

Minutes



Meeting	Ipswich Vision and Town Deal Board
Date	Friday, 9 th June, 2023
Time	09:00 hrs
Location	Orwell Room, Grafton House
Present	Terry Baxter, Chair of Ipswich Central (TB) James Davey, Ipswich & Suffolk Small Business Association (JDa) Becca Jackaman, (BJ) CJ Green, Chair, New Anglia LEP (CJG) Helen Langton, Vice Chancellor, University of Suffolk (HL) Cllr Neil MacDonald, IBC (NMacD) Dr Dan Poulter, MP for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (DP) David Ralph, Chair of Ipswich Vision Board (Chair) Cllr Paul West, SCC

Items:

	Action
<p>Officers in Attendance</p> <p>Emily Cashen, DLUHC (EC) Andrew Cook, Executive Director for Growth, Highways & Infrastructure, SCC (AC)</p> <p>Sarah Down, IBC (Minutes) Shirley Jarlett, Assistant Director - Governance, IBC (SJ) Elaine Joseland, Chief of Staff for Dr Dan Poulter MP (EJ) Emma Lindsell, Head of Towns Fund & Ec Dev, IBC Alex Rogers, Chief of Staff for Tom Hunt MP (AR) Chris Starkie, New Anglia (CS) Stuart McDonald, Assistant Director Place, IBC (SMc)</p>	

1.0	<p>Apologies:</p> <p>Helen Pluck, CEO, IBC (HP) John Dugmore (JD) Tom Hunt, MP for Ipswich (TH) Sophie Alexander-Parker, Ipswich Central (SAP)</p>	
2.0	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on 17th March 2023:</p> <p>Accepted as an accurate record.</p>	
3.0	<p>Matters Arising:</p> <p>Chair noted that a follow up on the Connected Town Discussion would be given by TB at end of meeting.</p> <p>Chair noted that HL would provide some photos on estates overview (HL had wanted to clarify what type of photos to provide before doing so)</p> <p>Biographies – SD to send out email to request biographies after meeting.</p>	<p>HL</p> <p>SD</p>
4.0	<p>Ipswich Vision Board Governance Review (P12 – 28)</p> <p>A draft paper setting out proposed revision to the Governance Framework was circulated with the agenda and reviewed. The Board had been asked by the Minister not to make any confirmed changes at this stage</p> <p>The Chair noted he considered it important to complete this review particularly, as the focus was moving away from the urgent requirement for focus on the Town Deal Business Cases and that these were now moving into the delivery phase. The Chair added that how we move forward as a partnership is very timely as it goes hand in hand with the objectives of the Ipswich Vision group.</p> <p>Chair asked if any questions in relation to the review and listed the following main questions he considered needed to be to be resolved:</p> <p>Question 1 – Does Board accept principles of strong partnership: Chair noted this point was self-explanatory.</p> <p>Question 2 – Are there any missing Task Forces: Chair outlined 3 main task forces which should be added to the Vision Board organisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connected Town DP pointed out his name is missing off the partnership arrangements, so this needs to be amended although was included further down 	

- **Heritage, Arts and Culture Group**

Chair noted he was not sure if this exists as yet. A follow up action was agreed to check and, if not consider whether such a group should be created or is already a sub-group of the Connected Town Group

- **Communications Group**

Chair noted he was not sure if this exists either; HL noted it has only been discussed so far and not implemented. As above discussion to be held around creation of this group and how it fits into the Operations Group which seems to have been omitted and which Board Members should continue to operate between meetings

- **Transport Group**

A number of partners already met about transport issues – how did this relate to the Vision Board

HL noted that Heritage is important but it should include Arts and Culture, which is not necessarily represented under the title of Heritage, adding the Vision Board wants Ipswich to be seen as a cultural destination. Chair agreed the Group's title needs to be expanded to include this. TB added the cultural offering needs to be emphasised.

Chair noted Wolsey 550 should be a sub-group of Connected Town Group.

AC noted that Communications Group should focus on creating positive stories but that content needs to be generated and that the various Task Force Groups, such as the Transport Task Group need to be work collaboratively to bring all of the principles together.

Chair informed the Transport Task Group would be a recommendation; DP noted it was out to consultation, then there will be a final plan which will need various organisations to sign up to, and we would need to see how it will tie in with the broader strategy for Greater Ipswich.

DP added he is happy to liaise with Chair to ensure it all joins up.

HL added it is really important to have it all linked and making sure we collectively champion the outcomes, which will be critical for this group.

Safety:

Chair noted it is an important issue but doesn't want to set up too many groups.

TB added he thinks it is covered within Connected Town Group that meets with partners and police to discuss safety.

City Status:

Chair thinks this is a Suffolk issue as much as an Ipswich issue and it needs to be wider than Connected Town.

HL agreed adding we should be ready for when call for when the bid comes.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri)

Chair noted we need to make sure it is clear who is Chair of each group, their terms of reference and whether they were independent groups or had accountability to the Vision Board

DP added he finds a good idea to have focus group on this and a specific sub-group should be set up for this.

Health and Wellbeing:

Chair asked if a separate group was required for this.

AC noted there are other forums where this is being discussed, so we would need to see how to harness the other work being done and incorporate it.

HL added it should be run through other groups as well, as it should be at heart of what we are doing.

DP noted he thinks Operations Group is functional and helpful in driving agenda forward between meetings as we need to co-produce the output that Board could agree on. He added this would keep the agenda on track and ensure the work ahead of the Board is co-produced.

Chair noted that Town Investment Plan and Town Deal are not the same thing; Town Investment Plan is a much wider set of projects, which includes Levelling Up.

Chair asked if we needed a broader plan for investment in town, wider than Town Deal projects (i.e. to include University expansion, Broomhill Lido etc.)

CS noted we could tie in with Vision for Ipswich.

Chair asked NMacD if he had a view on this; NMacD informed he thinks this Board is about pulling people together and that Towns Fund deal will finish in a couple of years, so we need to continue to plan for Ipswich's longer term future.

SMc added that as an example IBC is considering its Inward Investment Strategy for Ipswich. This will consider a strategic approach and plan to secure growth and activity for the town.

DP added in the longer term we would need a body that has a role in pulling the key stakeholders together and avoid fragmentation, which would send a positive message to Govt. that should attract funding going forward.

PW added it would need to be streamlined, so the delivery is effective.

Chair added he thought more should be progressed, other than Towns Deal projects, without duplicating work already being done.

TB added we would need to share plans and strategies and debate them, in order to formulate a plan and asked if there is currently any coordination between IBC and SCC, to avoid fragmentation.

	<p>Action</p> <p>Governance Review should include reference to Ipswich Vision sub-groups and the Vision Group Operations Group should continue (between Board meetings) (although it was noted that with CS departing this may need a new Chair)</p> <p>The review suggested the employment of an Ipswich Vision Coordinator, however, this would need to be paid for and asked if there is support for this as he had received some concerns from partners</p> <p>TB asked what that role would do specifically.</p> <p>HL added that when more details are available, we will most likely agree it is necessary, but we are not there yet.</p> <p>AC added he thinks it will be Programme Management.</p> <p>Chair noted the Board were supportive (particularly once the Governance reviews was concluded) but a funded business case would need to be brought back to the Board</p> <p>Action</p> <p>A funded business case to be drafted.</p> <p>Membership – in principle it was not a problem for the College to join the Board but partners should conclude a membership review and get a clear purpose following the skills audit</p> <p>HL noted she was in support of this adding it needs to have tight representation and use the groups to hear other voices through membership and discussion. She added she is not in favour of taking on anyone new until key decisions have been made.</p> <p>DP added he also feels we need a clear direction and to keep the Board small in order to be more effective with correct skills and representation; he thanked CS for all his contributions and for his work heading up LEP.</p> <p>HL noted John Dugmore’s comments – from email comments - needed to be included, i.e. using the correct language and commitment around inclusivity.</p> <p>Chair noted changes to purpose of Board and no objections were noted.</p> <p>Actions – complete the Skills Audit and Membership review</p>	
5.0	Visioning:	

	<p>As part of the 4 point plan:</p> <p>Town Deal (Business cases and implementation) Governance Review Visioning Comms</p> <p>The Chair added was looking to establish a process for a new/updated vision and had taken it to officer group for high level discussion, adding he has received feedback from most people and thanked them.</p> <p>Three main points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responsibility of this Board to produce updated vision: it was agreed it will be externally facilitated, however, it needed to be decided who will pay. Some partners have already offered to contribute, however, other contributions were welcome. 2. Long term vision but with measurable outcomes over next 5 years; 3. A vision was completed in 2015 so we need to learn from it before we embark on our own vision; this should be done first before we commit to a new vision. <p>Chair noted the Board should commit to developing a vision but should first look at lessons learned.</p> <p>PW asked about the costs involved.</p> <p>Chair estimated £30k with first part costing £10k, then another £20k will be required for remainder.</p> <p>Action - Chair to bring the specification and hoped to get it signed off and confirmed who will pay before the next meeting.</p> <p>HL added it would also depend on what the first phase of work produces, as it could lead us in a very different direction.</p>	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Town Deal Update:</p> <p>SMc informed as follows:</p> <p>There has been plenty of progress since last meeting and that Emma Lindsell had joined as Head of Towns Fund and Economic Development and that a Programme Manager had been appointed to assist with the delivery of Ipswich's Towns Fund projects.</p> <p>He added the projects were moving into delivery phase and that nine Business Cases are signed off, one is outstanding.</p> <p>Three projects are fully complete. The completed projects are:</p>	

- Former Post Office;
- Tech Campus;
- Integrated Care academy.

Projects in delivery:

Pauls Silo:

Good progress has been made on the appointment of a lead consultant. The project is going through procurement process; 13 tenders have been received should make appointment by end June/early July. Working with SCC on Public Realm design (car park at St Peters Dock and Wolsey 550 links to garden area).

Shopping Parades:

EL has taken over project and will set up meeting with Task Force Group to review requests from first tranche of parades, make recommendations and obtain a decision from group.

At end of May, EL launched the Community Group funding application; applications already received and will be reviewed.

Oasis & Public Realm

Positive meetings taking place with task force group, putting in clear governance and regulations and engaging in a positive way. Small parcels of work have been delivered since last meeting (Coronation planters on St Nicholas and St Peter's Street).

Re: Public Realm, meetings with stakeholders has taken place, e.g. Debenhams building, to discuss delivery of works. Procurement to progress.

Yacht Academy:

Discussions with M&E group around budget gap. A meeting with Spirit is being arranged to discuss the issue and to explore the operational model to ensure it was effective and fundable.

TB wished to emphasise the importance of public access and the need to create viewing platforms and educational access for apprenticeships.

DP added it is a project where there are concerns, i.e. how deliverable is this project.

TB asked if it did not work out, could the money be re-diverted to another project.

Chair informed it could as it has happened in the past, as particularly with inflation currently being so high, the money gets diverted to another project.

HL noted the part about apprenticeships and skills is very challenging adding she was happy to offer help but is concerned about this project as well, as it is very complex.

Digital Town Centre:

SMc informed the Business Case was now approved but that public WiFi had been removed from the project, as it was difficult to demonstrate the

	<p>benefits. Greater emphasis was placed on the augmented reality trails, which should bring people into the town, to also eat, shop etc. The team are moving in the delivery phase and will be resourcing the Group accordingly.</p> <p>Towns Regeneration Fund: Chair asked about the Regeneration not yet approved; SMC informed five more clarifications were required, which were being worked through with the consultants.</p> <p>CS noted government inconsistency in their approach to the approval given to regeneration projects and noted Norwich have had there Business Case signed off on a similar basis to Ipswich’s submission.</p> <p>General: DP made point about using local companies and skills from college, and questioned IBC procurement framework as he had concerns that it will deliver the required social value benefits.</p> <p>SJ noted we must adhere to PCR regulations and always have to keep key factors in mind i.e. living wage, anti-slavery, also the transparency rule. SJ added there are varying degrees of approval, depending on the value.</p> <p>DP noted we should not have to use full scale approval for every procurement process. He added he wants to be sure we back local companies and are linking the skills agenda from local colleges.</p> <p>Chair noted we would need to check IBC procurement regulations.</p> <p>SJ added we need to find a balance, the ideals of IBC procurement are shared with everyone on the Board, so we need to match it to the local market as well and pitching to attract people who can do the work and are available.</p> <p>Chair asked SJ to present IBC Procurement procedure to Monitoring & Evaluation Group.</p> <p>Action - SMC noted the Monitoring and Valuation Group will meet in July so it can be discussed there. (DP, JD and Neil Hawes from ITFC).</p>	
7.0	<p>Broom-Hill Lido:</p> <p>DP informed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group should look at broader regeneration of Ipswich, where there is potential, as this is of interest for Town from a heritage aspect, being a listed building and Olympians have trained in the lido. • Work has been done to get it reopened alongside a leisure facility, but the cost of materials has gone up so much, there is a shortfall in funding. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now at point of trying to leverage additional funds, to get much clearer costings to see what is required to be spent. • Need reassurance that Fusion would keep it open after it opens, as money is being provided by other parties and it is meant for public good. <p>Chair noted he thinks we have a chance to get this project delivered but need to be careful and asked who is responsible for making it happen.</p> <p>SJ informed the building and land is owned by IBC but Fusion have been working on this project.</p> <p>NMacD added the Heritage Lottery Fund provided £2m of funding.</p> <p>Chair asked if any business case should be sent for Board to review.</p> <p>DP noted he and TH met Fusion who were not prepared for meeting and it was very unclear what the extra funding was needed for. DP added it would be helpful to invite them to the next Board meeting to present on the finances and their plan for how the business will work in the long term.</p> <p>PW noted that re the investment, assurance needs to be in place for long term commitment.</p> <p>CS noted from Heritage Fund perspective, it isn't the capital shortfall that is the problem, it is the sustainability of the project.</p> <p>TB asked if we needed to provide evidence that local people want it to be renovated; CS noted it is a mandatory condition of the Heritage Fund to check there is public support for the works to be done.</p> <p>Chair noted he thinks Fusion want Ipswich Vision Support to make a Heritage lottery bid.</p> <p>Action - Agreed Fusion (or the Project sponsors) should be invited to the next meeting to present market assessment and Project Update.</p>	
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Any other Business:</p> <p>TB raised the points brought forward to this meeting on Connected Towns:</p> <p>City Status; Maximizing Heritage using Wolsey 550; Safety; Transport; Digital Town Centre.</p> <p>Chair formally thanked CS for all his contribution .</p>	

	HL informed that she would be absent for the meeting on 15 th September and that Tim Greenacre would attend on her behalf.	
9.0	Date, Time and Location of future meetings: To note that previously agreed dates are: (i) 15 th September 2023; and (ii) 8 th December 2023.	