## **Hartlepool Town Deal Board**

## **Friday 23rd September 2022**

## **9am**

**National Museum of the Royal Navy, Hartlepool**

**PRESENT:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name  | Organisation / Representing |
| Darren Hankey (DH)  | Hartlepool College of Further Education – Chair of this meeting |
| Denise McGuckin (DMc) | Hartlepool Borough Council |
| Maxine Craig (MC) | Love Hartlepool |
| Gary Wright (GW) | NHS |
| Cllr Shane Moore (SM) | Hartlepool Borough Council |
| Aaron Myers (AM) | Dept. for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy |
| Paul Taylor (PT) | Hartlepool Borough Council |
| Lauren Thwaites | Jacobs |
| Craig Dohring (CD) | EDF Energy |
| Toni Rhodes (TR) | Hartlepool 6th Form College |
| Ros Adamson (RA) | Nation Museum of the Royal Navy |
| Sarah Walker (SW) | Tees Valley Combined Authority |
| Bev Bearne (BB) | Hartlepool Borough Council |
| Martin Raby (MR) | Northern School of Art |
| Lesley Grant (LG) | Hartlepool Borough Council |

| **NO** | **DETAIL** | **ACTION** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **WELCOME** DH welcomed attendees and gave thanks to the National Museum of the Royal Navy for hosting this meeting. |  |
| **2.** | **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**Alby Pattison, Mark Rycraft and Reshma Begum sent apologies.DH would therefore be Chair of this meeting. |  |
| **3.** | **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND ANNUAL REVIEW**There were no Declarations of Interest not already recorded at previous Board meetings. |  |
| **4.** | **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – July 1st 2022** No matters of accuracy were raised.PT confirmed that all actions from the previous meeting would be covered under the agenda items. |  |
| **5.** | **5% CDEL DRAWDOWN**PT confirmed that following a number of projects receiving early funding, works were continuing and some completed. Specific details to follow in the project updates. |  |
| **6.** | **PROGRAMME UPDATE AND REPORTING DASHBOARD**Reporting dashboard displayed with summary of key updates across the programme.Programme overview displayed. PT confirmed that a more detailed programme will be produced for the delivery stage including spend profiles and budget information.DM noted that Hartlepool is the only authority in the North East to be delivering all originally planned projects on time and on budget, and thanked Bev, Paul and the team for the work to get to this stage.DH queried whether we would get formal approval from DLUHC for the 5 projects. AM confirmed that there should be formal communications and contracts coming out with/slightly ahead of payments. There would be an initial payment for Waterfront Connectivity today (minus 5% drawdown), payments for Wesley Chapel and the two Academies delayed to November, and then a payment for Reimagining Middleton Grange in December.MR raised the issue of cost inflation and queried whether we would be discussing the issue. PT stated that it needs to be a focus across programme and individual projects. Cost contingency has been built into the Business Cases, e.g. Middleton has 15% built in, but we do need to move to procurement and delivery quickly to secure prices. BB confirmed that there is an assurance strategy corporately to deal with inflation and once we have confirmation from DLUHC for the projects we can move quickly to procurement. MR stated it would be useful to have a timeline on when we expect to have detailed design and cost information.CD stated that the cost of materials is still expected to increase and companies are guaranteeing prices for shorter periods. If we can get moving, we have a have a better chance to secure prices within cost envelope. GW also stated that as well as prices rising, lead times are increasing on equipment.DM stated it would be helpful as we enter delivery stage to have a programme risk register and add it as a standard item on the agenda. | **PT** |
| **7.** | **PROJECT UPDATE - MIDDLETON**PT stated that this would be the last update on business case documents as we will be moving into the delivery stage by the next meeting.PT displayed and talked through the project update slides along with the plan for the next 4 weeks (circulated ahead of the meeting).MR queried the level of confidence that we won’t be delayed through legal processes. BB stated that there were no concerns as the solicitors were very timely in responding, but that we do need to accelerate conversations with MARS Pension fund. We can acknowledge this on the risk register, along with CPO. MR stated that opposing solicitors could be the issue. BB and PT agreed and acknowledged. BB stated that there have been preliminary conversations with MARS and don’t foresee any complications. DM stated that we are also working with the Mayoral Development Corporation and they may provide additional support to conversations.MC stated this project has the most energy, so we need to share what we can and explain to residents that we are still working on the details. We need to be clear on where we are with the plans and what has been agreed.  |  |
| **8.** | **PROJECT UPDATE - WATERFRONT** PT displayed and talked through the project update slides, including the plan for the next 4 weeks (circulated ahead of the meeting). |  |
| **9.** | **PROJECT UPDATE - HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SKILLS ACADEMY**GW displayed and talked through the project update slides, including the plan for the next 4 weeks (circulated ahead of the meeting).GW additionally confirmed that it is difficult to move to procurement until formal approval and the grant agreement are in place, so they are doing what they can behind the scenes to get ready to move. Procurement will likely be a 12 week process and they will use the NHS framework.GW noted that a further delay to funding increase risks with inflation and lead times which could create delays to opening.The floor plan was displayed. GW explained that this showed the work that has been done with the early drawdown funding to redesign the ward space into a flexible space.SW queried when the MOU would go out.BB stated that HBC are exploring to see if the funding could be cash flowed to prevent delay.TR stated that we need to communicate what is for and not for each of the providers. GW stated that there is still time to shape that, we want to do what is right for the community and it also has to be financially viable, so it needs income streams. Willing to meet with stakeholders and TR to discuss shaping.MC stated that it seems light on social care, but we have to sure as we enter delivery that it is health and social care. Need to be engaging and ensure nursing home providers feel central to this to fund revenue streams, show social care is a great place to work.DM highlighted that social care is built into the immersive suite and Adult Services sits on the project group, linking into care homes. The social care connection is there but needs strengthening. It is also about schools and colleges to get people into the workforce.TR offered the group an invite to the immersive suite in Sunderland to experience it. Also highlighted that there may be additional costs afterwards with filming for the scenes, etc, but would be happy to collaborate with GW.GW stated that he built into the Business Plan the need for a technician and is exploring readymade videos for the suite, or collaborative creation with other facilities. |  |
| **10.** | **PROJECT UPDATE - CIVIL ENGINEERING SKILLS ACADEMY**PT displayed and talked through the project update slides, including the plan for the next 4 weeks (circulated ahead of the meeting) provided by Sarah Ainslie.Sarah is offering a site tour to Board members to discuss how site will work, how the modular buildings will look, etcFundingAM gave an update received regarding funding. Initially the Head of Terms document is sent, followed by the Grant Offer letter (covering terms), then before every payment a grant determination letter should be sent setting out each individual payment. No other MOU.GW queried whether HBC can send the grant agreement then.BB/DM stated in theory, but need to do cash flow checks first.SW stated the terms should be checked to see if there are any conditional clauses, such as needing formal business case sign off. |  |
| **11.** | **PROJECT UPDATE - WESLEY CHAPEL**PT displayed and talked through the project update slides, including the plan for next 4 weeks (circulated ahead of the meeting). DM stated that Jomast have their own construction team, so they can move quickly into delivery. GW queried whether there was c conflict of interest around the construction team. BB stated that the procurement approach was set out in the Business Case.PT highlighted that Arup’s provided independent heritage advice and that the project was being closely monitored by Arup’s and DLUHC as an exemplar project on bringing a heritage building in disrepair back into use.SM queried what is stopping Jomast starting now with their own money if the Town Deal funding is only covering conservation and Jomast are putting in a significant amount.PT stated Board only approved early drawdown funding on the condition that Jomast are spending also and the grant agreement is on a monthly schedule. Jomast are only able to drawdown funding amounts once they deliver their elementsDM stated SM to pick up with Jomast on maybe getting started sooner.Briefing note to be sent to elected members on status of Wesley Chapel. | SMAction |
| **12.** | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT**PT provided a communications and engagement update provided by Emily Conyard and Ed Turner.PT displayed some comms that have been issued since the last Board and explained that the Town Deal work is becoming more visible, there has also been great press from the involvement of Arup’s as they want to report nationally on Wesley as an exemplar project.There is an article in Hartbeat, there has been social media posts/videos, and there has been interaction with the YourSay platform, we are now getting positive comments on the projects. Need to capture comments on YourSay and report on quantitatively.PT outlined engagement priorities and acknowledged significant work needed. There are good project communications going out, but a comms strategy has not yet been brought to the Board for oversight.The draft plan need significant improvement to become the strategy for the lifetime of programme, but will bring to next Board.MC stated that the Board committed public money to appoint an officer of the programme, but the Board have not been updated on how the money has been spent. We need simple KPIs. PT stated that a portion of the money was used on a part time practitioner and the rest remains unallocated. BB stated to add standard agenda items for financial update and KPIs.MC stated it would be good to open up a Levelling Up Tour for residents.PT stated that heritage tours for the general public are in the plan to connect with residents.SW stated that we could film the tour and then do regular progress videos, a video blog of progress.PT stated that it is on the draft plan to have certain members talking about the involvement of organisations in the Town Deal. SW stated that another Board has individual project ambassadors, so those people have the responsibility to raise the profile of each project. MC stated that we need visibility of the work Emily is undertaking. | PTPT |
| **14.** | **POLICY UPDATE** Nothing to update. |  |
| **15.** | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**No items raised. |  |
| **16.** | **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING** Friday 4th November at 9am at Hartlepool College of Further Education. |  |