

Brighouse Town Development Board Meeting

Tuesday 25th October 2022

Brighouse Library, HD6 2AF

Minutes

Present:

Jason Carlton

Cllr H Blagbrough

Cllr S Whittaker

Carl Wrigley

Colin Gordon

David Whitehead

Richard Mitchell

Lesley Adams

Anne Colley

Stephen Naylor

Cllr J Scullion (Left before end)

Shelagh O'Neill

Duncan Cooper

Apologies:

Malcolm Silkstone

Cllr G Robinson

Cllr S Courtney

Craig Whittaker MP

Item 3. Declarations of Interest

None

Item 4. Minutes for approval / Matters arising

Correction to be made: DW was not on remote (It was thought more likely to be one of the Cllrs), some names appeared on the appendence list twice, a comment about private sector investment had been wrongly attributed to CW (It was thought more likely to be from CW MP)

The Board voted, subject to the changes, that the minutes be approved (DW proposed, HB seconded)

SW had previously asked for the “quantitative data” assessed as part of the parklet ETRO to TRO approval process, but this had not been provided, could she have it? SW thought this would be data on how many people had used the parklets.

DC said he thought the data considered was the feedback that had been gathered, and possibly the reference to ‘quantitative’ related to the comparison of positive and negative comments made. To his knowledge no ‘footfall monitoring’ of the parks had or was taking place, so no figures for the numbers using them would be available.

JC said that the A641 plans they had seen showed car parking removed from Mill Lane car park (Outside Sainsburys), which they’d been told was to improve traffic flow, but the latest plans now showed this as a dead end for cars and only allowing cyclists and pedestrians, hence the rationale for the loss of parking had now gone.

SO said she would come back to the Board to comment on this. There was an internal workshop due to take place next week and she wanted to talk to the team before committing to when she would come back to the Board.

SW said that Steven Lee had said that the TRO would be amended to include blue badge holders. Had this been done? There was no one at the meeting suited to answering.

RM gave a reminder of his question from the last meeting about the ownership of the engineering equipment he’s seen during his tour of Kirkdale House. Is this a legacy from the previous use, or has it been brought in by the College. DC due to action by contacting the college.

Item 5. Town Deal Funding Confirmation

A report had been sent out with the meeting papers containing the extract for DLUHC email confirming official notification of the funding. DC briefly recapped the activities to that had been done to reach this point, and whilst the payment of the first tranche of funding is not expected until November CMBC S151 officer had confirmed that the DLUHC notification gave sufficient financial certainty to incur further project costs, hence work on the TD projects continues. This includes finalising the topo survey, developing the RIBA Stage 3 detailed designs, establishing a contractor procurement strategy.

HB, who is on the Cabinet Markets Working Party, said they are having a meeting to consider means of minimising disruption.

JC asked that his thanks to the project team who had enabled this confirmation be minuted, including those who have left such as Richard Spensley and Steven Lee. It was recognised that this had been a particularly challenging task due to the short deadlines imposed.

SW sought to clarify the ongoing role of the Board with relation to Town Deal. Was it to monitor the projects?

DC said the word ‘monitoring’ was more usually associated to the reporting on outputs that would be done for DLUHC, using the ‘monitoring and evaluation’ form. The Board would get updates on the progress of the projects so they could check that the spirit of what was wanted in the TIP and Business cases was being kept to.

SW Added that the Board would be there to maintain engagement and bring everyone along.

Item 6. Communications

Two reports had been previously circulated.

SN referred to the impact over the summer and coverage since the “green light” for the funding. He said there had been a big impact across all channels and mostly positive responses. Going forward the task was to maintain momentum into delivery.

RM said he’d been viewing the traffic on the website and had noted a highpoint and then drop-off. He wondered what the reason was? SN advised the peak would coincide with the submission to DLUHC, and inherently there would then be a drop in interest.

It was announced that an open day/evening would be taking place at the Central Methodist’s Church on the 17th November, between 6 pm and 8 pm. SW clarified that this was a TD Board event, for those who’d been unable to attend the engagement event at the Saturday market earlier in the year. Though the TD Board have organised this they asked if a representative of T&T could go along to answer and technical questions about the TD projects. DC said he would ask.

CW asked if the BID would promote this event? LA informed the BID was already promoting it. JC added a briefing document would be useful, on what can and can’t be said, and asked SN to take the lead in drawing this up.

Item 7. Waverley Contract

SN left the room.

Generally, there was satisfaction with service provided by Waverley. The Comms sub-group recommended extending the Waverley contract by a year. CW wondered if most was being made of links to links to CMBC comms, to maximise ‘reach’. Wondered if Todmorden was doing this better as they had higher number of followers.

JS highlighted that in Todmorden they’d pulled together the followers of a number of existing groups when the Tod Town Deal social media facility was set up, hence they hadn’t begun from a standing start as was the case in Brighouse. This would probably explain the higher number of followers in Tod.

As JS was talking a check was done to establish if there are links between the CMBC Next Chapter website and the Deal website. This showed that these links did in fact exist.

JC said the performance could be regarded as good, from a standing start, and that he was comfortable to support the proposal to extend the contract by 12 months. CB seconded this.

One Board member abstained; the remainder voted unanimously to extend the contract by 12 months.

SO said that it would be useful if SN would produce a comms plan.

Item 8. Parklets Project Accelerator Funding.

A report was provided in the papers.

The initial discussion was not about the Parklets and Accelerator Funding, instead it was about three benches that the Board had paid for using the Ambitions for Our Town budget, before the Board had become a TD Board. The benches had been installed but they had now disappeared following the wooden seating being broken.

LA had contacted CMBC about the missing benches and had got a response from 'Highways' saying the benches had been identified as private, that they had been removed for safety reasons and would not be replaced.

JC commented that the benches had been chosen to meet Calderdale Council specifications, and that some of the 'Ambitions' budget was ear-marked for maintaining the benches.

RM commented that there had been a memorial plaque on the bench outside the George, which had gone along with the benches. SO said she would take up the matter with SW outside the meeting.

JC wondered how much was left of the Ambitions budget, and what would be the total of this and the remainder of the Accelerator Funding. Clarification on how this could be spent was also sought. SO advised that potentially the funding could be spent strategically. HB highlighted he'd like some budget kept for refurbishing an underpass.

SO, referred to earlier communications with HB outside the meeting that dealt with this underpass and a bridge, confirmed that the orbs on the bridge had been replaced. DC reminded the board that at least some of the remainder of the Accelerator Funding would be set-aside for maintenance and demolition/relocation of the parklets.

LA said that the Parklets had been useful in getting people used to the idea of change and easing them along the path to new plans, so they'd been money well spent.

AC said the Parklets project has enabled a demonstration of how changes to parking could be accommodated. To help, they'd developed a list of where parking was available, demonstrating there was still capacity. Despite the concerns expressed about the parklets before their installation it was clear that the town was still busy. The feedback had changed and rather than being negative was now typically 'I'll believe it when I see it'.

SN added that the feedback he got was generally good about the proposals, with people asking if other private buildings would be included in the improvements.

Item 9. Governance

SW is stepping down as Co-Chair, though she'd be remaining on the Board. How is this to be addressed? DW said what an amazing job SW had done during her time as Co-Chair.

SW said currently one Co-Chair should be a Cllr and the other should be a representative of the private sector. Does the Board want to stick with this arrangement or change the Heads of Terms so that a community representative or another private sector representative could replace the Cllr Co-Chair? LA expressed the opinion that it was often helpful to have a Cllr as Co-Chair

HB said that whilst he had additional commitments the efforts of SW had potentially made the role easier, moving forward, so he expressed an interest in the role.

SW proposed HB. RM seconded. The Board unanimously voted for HB to be the new Co-Chair, currently there is also a place on the Board vacant because of the resignation of Amanda Coldwell.

SW said that Louise Read, who had been a close second in the interview process, was interested in a Board position, HB advised the importance to have the post filled quickly and a vote was held on the appointment of Louise Read to the Board. One Board member abstained; all other board members voted for the appointment.

Item 10. Any Other Business

CW said that Calderdale College had asked him to be the industry 4.0 & Skills conduit to the Board.

SO told the Board that the Climate Action Plan consultation, which connects to other policy agendas, was online now. She encouraged the Board members and their networks to complete the survey. There is a presentation that could be shared.

CW asked if the flood alleviation scheme in Wellholme was linked to this.

SO went through the themes of the CAP, emphasising that it's quite an open survey so people can highlight what they think is important. CG, who has a café unit on Brighouse market, asked SO how to get more input into the design of the new market. Could he contact her? SO said her email would be online.

Item 11. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 20th December 2022