**MINUTES**

**Greater carlton town board MEETING**

**Wednesday 11 September 2024, 17.00**

**Hybrid Meeting (Teams/Elizabeth Room)**

**Present:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Board Members (voting) | Sir John Peace CVO CStJ | Chair |
| Dawn Edwards | Director, Challenge Consulting and Area Leader for the Federation of Small Businesses |
| Nathan Kenney | Director, Mapperley All Stars |
| Paddy Tipping CBE | Non-Exec Director of Notts Healthcare Trust, Chair of East Midlands LIFT Companies, Board Member of Framework, Chair of Notts Community Foundation |
|  | Dr Ian Campbell | Senior Partner, Jubilee Park Medical Partnership |
| Other Partners: | Joelle Davis | Group Manager Growth, Infrastructure & Development, Notts County Council |
| Peter Gaw | Chief Executive, Inspire |
|  | Elizabeth Smith | Estates Manager Nottingham and Notts NHS Integrated Care Board |
| Gedling Borough Council Observers/  Support: | Tina Adams  Mike Avery  Tanya Najuk  Nathan Wall  Natalie Osei  Emma McGinlay  Rob McCleary | Section 151 Officer  Director of Place  Assistant Director - Housing, Growth & Regeneration  Economic Growth & Regeneration Manager  Assistant Director – Governance and Democracy and Deputy Monitoring Officer  Democratic Services Manager (Minute taker)  Communications Manager |
| Mutual Ventures: | Mark Bandalli  Gill Callingham  Sally Dickens  Philippa Curran | Project Director  Three-Year Investment Plan Lead  Ten-Year Investment Plan  Consultation Lead |

**Apologies:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Board Members (voting): | Dan Howitt | Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner |
|  | Candida Brudenell | Retired. Formerly Assistant Chief Fire Officer at Notts Fire & Rescue Service, and Assistant Chief Executive and Corporate Director for Strategy and Resources at Nottingham City Council |
|  | Stella Clarke | Gedling Borough Youth Mayor |
|  | Cllr Keith Girling | PFH Economic Development and Asset Management, Notts County Council |
|  | Val Green MBE | Founder and Chair, Friends of Gedling Borough Memorial Woodland |
|  | Michael Payne MP | MP for Gedling |
|  | John Taylor | Planning and Property Consultant, Entente/Purico Ltd |
| Board Members (non-voting): | Claire Ward | Mayor, EMCCA |
|  | Melanie Phythian | Deputy Area Lead, Notts of Cities and Local Growth Unit, MHCLG |
|  | Lynne Sharpe | Associate Director of Estates, Nottingham and Notts NHS Integrated Care Board |

<AI1>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.017 | **introduction and apologies** |

Introductions were made and apologies noted.

Natalie Osei confirmed that as there were less than six board members present, the meeting was not quorate. It was agreed that the meeting would take place but that no formal voting could happen, except for approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.

</AI1>

<AI2>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.018 | **minutes of the previous meeting** |

The minutes of the previous meeting were discussed, and it was agreed they were a correct record of the previous meeting.

**Decision: The minutes of the previous meeting to be agreed.**

For: Dawn Edwards, Nathan Kenney, Sir John Peace, Paddy Tipping and Dr Ian Campbell

Against: None

Abstentions: None

</AI2>

<AI3>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.019 | **matters ARISING** |

Letter to MHCLG regarding programme timescales

A draft letter, which was appended to meeting invite, was discussed to get the boards views on whether it should be sent or not seeing as similar correspondence has been sent from East Midlands representatives of local town boards.

It was unanimously agreed that Sir John send the letter to Alex Norris to show the boards strong commitment to this plan.

**Decision: To send the letter to the Under-Secretary of State, Alex Norris MP**

For: Dawn Edwards, Nathan Kenney, Sir John Peace, Paddy Tipping and Dr Ian Campbell

Against: None

Abstentions: None

GCTB communications and marketing planning

Rob McCleary confirmed it was hard to prepare effective comms right now due to the uncertainty of the funding. It was agreed to defer any decisions on marketing and communications until we receive a response from government, but that focus on comms engaging young people in the process would continue.

**Decision: To halt communications and marketing planning until response has been received from government on future of the town plan funding.**

For: Dawn Edwards, Nathan Kenney, Sir John Peace, Paddy Tipping and Dr Ian Campbell

Against: None

Abstentions: None

List of heritage sites and cultural assets across Gedling

Tanya Najuk confirmed she has found some books and leaflets which contained with heritage strategy which would be updated and form part of the publication. She invited board members to take a copy to read.

Board Member Data Hub/Central Data Repository

Tanya Najuk confirmed the team were working on this request and were reviewing policies and procedures to try and work in this direction.

</AI3>

<AI4>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.020 | **pROGRAMME PROGRESS & TIMESCALES** |

Mark Bandali gave the Board an update of the progress against the agreed project plan.

He confirmed the team at Mutual Ventures (MV) had done an initial review of the long list of projects and noted that they had received over 100 suggested projects by partners. He confirmed that these projects will go through a prioritisation framework to arrive at a shortlist for the Board to review and agree. The shortlist of projects is due to be delivered to the Board at the next meeting on 25 September 2024.

It was confirmed that MV were still working to the previous deadline and that they were making good progress with lots of tasks having been completed.

It was queried whether the timescales set for the Greater Carlton Town Board were the same as other boards were following. It was noted that some boards in round 1 of the programme had already submitted their bids to ensure they complied to the previously set timescales but that it wasn’t clear if all boards were doing this, given the resources the process needs.

It was agreed that this town board would proceed as normal but noted that if some/all of the funding is removed, there would be public reaction and disappointment. The Board therefore needed to navigate the next few weeks very carefully in terms of communication and messaging to the public.

Tina Adams confirmed the Council remained wholly committed subject to the remaining funding being honoured and noted the Council had already committed funds in excess of the £50k that had been received. Unfortunately, Gedling Borough Council would not be able to step in to fund the £20m should it not be delivered.

The board noted the value of the project in that it had a vision and well executed plans that are in place to provide a framework to get funding from other sources if funding is cut.

</AI6>

<AI7>

</AI7>

<AI8>

</AI9>

<AI10>

</AI10>

<AI11>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.021 | **oNLINE CONSULTATION – FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS** |

Consultation update

MV presented what progress had been made to date and noted there were a lot of responses which showed an engaged public, especially given it was a long survey with open questions. The total number of responses stood at 727, with over half of those confirming they were happy to be contacted. It was noted that there was a lack of response to the consultation from the 15-24 age group, but that work was still ongoing via youth clubs and educational providers to increase this. The highest number of responses came from mid to older adult residents of the borough.

Main themes

MV confirmed that the ranked priorities showed that supporting young people, local retailers and sports and leisure facilities were high on the respondents’ priorities. The lower ranked priorities included heritage and visitor economy.

The Chair noted he thought the statistics were lifeless and queried whether a matrix to confirm how each priority will affect jobs, profitability and economic growth could be formulated as this was more likely to show the government what they will get for their investment.

It was noted that the guidance was clear that the overall aim of the project is the betterment of the community and should not solely be focused on economic growth. It was confirmed that the 10-year Vision would demonstrate a strong link to economic growth but would be sure to show how it meets the guidance also.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.022 | **IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT – PROPOSED APPROACH** |

MV discussed the proposed approach of in person engagement, which would supplement the online consultation.

Schools and young people

It was noted that engagement with this group would take place via education providers and youth groups in conjunction with the Youth Mayor, Stella Clarke.

Local businesses and employers

Queries were raised about how the consultation was accessing businesses, especially capturing larger business. It was noted that a virtual workshop would be held focussing on the employment corridor. It was not possible to invite everyone to participate to ensure it was manageable, so determinations of what size of businesses would be targeted was still underway. As the timescales were tight and larger businesses may not be free to meet easily, it was agreed that information would be sent out as soon as possible. The Chair also offered to host a meeting to discuss the issues with local businesses.

High street/local retailers

The business-related feedback received so far in the survey largely related to high street business and how best to provide support to retain and encourage more businesses to locate in the Greater Carlton area.

To collect ideas from these stakeholders, the team at MV proposed spending a day in the area, going shop to shop to ask for further feedback on the themes emerging from the survey responses so far. It was confirmed that a series of prompts will be agreed, and notes taken to share with the Board.

<AI12>

</AI12>

<AI13>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 24.023 | **OVERVIEW OF PRIORITISATION FRAMEWORK FOR SIFTING PROJECTS** |
|  | MV presented the suggested approach to the prioritisation criteria to the Board with the aim to review and agree this so MV and council officers could shortlist the projects for the Board’s consideration. A meeting would be held to do this on 13 September, before the Board see the shortlist on 25 September.  The framework has a three-stage approach, set out as follows:   * Stage 1: Agree shortlist of interventions/projects (Town Board 25/09/2024) * Stage 2: Review a draft list of shortlisted projects/interventions (Town Board 14/10/2024) * Stage 3: Agree 10-year Vision and 3-year Investment Plan for submission (Town Board 22/10/2024)   Stage 1 would see the projects reviewed against 5 key criteria, as follows:   1. Does the project align with the Long Term Plan (LTP) investment themes/area?  Y/N   - If yes then move to 2. 2. Is there data to support need for investment/will it deliver the intended benefits? Y/N 3. The consultation results support an identified need/project? Y/N 4. The project provides additionality/co-funding? Y/N 5. Is the project sustainable in the long-term (legacy costs)? Y/N   It was noted that the Board could also consider projects with no clear evidence base if it has a clear community support.  Stage 2 would see the Board review the draft list against two main objectives – is the project deliverable within the 3-year investment plan and is the deliverable within the 10-year vision. If they met both of these them, they would be added to the investment plan and/or vision document.  Questions were posed about the criteria in the current guidance for funding as it had potential to be changed under the new government. The Board thought about the need to be adaptable as it could have the potential to put this town plan in front of the game.  MV confirmed they would review the projects based on the under current themes and then it can be revisited after the autumn statement at the scheduled Board meeting on 14 October.  Natalie stressed the importance of Board member attendance at the next meeting as crucial decisions would be made. |
| 24.024 | **ANY OTHER BUSINESS** |
|  | None. |

Meeting ended at 6.50pm.
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