

**HEREFORD TOWNS FUND BOARD
Notes and Action Points
Friday 27 November 2020 at 08.30
Zoom Video Conference**

Chair:	Lauren Rogers	LR	Project Manager, Rural Media
Minute Taker:	Melissa Walker	MW	Growth Programme Support Officer, Herefordshire Council
Board Present:	Alan Anderson	AA	British Land – Old Market
	Ellie Chowns	ECH	Cabinet Member Environment, Economy & Skills, H.Council
	Ian Christie	IC	Big Business Representative / MD, Welsh Water
	Elise Cummings	ECU	Younger Persons Representative
	Judith Faux	JF	Trustee, HVOSS
	Kath Hey	KH	Mayor of Hereford City Council
	David Langley	DL	Chief of External Engagement, NMITE
	Frank Myers	FM	Herefordshire Business Board / Marches LEP
	Jesse Norman	JN	MP for Hereford and South Herefordshire
	Ruth Parry	RP	Director of Operations & Marketing, Simple Design Works Ltd
	Paul Stevens	PA	Hereford Business Improvement District (HBID)
	Julian Vaughan	JV	Managing Director, Green Dragon
	Will Vaughan	WV	Hereford Pedicabs and Pedicargo
Board Apologies:	Laura Hughes	JH	Director, Signs And Labels
	Will Lindesay	WL	Chief Executive, HVOSS
Other Attendees:	Ivan Annibal	IA	Rose Regeneration
	Justine Burnett	JB	Senior Project Manager – Capital, Herefordshire Council
	Rebecca Collings	RC	Consultant, The Nichols Group
	Christian Dangerfield	CD	Rose Regeneration
	Clare Hannah	CH	MHCLG representative
	David Hitchiner	DH	Leader of the Council, Herefordshire Council
	Nick Webster	NW	Economic Development Manager, Herefordshire Council
Other Apologies:	Andrew Lovegrove	AL	Chief Finance Officer, Herefordshire Council

ITEM	NOTES	ACTION
1.	<p>WELCOME / ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES / DECLARATIONS AND REGISTER OF INTEREST</p> <p>Attendance and apologies are recorded above.</p> <p>LR made a declaration that whilst Rural Media are working with Rose Regeneration she is not involved with any of the work being undertaken.</p> <p>NW advised that he still waiting for a number of declaration forms for to be completed and returned.</p>	
2.	<p>MINUTES OF LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>The minutes from the meeting held on 06 November were agreed as a true record. Actions were discussed and updated.</p> <p>It was agreed that a joint meeting will be held of the Technical sub group and the Communications sub group.</p> <p>HVOSS have advised that WL will be unable to attend until after the January deadline and proposed that JF join as a Board Member in the interim; Approval was received for JF to become a board member until WL is able to return, thanks were expressed to JF for stepping forward to represent this sector.</p>	
3.	<p>FEEDBACK FROM DIRECTION OF TRAVEL WORKSHOP</p> <p>LR shared summary notes from the meeting held with MHCLG on 17 November and advised it was a useful session with good feedback, including; our inclusive approach shines through and needs to be included in the TIP; strategic objectives need to link back; although there is no match funding target we need to show we've sought it; need to show any risk and mitigations. MHCLG confirmed they were happy with the sign off process.</p> <p>RC commented that the TIP is taking shape well, and it is very obvious that Hereford has unique aspects being considered that not seen in other towns. They were really impressed with the level of engagement, and the evidence is really strong that we have been out and engaged despite Covid restrictions.</p>	

ITEM	NOTES	ACTION
4.	<p>SURVEY AND ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK</p> <p>IA & CD provided feedback from the responses to the survey and engagement sessions. There are a number of themes emerging; heritage, skills and green agenda. This should provide a clear backdrop to construct the TIP against.</p> <p>LR queried if anyone had any questions or comments;</p> <p>ECH noted that a number of things have emerged from the consultation that haven't come forward in the projects submitted, such as attracting people to the city and things for people to do, i.e. parkour, trampolining, stuff for young families to do etc. do we need to do more to entice these projects. IA commented that making it a user friendly city was an interesting theme and a lot of the projects could lead to further investment in the area to provide these elements.</p> <p>ECH asked if any there has been any consultation with young people, as she couldn't see that in the info, i.e. students, etc. CD advised he has consulted with the youth council and has tried to get sessions with the colleges but this has proved difficult due to Covid restrictions. He has held sessions with Vince McNally at the South Wye Police Boxing Academy and with the Kindle Centre, but it has proved difficult to get meaningful conversations with the younger people in the city. LR suggested this was something the Communications Sub group could pick up, we need to ensure that young people are high up on the agenda and that youth engagement is picked up in the second stage. PS suggested that Close House and No Wrong Door should be able to assist with linking into the younger sector; JF agreed that they have long established connections with the younger sector.</p> <p>FM stressed that there isn't time available to go back out at this stage to look for additional projects; LR acknowledged this and stressed she was not suggesting going out for projects, just that there is a need to engage.</p> <p>KH felt that there was a sense of frustration of missed opportunities with the key area of youth, she felt that the City Council could have been used more in this area as they have links to youth groups.</p> <p>DL highlighted that there has been struggle to get engagement with is the schools, they were invited but didn't attend. LR noted that plans are in place for surveying of schools</p> <p>WL suggested that when we go back out to projects for additional information they could be asked to provide evidence of their engagement with the younger community.</p>	
5.	<p>EVIDENCE BASE OVERVIEW</p> <p>IA advised that when the narrative is written it will assume that the person reading it has no knowledge of Hereford.</p> <p>It has been difficult to get key data that is just for the city, most of the national data is collected for the county as a whole. This has meant that certain things can't be broken down so they have included a map to show how geographical mapping has been broken down.</p> <p>Data clearly shows that Hereford is a split city, with vast differences between the North and South of the city; IA provided detail on the data collected to date.</p> <p>The TIP needs to show where we would like Hereford to be against the identified challenges in 5, 10, 15 and 30 years' time. We need to set targets based on the statistics in the transformation table, and agreement is needed on these.</p>	
6.	<p>PROJECT PRIORITISATION</p> <p>LR outlined that this process is not about reappraising the projects, it about the board making a collective decision about cut off and next steps. It is essential that we have confidence in the pipeline of projects.</p> <p>FM ran through the process that the Technical sub group used to assess the 40+ projects received; the project prioritisation tool developed by the Govt towns fund was used to score the projects and they were prioritised against our own local objectives. KH, WL & RP attended the meeting as observers.</p> <p>For the unsuccessful projects we need to provide good feedback and outline to them how they could be linked to the emerging themes in the future. Engagement has been positive to date so we need to ensure that this is not lost. They need to understand that this is the setting of a strategy and that although they may not be successful at this point there could be options in the future. There could be potential for these to be pursued through other funding routes.</p>	

ITEM	NOTES	ACTION
	<p>The Board expressed concern at the differences in the level of detail received for some projects, some only provided the proforma whereas others were more worked up, clarity was sought that projects weren't rejected due to lack of detail; reassurance was provided that all projects were assessed based on the criteria.</p> <p>IA outlined the next stage of the process; successful projects will have ten days to engage in the process and to work up projects in more detail, this will be followed by another scoring process before projects are brought back to the board for approval. Projects will need to meet strict Govt green book criteria in order to be considered for submission with the TIP.</p> <p>Discussions took place about the process, emerging themes and the need to progress things quickly due to the tight timescales.</p> <p>The key big projects deliver the biggest impact on jobs and growth which is a Govt requirement for this funding. Those projects will need to be worked up in more detail to provide reassurance to Govt that they are deliverable; it is suggested that some of the Capacity Funding is used to work up the technical element of these projects, and that decisions in relation to spend are delegated to the Technical sub group.</p> <p>Discussions took place about the capacity funding, and the need to ensure that there is enough funding left to complete work required if the TIP is successful.</p> <p>APPROVED; delegated powers to be granted to the Technical Sub Group to secure the technical support required to progress the projects.</p> <p>APPROVED; projects selected through the scoring process to be put through to the next stage.</p> <p>APPROVED; amber projects to be removed from the list as they do not fit with our local priorities.</p>	
7.	<p>PROGRAMME UPDATE</p> <p>NW outlined the process required to secure council sign off of the TIP; as accountable body HC need to have confidence in what is being put forward.</p> <p>The project development steps and timescales were outlined. Discussions took place about these; concern was expressed that this will impact on the work of the board, reassurance was given that it will have no impact. It was noted that there is engagement between the board and HC, and that Cabinet are being kept up to date as things progress to ensure there are no delays.</p>	
8.	<p>PROGRAMME BUDGET</p> <p>A proposal has been put forward to use some of the Capacity funding to secure additional comms support; this was APPROVED</p>	
9.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p><u>Women's Independent Group</u></p> <p>LR advised that she met with the Women's Independent Group who wanted assurance that whilst we are developing the TIP we are considering its impact on women and girls in the city.</p> <p>ACTION: LR to circulate information from Women's Independent Group to the board</p> <p><u>Prioritisation List</u></p> <p>ECH queried if the prioritisation list can be shared with her cabinet colleagues; it was agreed that IA will produce information that can be shared.</p> <p><u>Independent Technical Assessor</u></p> <p>JB queried if the board were happy to approve the use of Capacity funding to cover the appointment of an independent technical assessor to provide the S151 Officer with reassurance about the process, it was noted that MHCLG welcomed this early involvement from the S151 officer. The brief for this appointment was pulled together by LR, IA and the S151 officer, and the HC procurement process used to identify a supplier to provide up to ten days of support.</p> <p>Discussions took place about if this should be paid for by the capacity funding; it was agreed that details will be circulated to the board for further consideration.</p>	LR