

## BRIGHOUSE TOWN BOARD MEETING

Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2022

MS Teams Meeting

### MINUTES

**Present:** David Whitehead (Co Chair), Councillor Blagbrough, Councillor Robinson, Lesley Adams, Jason Carlton, Richard Mitchell, Anne Colley.

**In Attendance:** Councillor Jane Scullion, Steven Lee, Kate McNicholas, Richard Spensley, Duncan Cooper, Sandra Robertshaw (Minutes).

**Observer:** Lorraine Beiley, Richard Thorpe (Cities & Local Growth),

**Apologies:** Councillor Sophie Whittaker, Steven Naylor, Heather Waddington, Malcolm Silkstone, Craig Whitaker MP.

		ACTION
1.	<b>Apologies</b>	
	As noted above.	
2.	<b>Welcome and Introduction</b>	
	Introductions made and Lorraine Bagley welcomed to the meeting as an observer.	
3.	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
	None identified.	
4.	<b>Documents for Review and Approval</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Minutes of Board Meetings held on 23<sup>rd</sup> August and 10<sup>th</sup> November Board Meeting:</b> agreed both sets of minutes were an accurate reflection of both meetings. Proposed by Cllr Blagborough, seconded by Lesley Adams.</li> <li><b>Decision Log:</b> this is a record of previous decisions made by the Board under the Assurance Framework. One of the functions is to accurately record any decisions made. The log is to bring these earlier decisions onto a formal record.</li> </ul>	

		ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Board Terms of Reference:</b> query raised by JC about the accessibility of documents referred to in the ToR, as they weren't included. DC clarified this had been a query relating to the Sub-Group ToR which are currently only in draft form, hence referenced documents will only be included once the sub-groups have finalised their ToRs. RS clarified that the main change to the Board ToR was in relation to co-opting Board Members for a period of time. It was also highlighted that the proposed ToR aligns with the Assurance Framework in its references to the accountable body, CMBC, having the responsibility to progress, commission and appoint any consultants. The Board voted, show of hands 7. Amended Board ToR approved.</li> <li>• <b>Co-opt Lorraine Bailey:</b> Board voted on the co-opting LB, ACDAF, onto the Board. 6 votes, co-opting approved. Suggested co-option for same duration as community and business reps.</li> <li>• <b>Sub-Group Terms of Reference:</b> to be refined and approved at sub-group meetings.</li> </ul>	
5.	<b>Recruitment Update</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Procurement of Lead Consultant:</b> the role will be to develop the projects further and generate the 5 business cases that, once approved by the Board, will be submitted to the Department for Levelling Up Housing &amp; Communities (DLUHC) to secure the £19.1M funding assigned to Brighthouse. As the deadline for this submission is close, being the end of June '22, the procurement of the consultant has been done at pace following the receipt of the formal Brighthouse Town Deal Grant Offer letter at the end of November. This provides reasonable certainty of funds to pay the consultants, hence was needed before the procurement process could be started. The tender request went out on 14<sup>th</sup> December last year using the Council's Directory Framework that utilises the YORtender e-portal. Expecting tenders back on 21<sup>st</sup> January, these will then be evaluated and scored, and the result will determine the appointable candidate. Inception meeting will be held as soon as possible after the award letter has been published and is expected to take place early in February. Will be looking to arrange sub-group meetings with the newly appointed consultant shortly after that to discuss the details of the projects and business cases.</li> <li>• <b>Procurement of Independent Assurance Process:</b> This procurement, as detailed in the assurance process and to provide the Board with independent support to assess the more technical elements of the business cases prior to approval, must inherently follow completion of the Lead Consultant selection as both consultants need to be independent of one another hence identification of who the Lead Consultant will be is required first. This will be a smaller contract fee hence it is expected that a simpler and quicker procurement method will be allowable.</li> </ul> <p>Discussed concerns about the tight timescale and the meetings that need to be scheduled to meet the necessary compliance. RS reassured the Board that the aim was to have the inception meeting early in February such that sub-group meetings could be diarised soon after that. Noted we have five and a half months (until the end of June) before we need to submit business cases to DLUHC but the Board needs to see business cases prior to this as they need to approve them.</p>	

		ACTION
	<p>Question asked: what happens if we don't make the deadline? RT, Cities &amp; Local Growth Unit, responded that an extension by a month could be agreed without a formal request to DLUHC but if a longer extension was needed it would be necessary to look at mitigation and impact of delivery of the deal beyond the ultimate backstop of March 2026. Cllr Scullion then provided reassurance that the intention is to ensure there is appropriate support for the Board to make sure the business cases are robust and ready to go within the existing deadline. DC clarified that the deadline for the appointed consultants to complete the business case phase of activity will remain the end of June.</p> <p>Query whether pre-election period would impact? RS responded that the Council's business will continue including the normal function of meetings associated with the business case, advice may be required around consultations and outward publicity. SL advised that in respect of the pre-election period, this doesn't affect timescales, it is business as usual this would only affect any political announcements.</p> <p>Discussed whether sub-group meetings will be in person or virtual, this would depend on Government Guidelines and completion of appropriate risk assessments.</p>	
6.	<b>Communication Sub-Group Update</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Appointment of PR Company:</b> Process now complete and Waverley PR Consultants have been appointed. Also, Cllr Whittaker has contacted the unsuccessful companies. Subject to the Board's approval tonight delivery of PR activity can commence in earnest.</li> <li>• <b>Presentation of revised branding concept:</b> SN has done some work trying to communicate the Board's aims in a more simplified manner, a draft is now in place for a website and social media. These are all ready to go under "@brighousedeal". Branding that meets the requirements of the Town Deal Fund has been applied to the website. Press release is ready to go, subject to Board approval tonight. Mapping out the engagement, getting the citizens of Brighouse clued-up fast that the Board want to talk to them and then looking at the different groups to be engaged with. Waverley (PR Consultants) have done some work on this already, have drafted details about the hard-to-reach areas including young people, minority elements and the senior residents. The Board voted and approved use of the branding and the PR products presented.</li> </ul> <p>Discussed whether live streaming of meetings would be needed, and some concerns expressed around this. The Board can use different methods of communicating with the wider public, noted there was a degree of nervousness about live streaming and public meetings, some Board members lack the necessary experience with regard to publicity/visibility. Cllr Scullion recognised the concerns; however, it is important that we see democracy and accountability in action. Advice from consultants about live streaming was to consider it carefully at this point because we would at this stage be taking decisions which might be commercially confidential and there was a concern that we may have to move into a private session to discuss costs, something we could look at further down the line when the individual projects were fully established. Hopefully, the Board may be able to meet in person in the near future and then residents could attend in a conventional way where they can both see and be seen.</p>	

		<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>Discussed whether live streaming of meetings would be needed, and some concerns expressed around this. The Board can use different methods of communicating with the wider public, noted there was a degree of nervousness about live streaming and public meetings, some Board members lack the necessary experience with regard to publicity/visibility. Cllr Scullion recognised the concerns; however, it is important that we see democracy and accountability in action. Advice from consultants about live streaming was to consider it carefully at this point because we would at this stage be taking decisions which might be commercially confidential and there was a concern that we may have to move into a private session to discuss costs, something we could look at further down the line when the individual projects were fully established. Hopefully, the Board may be able to meet in person in the near future and then residents could attend in a conventional way where they can both see and be seen.</p> <p>JC discussed the challenges of public accessibility and visibility and how it suited some more than others. Those who are comfortable with it should certainly be accessible, but the relatively informal discussions of the sub-groups should best be kept to sub-group members, with public visibility of decision-making being provided at main Board meetings. To help avoid repeatedly answering common question from the public there will be statements on the website to deal with frequently asked questions and this may be useful in dealing with more contentious issues as people can be signposted to the relevant answer. Cllr Blagborough suggested engaging local residents outside supermarkets and the local market, both of which tend to be general meeting places. RS asked RT if any examples from other Boards under your remit were held in public, with them being admitted to meetings at certain times to avoid confidential issues? RT felt that this is a local decision so not for him to advise, but live streaming is not without risk and reward, need to reflect that the Board have a large volume of work to do and consider whether making progress on bigger projects needs to take priority.</p> <p>LA discussed if we could do something at one of our events, end of April. Likely to get a lot of really good engagement that way, hits a lot of people and always more willing to talk.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Board Development</b>	
	DW confirmed that both Co-Chairs were invited to Carlisle to observe a Town Board Meeting, but this was subsequently cancelled.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	Board Members reminded about the need to submit a short biopic to Cllr Whittaker (max of 75 words) for the website. If not already done so, please complete and send to Cllr Whittaker as soon as possible. Cllr Blagborough asked if there was an example so a similar format can be used, DW shared his example.	<b>ALL</b>

		ACTION
9.	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>DC confirmed that, in line with the Terms of Reference, Board Meetings should be held every quarter but suggested that with the amount of consultation work required the Board will need a meeting earlier than that. Agreed to progress the date of the next meeting once Lead consultant has been appointed. The remainder of the quarterly meetings can be added to calendars.</p> <p>RM asked if personal holidays could be taken into account. LA confirmed she would be on leave for one week from 30<sup>th</sup> September. RS advised that will try to accommodate but meetings will need to progress at the appropriate pace.</p> <p>JC mentioned the need to strengthening the Board's representation, agreed agenda item for the next meeting. We may have some skills gaps amongst the current Board that need exploring and a plan to resolve. Agreed once we start communicating, we may get more interest from residents and with the revised ToR's it will be easier to co-opt new Board members. JC confirmed a call to action to express an interest if want to be involved.</p>	DC