

## Town Deal Board

Thursday 21 January 2021

9am



### Online- Microsoft Teams

**PRESENT:** Alby Pattison, AP Services (North East) Limited (Chair) (AB)  
Adrian Coates, BEIS (AC)  
Beverley Bearne, Hartlepool Borough Council (BB)  
Cllr Shane Moore, Hartlepool Borough Council (SM)  
Cllr Mike Young, Hartlepool Borough Council (MY)  
Craig Dohring, Hartlepool Power Station (CD)  
Darren Hankey, Hartlepool College of Further Education (DH)  
David Tuck, Genecon (DT)  
Denise McGuckin, Hartlepool Borough Council (DMc)  
Ed Cardwell, Arcadis (EC)  
Gary Wright, North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust (GW)  
Martin Raby, Northern School of Art (MR)  
Mike Hill, Hartlepool MP (MH)  
Reshma Begum, Federation of Small Businesses (RB)  
Rob Smith, Hartlepool Borough Council (RS)  
Roslyn Adamson, National Museum of the Royal Navy (RA)  
Samantha Durham, Hartlepool Borough Council (SD)

Copy of paperwork to Marie Kiddell, Homes England for information

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
1.	<p><b><u>WELCOME</u></b></p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed new attendee Reshma Begum from the Federation of Small Businesses.</p>	
2.	<p><b><u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u></b></p> <p>Maxine Craig, Love Hartlepool (MC) Rachel Anderson, NECC (RA) Alison Fellows, Tees Valley Combined Authority (AF) Cllr Christopher Akers-Belcher, Hartlepool Borough Council (CAB) Julie Gillon, North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust (JG)</p>	
3.	<p><b><u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u></b></p> <p>Darren Hankey recorded an interest in the Health and Care Centre of Excellence and Tees Valley Civil Engineering Institute.</p>	

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
4.	<p><b><u>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – 24<sup>th</sup> November 2020</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.</p>	
5.	<p><b><u>TEESSIDE AND NORTH EAST ALL CHAIRS MEETING)</u></b></p> <p>DH provided the group with an update following the Teesside and North East All Chairs Meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was made clear that the minutes of Board meetings need to be on the website. RS confirmed that Hartlepool’s minutes could be found on Hartlepool’s Town Deal page at: <a href="http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/HartlepoolTownDeal">www.hartlepool.gov.uk/HartlepoolTownDeal</a></li> <li>• So far, not every town has received the funding that they’ve requested. There was a view that most towns in Cohort 1 submitted existing projects. It was mentioned that Cohort 1 had more leeway than we’ll get in Cohort 3.</li> <li>• Focusing on the story is key – something DH indicated that we’re strong at.</li> <li>• Low carbon seems to be a theme that many TIP’s are missing out on.</li> <li>• It was reiterated that we can ask for up to 10% revenue funding. MR confirmed that the board has previously considered the opportunity for 10% revenue.</li> <li>• Updates from the other towns in attendance indicated that they seem to have issues and are frustrated with the process.</li> </ul> <p>AP provided an update from the Teesside and North East All Chairs Meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other towns have had to review projects within their Investment Plans due to reduced Future High Street funding awards.</li> <li>• There was discussion around making sure COVID planning and issues are included, and as up to date as possible.</li> <li>• Make sure the presence of shovel-ready projects are spelled out. Whilst it’s not a listed requirement, it seems the Government likes to see them.</li> <li>• We need to discuss ongoing oversight of projects by the Board once they have started, and continue to consider links to other projects.</li> <li>• The Town Deal Partner suggested keeping up to date with the blogs and articles on the Towns Fund website. This can be found at: <a href="https://townsfund.org.uk/">https://townsfund.org.uk/</a></li> <li>• It was noted that bids for Cohorts 2, 2a and 3 need to be strong.</li> </ul>	
6.	<p><b><u>BUSINESS CASE GUIDANCE</u></b></p> <p>RS provided a presentation for the above item.</p>	

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>New guidance was released in December 2020. This covers the development and appraisal of business cases and other requirements related to project development and submission of the Summary Document.</p> <p>MHCLG and the Towns Fund Delivery Partner will continue to provide support and guidance throughout this next phase.</p> <p>After agreeing Heads of Terms, towns have two months to confirm which projects will be taken forward as part of their Town Deal, this should include the following information on each project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Towns Fund ask</li> <li>2. Match-funding total and breakdown</li> <li>3. Expected outputs and outcomes</li> <li>4. Plan for addressing key conditions</li> <li>5. Whether the project will be fast-tracked</li> <li>6. Proposed financial profile and the Revenue/Capital split (Approval at MHCLG's discretion).</li> </ol> <p>Full business cases should be developed for each agreed project in line with HM Treasury's Green Book 5 cases and the conditions agreed in the Heads of Terms. The 5 cases are: strategic, economic, commercial, financial and management.</p> <p>The Green Book has recently been updated to ensure the methodology supports the delivery of Government's levelling up ambitions and other policy priorities.</p> <p>The Council will be accountable for implementing the Town Deal and ensuring the funds are spent on the purpose that they were given.</p> <p>The Town Deal Board will have an ongoing role and have sight of decisions as projects are developed or possible changes are made. The nature and degree of the Board's oversight needs to be agreed locally.</p> <p>All business cases should pass through local assurance mechanisms with oversight from the Town Deal Board. MHCLG will reserve the right to call in any business case to be assured centrally.</p> <p>Once business cases have been developed and appraised a completed Summary Document will need to be submitted to MHCLG within 12 months of the Heads of Terms agreement.</p> <p>MHCLG will need to review and be satisfied with completed Summary Documents before funding can be released.</p> <p>For each business case, the accountable body should follow their local assurance processes. This should include sign off from relevant individuals and groups within the council (for example the S151 officer and Committee's).</p>	

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>There may be circumstances where towns wish to make adjustments to projects, or replace them with alternatives.</p> <p>Approval will be at the discretion of MHCLG. Adjusted projects will be reassessed against the original project assessment criteria to determine what effect the adjustment has had on the project</p> <p>No additional funding will be allocated if new or adjusted projects are of higher value</p> <p>RS explained that Hartlepool's projects are at either ends of the spectrum in terms of development. Some projects require design, costing, and business planning etc. before the business case can be written, whilst others can be brought forward more quickly. The costs need to be understood, evidence of need developed, and the risks identified, so the projects are capable of being signed off through a Business Case process.</p> <p>RS indicated that the Council needs to ensure that the local assurance framework is Green book compliant. It may be beneficial to use the Tees Valley Combined Authority forms and process as they have sufficient robustness.</p> <p>There is no guarantee that Hartlepool will receive the full level of funding requested. The board may therefore have to make some difficult decisions in the future around scaling back projects, finding additional Co-funding, or not progressing with some projects.</p> <p>RS to review the funding announced through previous rounds of the Towns Fund and High Street Fund and report back to the next board meeting.</p> <p>AC confirmed that the Future High Street Fund is considered separately to the Towns Fund. The Levelling Up Fund will be independent again. It is anticipated that this will be launched in the near future.</p>	<b>RS</b>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b><u>SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT</u></b></p> <p>RS provided a presentation for the above item.</p> <p>The second round of public engagement took place between 17<sup>th</sup> December 2020 and 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021.</p> <p>The physical exhibitions planned for the Shopping Centre and other venues were cancelled due to Covid-19 restrictions. The engagement was therefore largely online.</p> <p>The proposals were exhibited on the Town Deal Board website and included a video from AP and DMc.</p>	

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>The survey was shared by some significant social media pages/accounts, including Love Hartlepool, Radio Hartlepool and Hartlepool Life, the town's weekly free newspaper. Conversations were held with key groups and stakeholders and a newsletter was circulated to all households.</p> <p>230 responses were received via Survey Monkey. A number of direct responses were also received.</p> <p>Each individual response was coded as to whether it was deemed supportive, neutral or not applicable (for example a proportion of comments made in relation to Middleton Grange or marina proposals related to town-wide parking issues rather than the proposals being made), negative, or where no response had been made.</p> <p>The proposals for the Wesley Chapel and the two training projects (Health and Care Academy and the Tees Valley Civil Engineering Institute) achieved the highest degree of support from local residents.</p> <p><b>Wesley Chapel</b> Support for Wesley Chapel was divided between respondents who were supportive of the proposal to redevelop the chapel as a hotel (59% of supportive responses) and those who were supportive of redevelopment in theory but felt that an alternative use was more appropriate (41%).</p> <p>Issues raised by respondents relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability of a new hotel business – references were made to the adjacent Grand Hotel going out of business this year and what this might mean for demand within Hartlepool.</li> <li>• The Wesley Chapel is currently in private ownership and whether public sector funding should be used in this instance.</li> <li>• Desire to see the chapel reused in some form – if not as a hotel whether an alternative use could be sought. Ideas included office space, student accommodation, community space, homeless accommodation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Marina Connections</b> This project received the lowest number of supportive responses; this may have been due to a variety of other perceived issues relating to the marina area which people referred to (principally relating to the car parking for users of the restaurant / bar areas, the appearance of areas of waste land / issues relating to litter picking, and a perception that a considerable amount of investment has already been made in the marina area.</p> <p>RA indicated that the National Museum of the Royal Navy are looking to invest within the area and will take on board the comments. DMc will review how the Council can respond to the issues raised.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>RA/DMc</b></p>

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p><b>Health and Care Centre of Excellence</b> 69% of responses were in support of the project. The majority of responses were coded as 'not applicable' or 'neutral'.</p> <p><b>Tees Valley Civil Engineering Institute</b> Nearly three-quarters of responses were supportive. Comments related to the importance of training for both Hartlepool and the wider region, implications for job readiness and job creation and links with business.</p> <p><b>Middleton Grange</b> 58% of comments supported the project. Other issues raised by respondents related to the cost of parking within the town centre, anti-social behaviour and support for out of town shopping centres.</p> <p><b>Other Comments</b> The importance of continuing to engage with VCS groups to maximise the impact of projects through collaboration and joint working we highlighted.</p> <p>Outside of the priority projects, a need to address poverty, homelessness and physical, mental health and wellbeing for the residents of Hartlepool was raised.</p> <p>A requirement to see that investment is used to support the town towards net zero carbon commitments, reducing environmental impacts and increasing biodiversity was raised.</p> <p>RS outlined the importance of ongoing engagement. The board needs to continue the stakeholder mapping exercise and identify additional groups that can support future engagement. The Sub Group will continue to meet to do this.</p> <p>RS to circulate the summary of responses to the Board.</p> <p>DMc will consider how the Council can respond to some of the wider issues raised by the consultation results.</p> <p>RS and DMc to produce a summary response that can be shared on the website responding to the comments for each of the projects and how the Council will respond to the wider issues.</p> <p>The results from consultation to be included in the Stakeholder Strategy</p> <p>RS to circulate final stakeholder strategy to the Board.</p> <p>The board considered the results of the engagement exercise. The feedback will be used to inform the development of the project proposals.</p>	<p><b>RS</b></p> <p><b>DMc</b></p> <p><b>RS/DMc</b></p> <p><b>RS</b></p>

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
8.	<p data-bbox="229 264 1206 338"><b><u>CHECK AND CHALLENGE- TOWNS FUND DELIVERY PARTNER FEEDBACK</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="229 376 895 412">RS provided a presentation for the above item.</p> <p data-bbox="229 450 1230 524">Board Members received the full set of comments from the Town Deal Partner in advance of the meeting.</p> <p data-bbox="229 562 1331 636">An evaluation of the Town Investment Plan was carried out by the Town Deal Partner to make recommendations for improvements before submission.</p> <p data-bbox="229 674 1318 779">The comments were positive and it was considered to be a very good Town Investment Plan. No major concerns were raised. The comments were more about finessing the detail.</p> <p data-bbox="229 817 1307 922">It was considered a well-presented TIP where golden thread is evident. The challenges and interventions were clearly identified and there was a good consideration of the issues caused by COVID-19.</p> <p data-bbox="229 960 1337 1066">There was strong evidence of community engagement, cross-referenced with engagement around other plans to highlight core themes. Good use of quotes to illustrate key points.</p> <p data-bbox="229 1104 1243 1140">A number of minor suggestions were raised for consideration including.</p> <ul data-bbox="277 1178 1326 2033" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="277 1178 1289 1328">• A more detailed executive summary would help to highlight Hartlepool’s rich heritage and the key challenges, showcase the interventions to address the challenges and signpost the Towns Fund financial ask.</li> <li data-bbox="277 1366 1310 1471">• Consider how to make the vision for Hartlepool more distinctive to Hartlepool to pass the “Tipp-ex test”. How do the projects / outcomes then meet / help deliver the vision (links to Theory of Change)?</li> <li data-bbox="277 1509 1315 1615">• Suggest reinforcing the letter of the chair. Include a line regarding the proud heritage of the town and being on the cusp of existing journey into the future</li> <li data-bbox="277 1653 1259 1727">• Include a table in the document which summarises the funding by project</li> <li data-bbox="277 1765 1155 1839">• Improve some of the plans such as the “Dysfunctional and disconnected central area”.</li> <li data-bbox="277 1877 1326 2033">• Hotel project / Wesley Chapel –Outcomes could highlight encouraging longer stay and the visitor economy and supporting private sector investment / business accommodation (golden thread). Don’t just consider the project from a heritage and investment point of view.</li> </ul>	

NO	DETAIL	ACTION
9.	<p><b><u>APPROVAL OF TOWN INVESTMENT PLAN</u></b></p> <p>The Town Investment Plan was fully endorsed by the HBC Regeneration Services Committee on the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021.</p> <p>The HBC Finance and Policy Committee are due to approve the Investment Plan on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2021.</p> <p>The board agreed to review the final content and provide AP or RS with any final comments by Monday 25<sup>th</sup> January, prior to submission on the 29<sup>th</sup> January.</p> <p><b>The Town Deal Board approved the Hartlepool Town Investment Plan and authorised its submission to the Government.</b></p> <p>RS to circulate final submission to the board for information.</p>	RS
10.	<p><b><u>TIMESCALES AND NEXT STEPS</u></b></p> <p>RS outlined the next steps in the process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18<sup>th</sup>- 25<sup>th</sup> January - Final updates to RS and AP.</li> <li>• 29<sup>th</sup> January - Submission of Investment Plan</li> </ul> <p>AC indicated that MHCLG are aiming for an 8 week turnaround for the assessment of the Town Investment Plan, although the timescale could potentially be longer.</p>	
11.	<p><b><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></b></p> <p>Terms of Reference to be updated on the website to reflect the new members of the Board and changes to Council structure. The Town Deal Board website will be updated.</p> <p>Further advice has been sought around State Aid for the Wesley Chapel project. The initial advice is that the Board are still legally eligible to fund the project under the new Subsidy Control regulations. The justification for the advice will need to be provided at Business Case stage.</p> <p>AP thanked RS and the team for the development of the Investment Plan and their hard work over the previous 12 months in developing a strong case for funding.</p>	RS/AP
12.	<p><b><u>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u></b></p> <p>TBC in due course.</p>	RS/AP



<b>NO</b>	<b>DETAIL</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	Board Member's to be kept up to date by correspondence in advance of the next board meeting.	<b>RS</b>

DRAFT

## ACTIONS

MEETING DATE	ITEM NO	ACTION	RESP OFF	DEADLINE
21 <sup>st</sup> January 2021	6	<p><b><u>BUSINESS CASE GUIDANCE</u></b></p> <p>RS to review the funding announced through previous rounds of the Towns Fund and High Street Fund and report back to the next board meeting.</p>	RS	March 2021
	7	<p><b><u>SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT</u></b></p> <p>RA indicated that the National Museum of the Royal Navy are looking to invest within the area and will take on board the comments. DMc will review how the Council can respond to the issues raised.</p> <p>RS to circulate the summary of responses to the Board.</p>	RA/Dmc	March 2021
		<p>DMc will consider how the Council can respond to some of the wider issues raised by the consultation results.</p>	RS	February 2021
		<p>DMc will consider how the Council can respond to some of the wider issues raised by the consultation results.</p> <p>RS and DMc to produce a summary response that can be shared on the website responding to the comments for each of the projects and how the Council will respond to the wider issues raised.</p> <p>Stakeholder strategy to be circulated to the Board.</p>	DMc	March 2021
9	<p><b><u>APPROVAL OF TOWN INVESTMENT PLAN</u></b></p> <p>RS to circulate final submission to the group for information.</p>	RS/DMc	March 2021	
			RS	February 2021
			RS	February 2021

11	<b><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></b> Terms of Reference to be updated on the website to reflect the new members of the Board and changes to Council structure. The Town Deal Board website will be updated.	RS/AP	February 2021
12	<b><u>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u></b> Board Member's to be kept up to date by correspondence in advance of the next board meeting.	RS	March 2021

DRAFT

## COMPLETED ACTIONS

MEETING DATE	ITEM NO	ACTION	RESP OFF	DEADLINE
24 <sup>th</sup> November 2020	4	<p><b><u>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – 27th OCTOBER 2020</u></b></p> <p>Minutes to be amended to reflect concerns expressed by MR. Minutes to be updated and recirculated.</p>	RS	January 2021
	5	<p><b><u>PROJECT PRIORITISATION OUTCOME</u></b></p> <p>Written response is sent to MR addressing the concern with the Health and Care Centre of Excellence project.</p>	RS	January 2021
	6	<p><b><u>PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT EXERCISE</u></b></p> <p>Board members were requested to provide feedback from the first round of engagement.</p> <p>Board Members were requested to publicise the engagement through their networks.</p> <p>The Board were requested to feedback any activities that they would like to see included within engagement process (now or in the future) or any Stakeholders that can be consulted within the ongoing activity.</p>	All  All  All	January 2021  January 2021  January 2021
	7	<p><b><u>RESULTS OF INFORMAL CHECK AND CHALLENGE WITH TOWN DEAL PARTNER</u></b></p> <p>RS to contact arm's length bodies and feed any comments back to the Board.</p>	RS	January 2021

	<p>AP will continue to feedback the discussions from the Town Deal Board Chairs Forum.</p> <p>All presentations from today's Board meeting to be shared with the minutes.</p> <p>The next draft of the TIP will be circulated by email after the 4<sup>th</sup> December. AP welcomed comments on the next draft and stated that views would be very much valued from the board.</p>	<p>AP</p> <p>RS</p> <p>All</p>	<p>January 2021</p> <p>January 2021</p> <p>January 2021</p>
8	<p><b><u>TIMESCALES AND NEXT STEPS</u></b></p> <p>Rachel Anderson to join engagement sub group.</p> <p>RS to circulate timetable and identify when input will be required from the Board.</p>	<p>RA</p> <p>RS</p>	<p>January 2021</p> <p>January 2021</p>
9	<p><b><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></b></p> <p>An action tracker is being developed for the board which will be circulated in advance of the next meeting</p>	<p>KS/RS</p>	<p>January 2021</p>
10	<p><b><u>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u></b></p> <p>TBC January 2021.</p> <p>Board Members to be kept up to date by correspondence in advance of the next board meeting.</p>	<p>AP/RS</p> <p>AP/RS</p>	<p>January 2021</p> <p>January 2021</p>