# Stockbridge Towns Fund Board (STFB)

**DATE AND TIME:** Friday 20th September 2024, 1.00pm
**LOCATION:** Stocksbridge Town Hall, Manchester Road, Stocksbridge S36 2DT
**CO-CHAIRS:** Marie Tidball, MP
Yuri Matischen

**ATTENDEES:**
**Board members attending:**

- Yuri Matischen, Stocksbridge Resident – Co-Chair (**YM**)
- Marie Tidball (MP for Penistone and Stocksbridge) – Co-Chair (**MT**)
- Ian Sanderson, SLR Outlets (**IS**)
- John Crawshaw, JW Crawshaw Ltd (**JC**)
- Graham Silverwood, Stocksbridge Training and Enterprise Partnership (STEP) & Stocksbridge Community Leisure Centre (SCLC) (**GS**)
- Kathryn Giles-Bowman (Manchester Rd Rep – shared role) (**KG-B**)
- Gail Larking (Manchester Rd Rep – shared role) (**GL**)

**Also attending:**
- Sean McClean, Director of Regeneration and Development, SCC (**SM**)
- Howard Varns, Senior Programme Manager, SCC (**HV**)
- Michelle O'Neill, Capital Delivery Manager, SCC (**MO'N**)
- Sam Townsend, Cities and Local Growth Unit, DLUHC (**ST**)
- Helen Spivey, Communications Officer, SCC (**HS**)

**Apologies:**
- Cllr Julie Grocutt, (SCC) Stocksbridge and Upper Don

**Item 1.** Welcome, confirmation of minutes & issues arising

Yuri Matischen
Previous meeting minutes were agreed.

- **MT** – Welcome and intro as new Co-Chair.
- The above was followed by introductions of those attending.

**Item 2.** Governance & Declaration

Yuri Matischen
Declaration of interest: Required for new members. Existing declarations to be reaffirmed or updated for existing members.

- **Action**: SCC Officers to recirculate for affirmation to Board members.

Reiterated importance of transparency and accountability in production of minutes and accessibility of members to public.

Discussion around frequency and arrangements for Board Meetings going forward.

Agreed Friday afternoon or Monday morning. Alternating was also suggested as a possibility. Likely to be bi monthly. It was also mentioned that there was the option for online or extraordinary meeting should any urgent matters arise.

**SM** noted Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government **MHCLG** to commence a programme of compliance checks on TF Boards, likely to begin January 2025. Members suggested an internal review as an action to check this and for inclusion at the next Board meeting.

Agreed to amend term used from Project Champions to Board representatives of each project would be more appropriate.

Discussion of appropriate regular community forum for feedback and information dissemination on projects and progress. What might this look like? Is there an existing forum that is suitable? Discussion of other regen projects and how consultation is managed in structured and less structured forums. General agreement that more communication is needed.

Helen Spivey appointed as SCC communications lead for the programme. **HS** – referred to the website and social media as channels to keep people up to date with key messages and updates. **HS** noted development of communications moving forward to manage expectations on projects and to meet the need for a regular flow of information to the public.

**Item 3.** Board Membership (Changes to Membership & Board make-up)

Yuri Matischen
Board membership, Known changes

- MP and Co-Chair replaced by Marie Tidball. Board representative of Hopper Bus project also transferred to Marie
- Standing down
  - Miriam Cates – Change in Parliamentary Status
  - David Cates – Resigned as a member

- Neil Curtis – Change in personal circumstances

Discussion that no governance requirement for additional Board members – Board is quorate.

- **Action**: Confirmed that expressions of interest to join the Board will be included in the news update / press release that is issued.

Existing projects currently have Board representatives (previously Champions). **MT** will now represent the Hopper Bus project. Following resignation from the Board of David Cates, there was a collective desire for any new Board representative for Skills and Education project to bring an educational skillset who has experience providing the education sector within the community.

It was agreed that skillset is important as well as experience in relation to the above point. In terms of community representation **(MT)**

There is a format for a 'Request for interest' available from previous round of recruitment. SCC can provide that as a starting point for a fresh recruitment. **(HV)**

Interview required as part of the process of board appointment with the process likely to take 1 – 2 months. Potential volunteers for interview panel were provided to **YM** which will need executive decision. There will be two appointments, giving increased opportunities of balance.

**Item 4.** Programme and Project Updates

**Shop Fronts**

Architectural Stage 2 information has been received and has been made available to the Board.

SCC are now scheduled to engage with stakeholders to seek legal agreement to access and survey shops, to further develop designs.

Currently in the process of drawing up proposed legal agreements. Key engagement is with those people who hold those assets.

Within the next six months we expect to have contractors in place. There is a need to understand what the impacts are, including to pavement and roads, impacts on the public. Members asked who is doing the work with the shop owners? Noted that the process is not at that stage yet, only the proposals.

Members asked who is managing these budgets? Sheffield City Council Capital Delivery Service (CDS) are delivering projects, including cost management.

It was asked if this and placemaking aspect are running at the same pace. **HV** confirmed that was the case.

**MT** noted that it was key for those shops to be individually posted, and the discussion progressed around potential disruption to the area and shops involved. It was noted that disruption will be difficult to manage but if everyone understands and knows what is happening it will be managed to minimise any impacts. The discussion carried where stakeholder engagement was covered.

It was noted there may be concerns raised if anything needs to be changed and what happens if signing agreements became an issue? **SCC** confirm that all shop owners will need to sign agreements if project is to proceed. **SM** noted that we cannot force shop owner to sign up to shop front improvement. There is no option for CPO, the intention is to upgrade existing premises not to acquire.

The question was raised about disruption if shop closures were needed. **SM** noted not aware that shops would have to be closed whilst work is being done.

**HS** noted that a key message document as projects move through each phase that can be updated for Board members could be helpful and something members can call upon when asked any queries.

**MT** asked for individual projects plans and timelines to be provided to Board members to provide that level of detail and for shop owners in particular.

**Hopper Bus Service**

**HV** noted on the Hopper Bus service that the team is waiting for final feedback from the preferred provider, and then the project will go through the capital approval process in 6-8 weeks. **HV** noted there had been an issue with the supply chain.

**MT** asked for members to be provided with a summary document noting timescales. i.e. this is going to take 2 weeks – so members can explain it in response to any public enquiries, a mini project time scale.

**MT** noted the need to understand what the first step is and when it is going to happen. Bidder needs to speak to SYMCA and register the service and know how long it will take for the approval of the grant. If the bidder is given 100 days, **MT** suggested the need to expedite approval and if a bidder is approved it needs to start now, not from the administration date.

**MT** urged a need to make sure we get that signed and asked when is the next date? **HV** noted submissions are each month. **MT** asked if there is an interim solution so that there is approval not submission, noting that when meet in 6 weeks' time, need to do everything possible so that it is from the submission date and then make sure we are speaking to them.

**MT** noted it was crucial to get this running for winter, which should be a key objective and noting the need to manage expectations.

**HV** noted that the timetable is going to be finalised which happens during the 100 days and that a contract also needs finalising.

**Project General Update**

**JC** commented that the Board meeting had shown that members need an update on each project, with a key focus on one scheme per meeting. It was then raised if update meetings would be helpful outside of Board meetings. **SM** agreed briefing meetings could be helpful per project.

**MT** noted a need for process for Council, external stakeholders, any other external providers, architects etc to keep track, so we can explain any changes, and to understand that for each project to know where progress is at, when is the approval, so everyone can all keep pushing forward.

**519 (Community hub) Building**

Community Hub tender evaluation process is in progress. Each tender submission is different, proposing a different approach to construction delivery plans, whether roads will be closed, where to put car parks etc, and consultation plans. Further information will be provided to the Board when the tender evaluation is complete. (**MO'N**)

**JC** raised a point on contractor tender selection for 519 (YorTender) and what had been approved by the Board. **SM** – responded that the Board had previously agreed to YorBuild and had gone through this at a previous Board meeting noting his understanding was that proposals were brought by presentation, had discussed all the benefits and the Board had agreed the way forward.

**MO'N** noted that design, demolition was part of the current fixed cost, but this tender does not fix the total project cost. Tenderers have provided indicative project costs, to be developed during the next stage of design. Procurement is cost led.

Board Members questioned if the Council decide which of the four we progress with, and which of the derogations and various plans were utilised. **MO'N** responded that the Council undergo a fixed evaluation process and will select the contractor on that basis, but that the plans and processes were subject to discussion and could be shared with the board. **SM** responded that the approach is to go down to final two and then out of the two the Board lead for the project and Board members confirm. He noted that what has been done so far is state what we would like, this is what budget we have and find out how potential contractors can match that.

**MT** noted the need for an actual decision quite soon.

**SM** noted to sort out final derogations with two in the running and confirm what each is offering. In October the contract will be awarded between now and end of year, which is where the project is heading with final design for it to start in March and that is within the approved budget. That contract after it gets signed in October will be a public decision.

Press releases were discussed and if we have the most up to date visuals. Agreed that they need an update.

The current Library was discussed and suggested that it is best to keep the building active and in the process of sorting heating out.

**MT** queried the surveys that have taken place, asked if she could raise the issue with the owners and for an update on ground testing, preferably being expedited. **MO'N** confirmed that this would be a key part of the next stage of design – noting obstructions from buildings already on the site and limitations in available space and access for testing.

**Placemaking Scheme (Market Square and Highway Improvements)**

**MO'N** discussed placemaking and an interim meeting needed over parking issues, noting the concept is done and may need to send an updated report.

Discussion on what is the best way so that this can be presented to the Board and if the designer has done any animations.

Discussion about guaranteeing a process, sharing progress and engaging with businesses such as the chemist, pharmacist. Etc.

Planning preapplication process is in progress.

Discussion around opportunities for outdoor seating. **SM** noted that people would need to apply for the pavement licence to operate outside. **MT** asked that an overlay of the current spacings comparing to the designs is provided as it will be useful to know whether that will fit in with current designs. It was noted that the space and levels remains the same. Additional access and planting have been introduced.

The costs were raised on this project which **MT** noted the Board need to fully understand. **MT** also questioned electric charging inclusion within carparks. **MO'N** to review scope available to introduce EV charge points if desirable.

Discussion progressed around accessing the car park. Loading and disabled parking was referred to. The number of bays was also discussed. **MT** asked if that meant we were gaining spaces. **GL** noted that customers would pay to park there to be able to shop. It was noted that there has been a lot of consideration about parking and that Board members know this is a priority.

**MO'N** proposed transport attendance at Board briefing to explain requirements for design and parking. **MT** reiterated a need to make sure that there are more car parking spaces. The issue of people parking on pavements was referred to. **SM** noted that these issues are not particular to one area. Attercliffe was used as a primary example.

Further discussion had relating to free parking, benefits, signage and accessibility.

**Oxley Park**

Works are completing this week, with planting and seating to be installed over the winter.

It was noted that the plan is to get Board availability so that everybody can get together for a soft launch. **SM** suggested a photo opportunity on site within the next couple of weeks. Full launch in the spring when plants have grown in and the weather is better.

AOB

End of the meeting.

Next meeting: Friday, November 22nd 2024