

**Burton upon Trent Town Deal Board Minutes**

**23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020**

**Present**

Ben Robinson                      Chair  
 Cllr Duncan Goodfellow      East Staffordshire BC  
 Cllr George Allen                East Staffordshire BC  
 Cllr Bev Ashcroft                East Staffordshire BC  
 Cllr Philip White                 Staffordshire CC  
 Cllr Julia Jessel                 Staffordshire CC  
 Mick Clifford                     Burton Civic Society  
 Peter Hardingham                Formerly Octagon Shopping Centre  
 John McKiernan                 Parish Council Representative  
 Kate Griffiths                     Member of Parliament  
 Shaid Hussain                    Business and Community  
    Representative  
 Dennis Fletcher                 Parish Council Representative

**In Attendance**

Andy O'Brien                    East Staffordshire BC  
 Thomas Deery                    East Staffordshire BC  
 Jonathan Turner                 Cushman & Wakefield  
 Lorenza Casini                  URBED

**Apologies**

David Chadfield                 Coopers Square  
    Shopping Centre  
 Wayne Mortiboys                Staffordshire CC  
 Simon Humble                    East Staffordshire BC  
 Kate Griffiths                    Member of Parliament

<b>Agenda Item No.</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Decision / Discussion / Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Points</b>	<b>Date Action Required</b>
1	Welcome and Apologies	The Chair welcomed the Board to the meeting and noted that there were apologies from David Chadfield, Wayne Mortiboys, Simon Humble, and Kate Griffiths. Cllr Bev Ashcroft and Peter Hardingham were running late.		
2	Minutes of Friday 11 <sup>th</sup> September 2020 Town Deal Board meeting and Matters Arising	AOB raised that there is an opportunity to submit the Town Investment Plan on 11 <sup>th</sup> December, rather than at the end of October, providing an additional few weeks to develop the TIP. As such, he suggested submitting the TIP in the later cohort and the Board agreed.  The minutes of the meeting were approved.	TD to email MHCLG to confirm new submission date of 11 <sup>th</sup> December 2020	23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2020
3	Update on Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation	The Chair invited LC from URBED to present on this item and the presentation followed the same information that had been provided in the meeting documentation, providing an overview of the responses from the stakeholder engagement events and the public consultation. The following was also discussed:	AOB to produce a Frequently Asked Questions document to share via the press and the Council's website	1-2 weeks

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AOB suggested that he should create a Frequently Asked Questions document to provide the public with a response to some of the common themes of questions arising from the consultation. The Board supported this suggestion.</li>   <li>• GA welcomed how positive the outcome of the consultation process was, with no singular project having more non-support than support and the lowest 'net' score being zero, meaning that there aren't any projects where a majority of people don't support it.</li> <li>• PW echoed the earlier comments and highlighted that the 'menu' of proposals that can be selected from are all things that the public are generally willing to accept.</li> </ul> <p>The Board recorded their thanks to URBED.</p>		
4a & 4b	Findings from the Check & Challenge Process and Impact on the TIP  Response to the Check & Challenge and Next Steps	<p>The Chair invited AOB to present a headline summary and it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to tighten the golden thread from the original Burton Regeneration Strategy all the way to the projects that are being selected in the investment plan.</li> <li>• As part of this, the Board must focus on the project 'need' and the theory of change. Therefore, it's important that the relevant evidence is drawn on to support the project prioritisation process.</li> <li>• The submission to the C&amp;C process was an initial draft and so some of the queries will be picked up naturally as part of the drafting process, such as the amount being bid for.</li> <li>• At this stage, there are still no exemplars coming out of the July submission highlighted by Government from the 12 that submitted at the time.</li> <li>• There is a word count limit of 10,000 that will put pressure on the content of the TIP.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair then invited TD to present an overview of the 'balanced scorecard' approach to project prioritisation and it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The balanced scorecard approach identifies 6 different categories of assessment for each project in order to make the prioritisation process as robust as possible. The proposed categories, with their weightings, are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of Need – 40%;</li> <li>• Benefit and Cost Ratio/Economic Analysis – 20%;</li> <li>• Lead Accountable Authority (View of the Administration) – 10%;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>TD to email all Board members a survey form to gather individual project prioritisation preferences.</p> <p>All Board members to provide TD with their responses for project prioritisation.</p> <p>TD to undertake project prioritisation process to discuss electronically prior to the next Board meeting.</p>	<p>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020</p> <p>29<sup>th</sup> October 2020</p> <p>Before 4<sup>th</sup> December 2020.</p>

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Deal Board View – 10%;</li> <li>• Public Consultation Response – 10%;</li> <li>• Stakeholder Engagement Response – 10%.</li> <li>• This effectively means that the assessment process is 60% based on technical analysis (evidence of need and economic impact) and 40% based on the views and perceptions of various groups.</li> <li>• Through this scorecard approach, each project would receive a rank against each of the scorecard categories, which then turns into a score for each category.</li> <li>• Each Board member was invited to provide their own 1-11 ranking of each project to be considered under the ‘Town Deal Board Views’ category.</li> <li>• The scores for each category would then be calculated against the weighting for each category to then project an overall score for each project. This score would then be used to rank the projects from highest to lowest, establishing a prioritisation list.</li> <li>• The projects that are lower down the prioritised list and fall outside of the selection process will form a backup list of projects with their own strengths and weaknesses, if any of the selected projects cannot progress beyond the business case stage.</li> <li>• It is believed that this process of quantifying the assessment and prioritisation of the projects will make the overall assessment less subjective and so more robust by being able to demonstrate clearly how and why each project has received the score it has.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair then invited JT to present an overview of the next steps for the TIP following the C&amp;C process, which also captures agenda item 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first act of response to the C&amp;C process has been to strip out the feedback comments from the PowerPoint presentation and try to relate them directly to the draft TIP document to identify where the changes need to be made. This is to make sure that the feedback is being interpreted in the right way and so the marked up documents have been sent back to Arup for comment.</li> <li>• There are a number of quite clear actions that C&amp;W are undertaking in the medium term and meetings have already taken place this week to progress those.</li> <li>• More resource is being provided by Amion, the economic consultant, to provide a bit more information on the economic and demographic statistics to help underpin the arguments made in the TIP document.</li> <li>• Similarly, Fore Consulting, who previously worked on the Burton Regeneration Strategy, are being brought in to look at the transport elements of the projects. They will be able to support the development of the narrative for these areas in the TIP and show how they link together.</li> </ul>		

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The limit of 10,000 words is probably the biggest challenge of the document against the need to see more from the TIP. The use of infographics and diagrammatic installations within the document don't count towards the word count and so Lathams will be looking at how to implement this in the next draft of the TIP.</li> <li>• The additional time will also help enable the creation of a central visualisation within the document that is about bringing the whole proposed strategy to life.</li> </ul> <p>Following questions, it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The foreword at the beginning of the document will be completed nearer the final draft of the TIP and will capture the passion behind the vision for the plan.</li> <li>• There will be some interim feedback to the public via an FAQ type document prior to the publication of the submitted TIP, in order to provide some reassurance about the projects.</li> <li>• The Amion work will quantify some of the economic and non-economic benefits for the TIP, including net social present value and net present value.</li> <li>• There will not be a third public consultation prior to the submission of the TIP on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2020 considering the significant amount of response received from the consultation process and the fact that those findings will be taken into account during the evaluation of the projects.</li> <li>• Notwithstanding the above, there is a need to keep engaging the public to ensure that there is a good understanding of the projects and associated work, including about those projects that are not selected to be taken forwards.</li> <li>• There is a need to have a stakeholder engagement plan as part of the Town Investment Plan and this will set out how the public will be engaged as part of the business case development stage.</li> </ul>		
5	Draft Town Investment Plan	This item was covered under agenda item 4b.		
6	Next meeting – 4th December 2020	It was agreed that the next Board meeting would take place on Friday 4 <sup>th</sup> December 2020 at 3pm.		
7	Any Other Business	<p>VB asked who carried out the C&amp;C exercise and TD confirmed that it was the Government commissioned consultant consortium, which is led by Arup as the main delivery partner and includes the organisations listed in the document.</p> <p>DG asked if the timescales for the next steps could be clarified and it was confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the short term, next few days, AOB will be working on the FAQs to ensure that the</li> </ul>		

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<p>Board is responding to the public consultation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JT, TD, and the rest of the team will continue to work on responding to the C&amp;C feedback and developing the TIP;</li> <li>• Over the next week, the project prioritisation and selection process will be finalised;</li> <li>• In the next few weeks, a further draft of the TIP will be circulated to the Board members in advance of the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> December.</li> </ul>		

DRAFT