priorities were adapted in light of feedback received.
- There appears to be no mention of planned engagement going forwards.
- Level of past and ongoing engagement/consultation. – Described in the ‘*Engagement and delivery*’ section.

- Level of collaboration in the production of the TIP (e.g. joint projects). – The document indicates in the section ‘*Synergies and alignment*’ where a scheme may have governmental alignment. The section ‘*Business case development and deliverability*’ also describes project sponsors/ accountable bodies with whom the town is developing projects. However the strength of planned collaboration with local communities may need further expansion.
- Level of representation and institutional collaboration both in the production of the TIP and planned for the future. – The level of representation is not clear, however institutional collaboration in the contribution of the TIP with regarding to projects is described as above in the ‘*Business case development and deliverability*’ section.

Other observations:

- There may be some merit in carrying out a structured stakeholder audit to set out clearly the breakdown of stakeholder groups – including hard to reach and seldom heard.
- This may help inform future engagement and style of consultation.

3.2 Strength of past and planned collaboration with the private sector

Primary comments:

- As above – it may be helpful to set out historic engagement.
- Otherwise there is good representation on the Board and good evidence of strong links with private sectors when developing proposals and through the consultation process
- Level of past and ongoing engagement/consultation. – An overview of the engagement plan is described in the ‘High level delivery plan’ section. Past engagement and methods for engagement is described in the ‘*Engagement and delivery*’ section.
- Level of collaboration in the production of the TIP (e.g. joint projects). – The extent of collaboration with the private sector has not been clearly defined. Projects where collaboration is indication is included in ‘***Business case development and deliverability***’ section. ***Most of the projects are yet to be populated, perhaps this will be further expanded on when the TIP is near completion.***
- Level of representation and institutional collaboration both in the production of the TIP and planned for the future. – Future representation and collaboration in the production of the TIP other than specific projects has not been identified.

Other observations:

- They could elaborate more on the networks represented within the board to demonstrate broader representation than individuals.

Missing information

- Stakeholder engagement plan

TIP ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Section	Criteria	Evidence
1. Potential impact	1.1. Evidence level of need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of (un)employment, income levels, deprivation and wellbeing. • Low-quality employment. • Details of town transport challenges (e.g. insufficient links to existing assets, congestion and air quality issues). • Town centre vacancy rate and footfall. • Business growth challenges. • Land and development challenges. • Skills shortage and low educational attainment. • Crime and anti-social behaviour.
	1.2. Scale of opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to benefit from capital funding towards: urban regeneration, planning and land use; skills and enterprise infrastructure; and connectivity. • Demonstration that project proposals address/ capitalise on the major challenges/opportunities in the town. • Details of local commercial/industrial demand. • Level of private-sector co-funding. • Evidence that the differential impacts of proposed interventions have been considered. • Potential impact e.g. jobs created, GVA increase.
2. Strength of strategy	2.1. Strength of vision and realism of its economic narrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision for the future that is built around the town's unique circumstance with alignment to the objectives of the fund. • Clear use of local knowledge to produce an investment plan grounded in its context. • An indication that the process followed to prioritise interventions has included an element of spatial analysis, with a clear explanation of how the strategy will benefit the town centre. • Reference to wider strategic plans including (but not limited to) housing, transport, local growth and the Local Industrial Strategies. • Evidence of learning from good practice i.e. an evidenced-based investment plan which is clearly informed by sound knowledge of local growth investment, formed through a process of clear and rigorous prioritisation and backed by sophisticated analysis.
	2.2. Coherence of TIP – strength of linkages and rationale between need/opportunity,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear rationale for the vision in its context. • Coherent set of proposals forming a broader strategy which clearly addresses the challenges identified in section 1.1. (e.g.

	vision, strengths and projects	<p>local housing shortage and high rate of empty retail units that could be addressed by mixed-use developments).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logic models developed for each project proposal, including a comprehensive set of inputs/resources, outputs and outcomes/impacts, setting out clearly the assumptions and external factors (context). • Wider strategy that is geared towards alleviating private-sector-investment bottlenecks and/or targeting the most disadvantaged groups.
	2.3. Capacity and alignment of proposed projects with existing and ongoing initiatives and match funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of how the proposed vision would complement existing and planned work in the town and wider region. • Demonstration of the additionality of the intervention. • Details of co-funding for intervention proposals. • Delivery capacity and accountability arrangements
3. Local partnership and collaboration	3.1. Strength of past and planned collaboration with local communities and civil society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of past and ongoing engagement/consultation. • Level of collaboration in the production of the TIP (e.g. joint projects). • Level of representation and institutional collaboration both in the production of the TIP and planned for the future.
	3.2 Strength of past and planned collaboration with the private sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of past and ongoing engagement/consultation. • Level of collaboration in the production of the TIP (e.g. joint projects). • Level of representation and institutional collaboration both in the production of the TIP and planned for the future.

LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN DEAL BOARD

2nd October 2020

Item 7 – Project Appraisal Process

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This paper explains the process followed to appraise the submissions made by partners for the Town Deal Investment Plan.

2. Recommendation:

That Board note the evaluation process followed to assemble the basket of projects to include in the Town Deal Investment Plan

3. Background

- 3.1 The Loughborough Town Deal Board is responsible, in conjunction with Charnwood Borough Council as Lead Council, for securing a Town Deal for Loughborough, worth up to £25 million. In ‘exceptional circumstances’ the Government will potentially agree a deal worth up to £50 million.
- 3.2 Following the agreement to submit the Town Investment Plan in Cohort 2, the deadline for bid submissions was extended from 10th July 2020 to 31st August 2020 to give the best possible opportunity to partners to work up and submit robust bids against the government’s intervention framework.
- 3.2 At the Board meeting on 24th July 2020, Board were advised there would need to be an evaluation of project proposals undertaken and sent to the Board for its comment, prior to a further draft of the Town Investment Plan being submitted to the Board.

4. Appraisal process

- 4.1 The submissions were summarised and compiled by the consultant in a table providing a ‘deal on a page’ indicating the capital and revenue ask and an indication of funds leveraged. The table was shared with the co-chairs and council officers on 6 September and with the Member Reference Group and Community Consultation and Engagement Group on 21st and 23rd September respectively.
- 4.2 The table indicated 25 project proforma had been submitted amounting to an ‘ask’ of £57m in a total programme of over £116m. The revenue ‘ask’ exceeds £3m. These submissions far exceed the government’s expectations even for an exceptional town deal submission. Therefore it is necessary to evaluate and prioritise projects to ensure that there is a cogent and robust basket of

projects that responds to the vision and strategy of the part 1 TIP and that are deliverable. In order to assist the Town Deal Board in this process, officers have assimilated the information and evaluated it so a sub group of the Town Deal Board can consider it and make recommendations to the Town Deal Board on 2nd October 2020. That sub group comprised of the Co-Chairs of the Board, the chairs of the MRG and CCEG, the LLEP and County Council Board representatives.

- 4.3 The evaluation process sought to appraise submissions against the government's criteria in their intervention framework, the four pillars set out in the vision and strategy of the TIP, deliverability, value for money and the ability of the scheme to assist in responding to a post-covid Loughborough.
- 4.4 Council officers met on 25th September 2020 to review and score the submissions. Scores were given against each criteria drawing on the evidence provided by partners in their submissions. It was apparent through this process that some schemes naturally clustered together to form more than the sum of their parts or to develop thematic responses to the TIP vision and strategy. For some weaker schemes this has enabled them to proceed where otherwise they may have been discounted.
- 4.5 The Town Deal Sub Group will meet on 30th September 2020 to consider the evaluation and 'sense check' the proposals, prior to submission to the Board. The Board will then receive the full evaluation for consideration and decision on 2nd October.

LOUGHBOROUGH TOWN DEAL BOARD

2nd October 2020

Item 8 – Final Draft Town Deal Investment Plan

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This paper explains the position in relation to the development of the Town Deal Investment Plan for submission to Government by 31st October 2020.

2. Recommendations:

- a. That the Board approve the projects endorsed by the Town Deal Board Sub Group and include these in the final draft of the Town Deal Investment Plan;
- b. That the Board endorse the final draft Town Deal Investment Plan for submission to Government before 31st October 2020.
- c. That the Board agree that any amendments required as a result of the ARUP check and challenge process or changes to bid proposals which may be necessary are agreed with the co-chairs of the Board, in order that the deadline for submission can be met.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Loughborough Town Deal Board is responsible, in conjunction with Charnwood Borough Council as Lead Council, for securing a Town Deal for Loughborough, worth up to £25 million. In 'exceptional circumstances' the Government will potentially agree a deal worth up to £50 million.
- 3.2 The Board has overseen a process over the past 8 months to develop a Town Deal Investment Plan. Significant work has been carried out by partners, officers of the council and the consultant, which ultimately, will lead to a Town Deal Investment Plan (TIP) being submitted to the Government as part of the town deal process. A draft proposition was considered by the Board on 12th June 2020 and a period of public consultation has occurred. The consultation responses and the views of the Board, Member Reference Group and Community Engagement Group have informed the vision and strategy for a TIP presented to the Board on 24th July 2020 and this and the government intervention framework has been used as the context to inform bids and their evaluation.

4. Final Draft Town Deal Investment Plan

- 4.1 Board members have already seen part 1 of the TIP. The main focus of work since 24th July has been in ensuring the feedback from the Arup check and challenge review on 27th August 2020 and the lessons learned from cohort 1 have been taken on board. To this end the TIP has shifted its focus from the vision of Loughborough as an 'Active Healthy Living demonstrator' (AHL) towards Loughborough as a sub regionally important place. This is because the submitted projects around the AHL concept were too immature to provide the project team with confidence that it could be recommended to the Board. Instead, the TIP promotes a Loughborough place-based strategy as a stepping stone to an AHL in the longer term.
- 4.2 Another strand of work has been to ensure bids are submitted and that they are robust and evidenced. The desire to ensure that the TIP is supported by really strong and convincing projects will strengthen the credibility of the TIP.
- 4.3 Item 7 on the agenda explains the process that has been followed to evaluate the bids. The Town Deal Board Sub Group will meet on 30th September to consider the bids submitted to the Board. The outcome of the Town Deal Board Sub Group's consideration of the project basket will be engrossed within the TIP and circulated to board members prior to this meeting, in order that the proposed TIP can be fully considered by the Board at the meeting.
- 4.4 Third Life economics will be available at the Board meeting on 2nd October to take Board through the TIP and explain how the projects support the vision and strategy.