

BRIGHOUSE DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING

Tuesday 26th July 2022

Meeting Room 1, Brighouse Library, HD6 2AF

MINUTES

Present:

David Whitehead (Co-Chair) (via remote link)
Cllr Sophie Whittaker (Co-Chair)
Cllr Howard Blagbrough
Cllr George Robinson (via remote link)
Craig Whittaker MP (via remote link)
Lesley Adams
Anne Colley
Richard Mitchell
Jason Carlton
Colin Gordon
Carl Wrigley

In attendance:

Cllr Sarah Courtney
Cllr Jane Scullion
Bill Waller, Turner & Townsend
Jamie Catlow Turner & Townsend
Peter Finley, Turner & Townsend
Anthony Everett, Regeneration Consultancy
Steven Naylor, Communications Consultant for Town Deal
Tom Bridges ARUP, Towns Fund Delivery Role for DLUP
Steven Lee, Assistant Director – Strategic Infrastructure, CMBC (Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council)
Rob Shipway, Programme Manager, CMBC
Duncan Cooper, Project Manager CMBC
Anthony Everett, Regeneration Consultancy
Steven Naylor, Comms Consultant for Town Deal
Tom Bridges ARUP, Towns Fund Delivery Role for DLUP

1. Apologies

Noted from Malcolm Silkstone, Richard Spensley, and Amanda Coldwell. The Chair also confirmed that Amanda had resigned from the Board due to workload.

2. Welcome and Introductions

All welcomed to the meeting, and introductions made.

3. Declaration of Interests

JC declared an interest in 'Industry 4', as his partner is linked to the College.

4. Minutes for Approval

Request that the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) for the Parklets could be amended to allow for extra Blue Badge parking spaces on Commercial Street? SL confirmed that the current TRO is up for renewal and confirmation will be provided after 25th September, subject to Governing Body Consideration.

Agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of the meeting. Proposed by Cllr Blagbrough and seconded by Richard Mitchell.

5. Update on Communication Activity (Steven Naylor)

Noted SN's report from June, circulated with the agenda. SN reported that the communications works were gathering momentum. Industry 4.0 has gained a lot of interest from the business community. Now working on plans for what happens next after the Business Cases have been submitted to Government engaging residents and the wider business community, including open events. Asked about feedback to the plans, SN confirmed broad support for the plans, seen by many respondents as a welcome opportunity for the town, although inevitably there have been contentious issues as the plans have taken shape. Some of these concerns have been lessened by proactive communication of the projects.

The Chair thanks SN for his contribution to today's meeting.

6. Presentation by Towns Fund Delivery Partner (Tom Bridges, ARUP)

TB began by referring to an article written by a colleague on Towns Fund website [Town Leadership in the Delivery Phase — townsfund.org.uk](https://townsfund.org.uk) exploring the changing role of the Board as we move from project development to delivery. This includes a change of focus, and new challenges for Board members – even a need for new members. The relationship between the accountable body and the Board will change, and his experience included observing areas where this had caused some conflict.

TB felt that Calderdale and the Brighouse Board are in a 'good place,' with solid foundations at project and partnership levels. The Board has a strong vision and a good mix of skills and expertise that reflect the projects. But even here, TB suggested a review is necessary as we move forward, to ensure the role of the Board and its relationship with the accountable body is well understood.

TB set out five key learning points from ARUP's work for the Town Deal which might inform the future direction of travel for Brighouse Town Deal Board.

1. Understand each other's positions. Do not underestimate the processes that Council Officers have to go through to ensure good governance, solid delivery, and appropriate management of significant capital projects like this.

2. Review and agree the role of the Board and its purpose as you move into a different phase. Consider refreshing the Board's Terms of Reference, establish who is taking what decisions.
3. Assess the Board's skills, are these right? Do we need to seek new membership or expand?
4. Agree what is the appropriate appetite for risk. Some Boards are keen to move quickly on projects however the LA/Central Government must go through significant risk management approaches. Brighouse Board has good support and a good understanding of what the risks are.
5. Continue to work alongside each other, stand shoulder to shoulder, communicate, and draw on the skills of the Board. Think about the bigger picture, do not get bogged down in detail.

Comments:

DW thanked TB for his contribution and commented that he felt that we had a strong Board, who clearly care about the town. He would welcome a discussion about board membership, the relationship between partners, and how the Board's role changes. However, he felt it was important we are mindful of the skills and expertise round the table, a view supported round the table.

CW asked about bringing in private investment, citing that some local Town Boards do not agree with private investment running alongside Government investment. If the Board decided to go down this road, how do we stand, what do we say to the Council, what power do we have or will be wasting our time trying to source additional private investment? Cllr. S responded the Council, and all local Town, are committed to working with partners to secure private investment as well as further public investment from WYCA (West Yorkshire Combined Authority) and others. TB. agreed with Cllr Scullion that the Towns Fund Programme should act as a catalyst to lever in private investment and improve market conditions.

The Chair suggested that discussions about the membership of the Board and Terms of Reference could be undertaken at the next meeting.

The Chair thanked Tom for his contribution to today's meeting.

7. Presentation by Turner & Townsend (Jamie Catlow)

Jamie Catlow, Peter Finley, Anthony Everett from Turner & Townsend welcomed to the meeting. The Board noted the content of the presentation provided (copy to be circulated).

Initial funding profile was approved by the Board in June and August, from that T&T were engaged in March 2022. T&T use the Town Investment Plan a lot so useful to help develop strategic initiatives behind the programme itself, built on that with current survey information and workshops on strategic and economic and delivery of the cases. Draft

designs were submitted to T&T Architects, took through costing and evaluation process. Developed further, submitted a reallocation of funding, keep all 5 projects but slight adjustment in costings, to help enhance the market and viable for the future and to maintain night-time economy.

Comments:

CWh: challenge re reports from independent assessor who identified some issues around viability of the proposals for the Market, specifically the operating and costing model. Questioned how we can we take this forward without being sure this is the most sustainable and best value for money option? T&T noted that based on information provided by the Local Authority and developed with their specialist Markets Team, the proposals provide the necessary assurance to progress the option at this stage. The model can be further tested at RIBA Stages 3 and 4, and the Council as Accountable Body and the Board can decide on options for development then.

CWh: responded that without a thorough sustainable operating model, it is not possible to be sure if the proposed capital spend offers value for money and asked for more detail on the sustainability of the proposal. T&T clarified, the proposal is not the final mode, it is at RIBA stage 2. The project is effectively a concept which will continue to be developed, and the Local Authority can have an opportunity to review if it is a stable model. Hope at this stage it is enough to reassure the model is sustainable.

JC: what area are you counting for the residential value land uplift? T&T: we used a suite of four postcodes (details in presentation) which are around the wider town centre.

JC: Section 106 exclusions (developers third party contribution) what are best- and worst-case possibilities? Officers present suggested S106 would not apply on public realm.

JC: what is optimism bias? AE: Optimism Bias is when you go above budget, Treasury insists on having this in place. A Contingency of 25% has already been set, which shows that the Board have been careful, and this covers optimism bias.

DC: extra information on market viability, extra information around timescales has this been worked into the model of the market's financial liability? T&T responded: developed a Word document which has most of the information changed or amended so far, and a separate one for markets on operational management. Will submit all three by the end of the week and take feedback from Council and Board on operational management of the market that has been developed. Will implement in final document.

Cllr. B: market was privately owned, and Council only taken ownership recently, so lack of information. T&T: there is convincing evidence behind it. Cllr B: take back to markets sub-group.

DC: risk regarding lease, Industry 4.0, may not sign until they have funding for the project, so it is not surprising they have not yet signed. T&T responded: monitoring and evaluation requirements are set within the agreement the college has and this must be maintained throughout the programme.

Cllr. SWh: questioned whether there was provision for the security of capital items supported in industry 4.0, and whether this had been discussed with the college. T&T responded, this was something that should be considered in the funding agreement

between the college and Council. The conditions for funding would stipulate the need to ensure equipment and services remain in Brighthouse.

RM: colleges premises, the rest of the equipment in there is it theirs? There is a well-equipped full machine shop, which is not available in Halifax. Who does it belong to? DC: we will investigate.

Turner & Townsend were thanked for their contribution to the meeting.

8. Presentation by ADE Regeneration

Anthony Everett welcomed to the meeting. DC explained AE's role, T&T have written business cases, some aspects are very technical. AE is an independent assessor who has been brought in to look at these to check the technical aspects.

AE confirmed that he had looked at the information provided, does it cover everything needed to decide, any gaps, any methodologies that we would challenge etc?

Market revitalisation Project: inspiring project, lots of precedence elsewhere, if managed will make a significant difference. Strategic case, reason for doing it, vision and achievement for it, well-articulated, solid project. In the strategic case the Equality Impact Assessment is missing, this has been addressed.

Theory of Change sets out an executive summary of the flow and logic of why, inputs, outputs, benefits etc. Business cases are professionally written, so can get to theory of change, it helps you as the Board to articulate with Central Government what the project is about. Monitoring and evaluation must set out how you prove you have these benefits.

Economic case for markets: methodology seems perfectly acceptable, benefits are driven by use of market and therefore links intrinsically with challenge on management case, demand, and viability of markets. Financial case, Bentley PM looked at the costs that T&T had produced and the programmes and on the whole perfectly content and as expected.

Management case for market revitalisation: level of information provided with proof that the market could be financially viable was not where it needed to be. Needs an ongoing revenue subsidy, and asked the Council are they committed to providing it? Can income sustain costs? Moving from a 2 day a week market to a 6 day a week market, level of resources will be high. Assumption is that the Local Authority will manage the market, so would want the rationale to be explained.

Comments:

DW: thoughts given to the fact, market retailers paying lower rent, but those business in retail units in town centre will be higher. Will there be a detrimental impact to current business owners in the town centre? CG: 6 days trading, not much difference from having several units there compared to a retail shop. Lock ups are the main part of the market and likely to be food oriented or craft based. Ideally, we would want stallholders in the market to use this as a platform to expand their business and potentially move into local retail units.

Cllr. C: stated that when accessing her own local market, she then tends to wander round and use the other shops more. Obviously, this is only anecdotal evidence, but it is not an unusual thing.

Cllr SWh: wording around third option, de-couple market from residential, does say preferred option was just that and this is what the Board has gone with, but then talks about Daisy street car park as a residential option? AE: yes, noticed that, discussed with T&T as a drafting issue, would be captured in polishing off the document.

Industry 4.0: theory of project was sound, £650k to deliver apprenticeships. The strategic case was good, although the EIA needs strengthening. Thought there was a lot of references to national strategies, could be more reference to local. Economic case, some challenges around methodologies employed. Whole life costs, benefits of apprenticeships need to include cost of implementing.

Commercial risk around lease was picked up. Needs to be in place before any funding defrayed. Monitoring and evaluation, lot of benefits mentioned in addition to apprenticeships. Management case was light in detail and suggested a 'letter of comfort' from the college is needed confirming they will maintain and refurbish the space and deliver courses.

JC: college had fixed prices and no contingency, if this goes forward and there is a short fall who has the problem? T&T: quoted by email, did add a 25% onto the capital refurbishment, for a small space is a high contingency to include that would capture some of the small risk that may arise due to inflationary costs. JC: encouraged by contingency.

CWh: the key contacts at the college are not civil servants, and therefore not used to dealing with procurement like the Local Authority. Content that the level of funding being put in top the project will deliver the necessary outcomes, and owners will put in what is needed.

C.Wr: no acknowledgment that this is new equipment for lecturers, no provision for costs for them to upskill on the equipment. Will catch up on Friday. AE suggested this could be covered in a letter of comfort or intent.

Public Realm: AE suggested combining three projects into one, would make it much easier. Delivered through one construction contract, would be good to consolidate. Strategic case, designs etc, are sound. Monitoring evaluation needs more detail. Methodology used few issues in terms of costs used to deliver projects.

Management in respect of Thornton Square, the predicted number people attending events goes up fourfold, make sure that this is thought about at delivery stage way ahead of time.

Overall, the only operational model of any concern was Brighthouse Market, would like to see more proof. Cllr. S: history of managing large events. Can manage this well.

9. Business Cases for Approval

The Board took a vote on the following Business Cases (11 votes available)

Retail & Leisure: 11 in favour

Canalside & Thornton Square: 11 in favour

Welcome: 11 in favour
Market Revitalisation: 11 in favour
Industry 4.0 & Skills: 11 in favour

10. Any Other Business

DC: there has been a request from the Board to have a briefing on the A641 project. A meeting will be held Wednesday 17th August at the library. Cllr B: asked if this invitation could be offered to other local councillors. DC will take back to officers and confirm.

CG: noted that there is a new Minister for Levelling Up, and questioned if this political change might affect project? T&T responded that the change may mean there is a temporary push towards civil servants but there will be no change to projects.

11. Date of Next Meeting

25th October 2022