

TOWNS FUND BOARD
Notes and Action Points
Friday 27 May 2022, 8.30-10.00 am via Zoom

Chair:	Abigail Appleton	AA	Principal, Hereford College of Arts
Board Present:	Ellie Chowns	EC	Cabinet Member, Environment and Economy, HC
	Judith Faux	JF	Trustee, HVOSS
	Kath Hey	KH	Councillor, Hereford City Council
	Frank Myers	FM	Herefordshire Business Board / Marches LEP
	James Newby	JNe	Chief Officer, NMITE
	Jesse Norman	JNo	MP for Hereford and South Herefordshire
	Ruth Parry	RP	Director Operations & Marketing, Simple Design Works Ltd
	Paul Stevens	PS	Hereford Business Improvement District (HBID)
	Julian Vaughan	JV	The Green Dragon Hotel
	Will Vaughan	WV	Hereford Pedicabs and Pedicargo
Other Attendees:	Ivan Annibal	IA	Rose Regeneration (RR)
	Christian Dangerfield	CD	Rose Regeneration (RR)
	Olli Hindle	OH	MHCLG Representative
	Joni Hughes	JH	Portfolio Manager, Capital Development, HC
	Andrew Lovegrove	AL	Chief Finance Officer, Herefordshire Council
Apologies:	Lauren Rogers	LR	Project Manager, Rural Media
Absent:	Alan Anderson	AAAn	British Land – Old Market, Hereford
	Ian Christie	IC	Big Business Representative/MD, Welsh Water
	Paul Walker	PW	Chief Executive, Herefordshire Council
Notetaker:	Jan Bailey	JB	Herefordshire Business Board

ITEM	NOTES	ACTION						
1.	<p>Welcome and Apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, Apologies and Absences are as noted above.</p>							
2.	<p>Conflicts of Interest</p> <p>The Chair declared an interest as a partner in the Meadow Arts project. EC declared an interest as Herefordshire Council is sponsor of the Greening the City project AL informed the Board that he is a member of the Kayak Club, which uses the Rowing Club premises to store kayaks and uses steps to access the River Wye (ref Wyese Project).</p>							
3.	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting (held 6 May 2022) and Matters Arising</p> <p>3.1 The minutes of the STF Board meeting held on 6 May were accepted as a correct record.</p> <p>3.2 Matters Arising</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="225 1973 1297 2065"> <thead> <tr> <th>Minute No</th> <th>Action</th> <th>Update</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3.2</td> <td>Skills Matrix Development</td> <td>In hand.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Minute No	Action	Update	3.2	Skills Matrix Development	In hand.	
Minute No	Action	Update						
3.2	Skills Matrix Development	In hand.						

	3.2	Finalise brief for youth membership recruitment and circulate to Board members	LR not present at meeting but the Chair advised that work is being done regarding youth membership and that a recruitment campaign will be launched after half term week.	LR RR All
	3.2	Schedule of Board Members link to specific projects	Board Members already usefully supporting projects and ongoing.	
	3.2	Set up meeting for Roger Allonby to present re Levelling Up Fund	RR are in liaison with RA to arrange a date for this.	
	3.2	Project management tender to PDG	Tender has now gone live on the Council's portal. Link will be shared with Board members for onward circulation to anyone who could be interested in tendering.	
	3.2	Draft Communications Toolkit available by 16 April	LR absent – update next time. Board to note that the Central Towns Fund Hub has now published updated comms advice to schemes.	
	3,2	Provide comms support to Friends of Castle Green regarding submission of planning application	LR absent – update next time	
	3,2	Compile list of media spokespeople for all projects	LR absent – update next time	
	3,2	Updates on University of Southampton's Impact of Culture on Civic Pride event	LR absent – update next time	
	4.2.3	PW to provide details of Maylord Orchard's strategy to JNo	JNo confirmed PW has provided details of short-term strategy for Maylords. Further clarification regarding long term commercial/social/cultural vision is still not clear to JNo.	
	5.5	Discussion with regard to streamlining of processes involved with FBC submission and responses	IA confirmed discussions had taken place with AL and agreed protocols now in place.	
4.	Monthly Programme Update			
	4.1 The Chair referred to the Programme Update document circulated to members and attendees in advance of today's meeting.			
	4.2 IA highlighted one issue to do with the Encore project to the effect that Encore had concluded they will not be locating in Maylord Orchards. However, IA advised that it had been agreed with the Project Leaders to continue with the development of a 'place neutral' FBC.			
	4.3 IA stated that an additional Board Meeting will take place on 24 June and that timelines have been amended accordingly.			
	4.4 The Chair advised that she is working with JH to discuss the management of the last few months of the available budget.			
5.	FBCs – Access and Greening Composite			
	5.1 The Chair introduced this cluster of FBCs, which she advised had already been discussed at PDG. At today's Board Meeting, members were asked to consider each of these FBCs to see if they remained in line with the overall vision of the Stronger Towns			

	<p>Fund and to confirm they were satisfied that risk assessment for each project had been properly and adequately addressed.</p> <p>5.2 IA explained the process involved in developing FBCs from initial compilation of the Council's FBC pro-forma through to submission of all FBCs to the Board meeting for final sign off on 24 June.</p> <p>5.3 AL stated that the risk transfer issue with regard to each project needs to be addressed. In particular, he said that clarity was needed at Board and Council level as to what would happen in the event of project cost over-runs.</p> <p>5.4 FM agreed, but said he sought clarification regarding the definition of risk. KH stressed that assessment of risk must be proportionate to each project and queried where the level of scrutiny is coming from – Chamberlain Walker, the Council or the STF Board.</p> <p>5.5 It was agreed that AA/AL would continue this discussion outside of today's Board meeting. AL indicated his willingness to hold a workshop on this topic for project leaders/Board members, if useful. In the meantime, RR to ensure all FBCs include carefully considered and thorough risk assessments.</p>	<p>AA/AL RR</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>FBC – Castle Green Project</p> <p>6.1 IA talked to this FBC, which had been circulated to Board Members/attendees in advance of today's Board meeting. He also referred to the initial feedback from Chamberlain Walker (CW) on this document.</p> <p>6.2 The Chair invited comments from attendees on the FBC. The following were noted:</p> <p>6.2.1 JNo stated the importance of CW clearly stating if they agree that the analysis of each FBC demonstrates value for money or that they provide clear reasons where they disagree.</p> <p>6.2.2 OH pointed out that the Revenue budget for this project had increased from £39K to £100K and reminded the Board that the overall proportion of Revenue to Capital STF funding needs to stay within previously agreed parameters. IA replied that RR were mindful of this, but that it would not be possible to take an overview until all FBCs had been submitted. However, he felt confident that the overall balance of Revenue to Capital funding would remain within agreed parameters.</p> <p>6.3 Board members confirmed that they were happy to recommend this FBC, subject to the minor amendments highlighted by CW.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>FBC – Meadow Arts</p> <p>7.1 IA talked to this FBC, which had been circulated to Board Members/attendees in advance of today's Board meeting. He also referred to the initial feedback from CW on this document.</p> <p>7.2 The Chair invited comments from attendees on the FBC. The following were noted:</p> <p>7.2.1 OH referenced the change in the budget from £88K capital to £88K revenue and repeated his concerns as stated in 6.2.2 above. IA responded that with regard to this project in particular (art installations), there is a fine distinction between capital and revenue. However, he repeated his assurances as stated in 6.2.2 above.</p> <p>7.2.2 AL recommended that the Board compare the budget profiles in the Outline Business Cases with those in the Full Business Cases and RR be requested to bring a summary to Board on 24 June. OH agreed this would be useful as Government approval would be needed if changes to the budget profile were needed. The Chair stated her</p>	<p>RR</p>

	<p>agreement and also asked RR to highlight any changes to profiles as each FBC is brought to PDG for approval.</p> <p>7.3 Board members confirmed that they were happy to recommend this FBC, subject to the minor amendments highlighted by CW.</p>	
8.	<p>FBC – Wyese Project</p> <p>8.1 IA talked to this FBC, which had been circulated to Board Members/attendees in advance of today's Board meeting. He also referred to the initial feedback from CW on this document.</p> <p>8.2 IA stated that the points highlighted by CW were more substantial than those for the other two projects discussed so far today, but were manageable. However, he said that there were issues to do with the content of the PDG, of which members needed to be aware.</p> <p>(JNo left the meeting)</p> <p>8.3 The Chair reminded the Board that their role was partly to ensure projects remained in line with the overall vision of Hereford's Stronger Town plans.</p> <p>8.4 EC stated her concerns about the FBC. Firstly, that it should contain more design drawings to provide greater clarity regarding what was planned. Secondly, that the proposed removal of trees and replacement with a 2.4m high security fence was not in alignment with the STF's pledge to provide 'a greener and fairer Hereford'.</p> <p>8.5 Board members agreed that this PDG needed further work before they could recommend it, both with regard to the technical details outlined by CW and also to further understand why the removal of a treeline was needed.</p>	RR
9.	<p>FBC – Greening the City</p> <p>9.1 IA talked to this FBC, which had been circulated to Board Members/attendees in advance of today's Board meeting. No feedback on this project has yet been received from CW.</p> <p>9.2 IA referred to discussions at the PDG where it was recognised that the impact of reductions to the project's original bid meant that certain compromises needed to be made in terms of what could be achieved. However, PDG remained supportive of the project and the impact that it would still achieve.</p> <p>9.3 Board members confirmed that they were happy to recommend this FBC, subject to any minor amendments identified by CW.</p>	
10.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>10.1 KH advised that she would be unable to attend the Board meeting on 24 June. IA said that papers would be circulated one week ahead of the meeting for members' consideration. He also offered to provide a personal briefing to KH if required. To be further discussed by IA/KH.</p> <p>10.2 AA advised that the first installation for the Meadow Arts project was expected in June and that she would be sending Board members invitations to attend.</p>	IA/KH AA
11.	<p>Date of Next Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friday 17 June, 8.30 – 10.00 am • Friday 24 June, 8.30 – 10.00 am 	

	Via Zoom – links circulated	
--	-----------------------------	--

Action Items
STF Board Meeting – 27 May 2022

Minute No	Action	Responsibility
3.2	Ongoing actions for recruitment of youth members to STF Board	LR
3.2	Arrange meeting with Roger Allonby re Levelling Up Fund	RR
3.2	Share link to Project Management Brief with Board members for onward sharing to potentially interested contacts	AA
3.2	Communications updates	LR
5.5	Risk Management discussions	AA/AL
7.2.2	Profiling of capital to revenue budgets and highlighting variances to outline business cases	RR
8.5	Additional development of Wyese Project PDG	RR
10.1	Briefing for KH	IA/KH
10.2	Invitations to Meadow Arts 1 st installation	AA