

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<p>different categories of the scorecard. TD also provided an update as to how the process had been considered by MHCLG and Arup, with the latter confirming that the process was robust.</p> <p>The following questions and clarifications took place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JJ queried the metrics by which the new bridge project had been assessed and whether the target number of extra journeys that was mentioned in the TIP were achievable, given the number of residents that it benefits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TD confirmed that this would be further explored during the business case development stage and WM confirmed that the number of residents identified is actually number of households and the target journeys does assume multiple and regular journeys. • JJ stated that there was in total dedicated to cycling and walking and that although cycling and walking may be relevant in big cities where a couple of miles get you to work, in places like Burton a lot of people drive as they live some distance out. JJ suggested that the amount of funding to these schemes was disproportionate and funding could be provided to the Ferry Bridge instead to protect it rather than providing a new bridge, as the Ferry Bridge could be susceptible to flooding in the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TD confirmed that the Ferry Bridge received investment circa 4 years ago but was not aware of the details of that project, with this project being an SCC proposal. TD also confirmed that the projects could be packaged up in various ways under different themes, for example as also being invested in projects relating to heritage buildings, which is why it's important that stakeholders and public can input into these decisions. Finally, that if the project was no longer considered viable at business case development stage, the Board could raise this with MHCLG to consider whether funding could be reallocated to other projects instead. • WM confirmed that the Ferry Bridge won't be washed away, but rather that at some point it would be inundated with water during a time of flooding in the coming years, preventing its use for that time. The new bridge proposal follows EA guidelines and requirements meaning that it will be at a height of 1m greater than the new Burton flood defences, which will futureproof its use for some time. • GA stated that it can be difficult to assess need without knowing the full cost of a proposal, but the new bridge will ensure that access is facilitated all year round, even in times of flooding. GA also suggested that the bridge is kept under review during the business case development stage. 		

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TD clarified that all projects that proceed to the business case development stage will be subject to a Green Book assessment, taking into account any recent revisions, which will determine their viability and their merit as individual projects. So there is a point in time where every project will need to pass a test to warrant receiving Towns Fund investment. • PW suggested that the project goes forward and is assessed in more detail at the next stage, but that there are reserve projects that could offer suitable alternatives if needed. PW also stated that his concern was that the bridge was being looked at on its own, but it's part of the whole purpose of this Town Deal, which is focusing on that part of the town that the Board wants to draw people into along with the other projects. • BR asked WM about the potential of the Ferry Bridge flooding, WM confirmed that when the Ferry Bridge was built, no one envisaged that a 1 in 100 year storm back then occurs more often now. Water levels are rising year on year and flood events happen more often, with the town now moving from 1 in 100 year protection to 1 in 200 year protection. The EA's own standards require bridges to be built at a 1 in 200 year defence level, plus 1 metre to the bottom of the bridge, which is around 1 metre higher than the Ferry Bridge is currently. This is to also deal with debris moving down the river during times of flooding, such as uprooted trees. • JT reminded the Board that the Ferry Bridge is a Grade II listed structure, which affords it a degree of protection meaning that it can't be left to wash away with the trees. As such, the authorities concerned can't just ignore the bridge in the future generally. • PH stated that he believed this debate strengthens the need for a new bridge and one that goes across the whole of the Washlands to keep it accessible. • AOB stated that there are a whole range of projects that are under the challenge and theme of connectivity and they try to work together but hopefully work individually as well, which is why the projects have been put together in this way. AOB also confirmed that the previous investment to the Ferry Bridge was around £1.5m, which will hopefully keep it in good stead as we move forward to the future. 		
4	Town Investment Plan	<p>The Chair invited AOB to introduce the item.</p> <p>AOB provided the Board with a recap of how this item had progressed to date and how it could be taken forward. AOB stated that over months the goalposts for the investment plan have changed, but the development of the plan has benefitted from Government guidance and feedback from previous TIP submissions. AOB also thanked Board members for their comments and feedback on the development of the TIP and confirmed that as many as possible were being incorporated into the updated drafts. Finally, AOB stated that some of the structure and content</p>		

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<p>of the document is as required by Government, such as the Theory of Change content.</p> <p>The Chair then invited Jon Turner (JT1), Jon Tutt (JT2) and Jon Phipps (JP) to present the updated draft of the TIP and a specific update around the progress on Project D.</p> <p>JT1 introduced the presentation stating that it would cover TIP1 and TIP2 and how these had been updated to reflect feedback from Government and Arup, their consultants, with JP providing an overview of Project D.</p> <p>JT2 provided a summary of the changes to TIP1 that had been incorporated into the version that was sent out in advance of the meeting. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Foreword provided by the Chair. • The programme level Theory of Change, showing the thread between challenges and opportunities → vision → strategic objectives → core themes → interventions → output families → outcomes → impacts. • The wider impacts of the overall TIP around GVA growth, social return on investment, land value uplift, transport benefits, leading to a return on investment of £3 for every £1 of Towns Fund investment. • The new summary page at the beginning of the document that shows the overall TIP ask and 8 shortlisted interventions, with their descriptions, funding request, and BCR scores. This included the strategic plan for the projects showing the spatial spread of intervention and how they link together. • The updated successes to date section that summaries recent investment in the town, such as the Station Street project, Washlands Enhancement Project, Flood Defences, and others. • A town centre strategic plan showing the High Street/riverside area and how the various existing and future projects would impact this area. There was also a separate, but similar, map for Project D, showing the various property intervention parcels. • Updates to the engagement and delivery section that build upon the Arup feedback as well as a new governance section. • Indicative financial profiling for the 5 year programme, overall ask and co-funding contributions. <p>JT1 and JP then talked though the update to Project D, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As assessment of the heritage status of the High Street, including graded buildings, 		

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		<p>positive value buildings, and those that are harmful to the ‘townscape’ from a heritage point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the potential areas and parcels of intervention along the High Street, which included an illustrative masterplan for the area. • Some initial proposals for how the library site could be taken forward if Project E is delivered, which incorporated residential uses fronting the Garden of Remembrance. • Suggestions for how the riverside could be opened up into the High Street were identified in terms of creating better access between the two, particularly around the Andressey Passage area. • A potential café located in the centre of the Garden of Remembrance, which could facilitate the additional footfall that will be created by the Washlands Enhancement Project when delivered. <p>The following questions and clarifications took place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board members raised a concern about the allocation of residential uses in the library site and stated that this area should comprise a mixture of quality uses, to be explored during the business case stage. JT1 and JP agreed to update the plan accordingly. • JJ raised a comment about the photographs in the TIP and suggested that there were too many photographs associated with interventions that weren’t being taken forward anymore. AOB confirmed that JJ was working from the wrong document and this had been updated. • JJ raised a query about whether the River Trent could be used to generate electricity for some of the development on the riverside. • MC suggested having some temporary, pop-up stalls during the course of Project D on the areas that weren’t yet developed. • JT confirmed that there would be a supplementary masterplan document associated with Project D that will standalone separately to the TIP. • GA suggested that there was a need for more colour in the format of the TIP in general with some new photos. <p>AOB then summarised the options for the next steps to take forward the TIP to submission. A proposal was made that the Chair of the Board, along with DG (as Leader of ESBC), GA (as Deputy Leader at ESBC), and AOB (as Secretary to the Board) meet on the morning of Friday 11th December to review the final draft of the TIP and whether it is in a place to submit to Government. AOB suggested that the few days leading up to the 11th would be used to address those updates and changes. The working final draft of the TIP would be issued to the Board on</p>		

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Decision / Discussion / Recommendation	Action Points	Date Action Required
		the evening of Thursday 10 th to ensure that the Board are happy with the overall structure of the document, with any comments being discussed at the meeting on the Friday. The Board agreed to this approach with no concerns being raised.		
5	Next meeting – to be confirmed	<p>As per the previous item, BR; DG; GA and AOB would be meeting on Friday 11th December to agree the potential submission or delay of the TIP.</p> <p>The next full meeting of the Town Deal Board would be confirmed in due course, as required depending upon whether the TIP is submitted on Friday 11th December. This will probably be in late January, but it was suggested that Friday's can be difficult for some Board members so alternative days would be looked at.</p>		
6	Any Other Business	TD raised that MHCLG had undertaken its governance check of the Town Deal Board based on the information available on ESBC's website and the Board passed.		

DRAFT