

SCR INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE BOARD

3rd JUNE 2016

BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD

No.	Item	Action
1	<p><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u> Mayor Ros Jones - Doncaster MBC, CHAIR Martin McKervey - Nabarro / LEP Cllr John Burrows, Chesterfield BC John Mothersole, Sheffield CC</p> <p>Apologies were received from Board Members Neil Taylor, Bassetlaw DC and Chris Scholey – Doncaster Bassetlaw NHS Foundation Trust / LEP</p> <p><u>Also in Attendance</u> Matthew Southgate, CBC Neil Firth, DMBC Rob Pearson, HCA Ed Highfield, SCC Simon Ogden, SCC (for item 4b) Mark Lynam, BMBC Neal Byers - ARUP / SCR Executive Team Julie Hurley, SCR Executive Team Dave Allatt - SCR Executive Team Veena Prajapati - SCR Executive Team Adrian Withill - RMBC Craig Tyler - Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p>	
2	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>None noted</p>	
3	<p><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></p> <p>None received</p>	
4	<p><u>SCRIF Business Cases</u></p>	

Peak Resorts and Junction 37 1a

Papers were presented providing recommendations by the SCR Appraisal Panel.

It was noted that the SCR Appraisal Panel has reviewed Business case applications for two schemes and the technical recommendations are now presented for consideration for Peak Resorts and M1 Junction 37 Economic Growth Corridor.

Regarding the Park resorts scheme, it was noted the scheme promoter has provided information in support of the scheme, as requested at the last meeting, and has accepted all clawback conditions.

RESOLVED, that the Board Members:

- 1. Approve progression of Peak Resorts to Full Approval and Award of Contract at a cost £2.85M to SCR CA subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table (attached at Appendix 1 to the report) and endorse the escalation of this recommendation to the SCR CA.**
- 2. Approve progression of M1 Junction 37 Economic Growth Corridor to Stage 1B Full Business Case.**

Sheffield City Centre Scheme

Members were reminded that at the last IEB meeting, the request to fund the £175k loss of ERDF funding was declined and it was agreed this should be borne by the scheme promoter. Members also requested a presentation to explain how the scheme has evolved against its original submission.

A paper and presentation were therefore received setting out the proposed changes. It was noted this includes a greater focus on the Riverside Business District element and is a direct response to changes in the current market. It was confirmed the changes have no effect on the existing SCRIF allocation and will help to raise the profile of the scheme regionally and nationally.

It was confirmed the GVA assumptions are not predicated on the development of a city centre HS2 station location.

Members welcomed the suggestion that schemes should evolve to meet the requirements of the market.

	<p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p> <p>1. Note and support the proposed scheme changes</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p><u>SCRIF Quarter 4 Programme Update</u></p> <p>A paper was received setting out the high level findings from the Sheffield City Region Investment Fund (SCRIF) quarter 4 updates. It was noted these updates are based on a revised approach which provides a good overview of the programme.</p> <p>Members were advised there has been a considerable change from Q3 to Q4 and the final outturn position at year end was significantly under the 15/16 approved SCRIF budget (£8.9M), with a variance of £5.3m from the figures projected at Q3 which were returned in February 2016. The cumulative spend to the end of 16/17 has also reduced by £3m with increases in spend in the latter years of the programme.</p> <p>The report provided key updates on a project by project basis.</p> <p>It was noted SCR will continue to work with partners between cycles to maximize project delivery present recommendations of how to proceed and potential corrective action at the next meeting.</p> <p>Members commented favourably on the style and content of the report and suggested such reports are a good way of demonstrating the potential positives of devolution.</p> <p>It was agreed that slippage, whilst somewhat inevitable, needs to be appropriately managed.</p> <p>Members considered what actions the IEB could take to help assist scheme promoters experiencing delivery issues and were informed that the SCR Executive Team is likely to experience a shift towards the provision of such services to scheme promoters.</p> <p>It was agreed that peer review processes will be a good way of helping schemes recover from or avoid delivery issues.</p> <p>Consideration was given to how addition 'lessons learnt' could be shared between the Partners. It was noted a fuller lessons learnt report will be presented to the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: Mark to share more information regarding the M1 J36 scheme.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p>	

	<p style="text-align: center;">1. Notes the contents of the report.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Local Growth Fund 3 Process and Timescales</u></p> <p>A paper was received setting out the LGF3 submission process, internal timescales and next steps.</p> <p>It was noted the Fund is worth £1.8bn and will be primarily phased from 2018 onwards. The deadline for Government to receive submissions is 21 of July 2016.</p> <p>The Board was invited to discuss and endorse the proposed approach to the Fund</p> <p>Members were reminded that a Devolution Deal ‘reward’ is the ability to submit a programme level bid, rather than a project level bid.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the proposed programme level approach as agreed by the Combined Authority (CA) and LEP on 9 May 2016 to the development of the City Region’s LGF bid, to act as a ‘top-up’ to the SCR’s existing Growth Deal programmes which delivers priorities identified through the LEP prioritisation workshop, the Integrated Infrastructure Plan (IIP) and the planned Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) refresh. 2. Endorse the proposed approach to the LGF 3 bid and discuss how best to utilise the Integrated Infrastructure Plan to show that the SCR has an evidenced based Plan on which to base its submission to Government. 3. Notes the internal timescales that have been set and agreed in order to meet the 21 July 2016 Government deadline. 	
<p>7</p>	<p><u>SCR’s Progress in Attracting Inward Investment</u></p> <p>As requested at the last IEB meeting, a paper was received setting out how infrastructure contributes to the attractiveness of SCR to inward investors and how the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan (SCR IIP) can support this and describe the role of the Inward Investment team and the progress Sheffield City Region (SCR) is making to attract Inward Investment</p> <p>The report also provided an update on Inward Investment performance in the SCR and other Northern regions</p>	

	<p>The Board was asked to note how inward investment links with infrastructure in the SCR and the need for the IEB to maintain close liaison with the Inward Investment Team.</p> <p>The Board discussed the benefit of comparisons with other LEP areas nationally to determine relative inward investment performance.</p> <p>It was agreed that the matters presented in the paper should be explored in more detail with the Inward Investment Team</p> <p>Action: Julie to convene a meeting for II and IEB representatives</p> <p>Members noted support for Dave Smith’s plans to develop a more comprehensive SCR Marketing Strategy. Members also discussed the importance of ensuring the SCR has the right products to ‘sell’ to potential investors.</p> <p>It was suggested that links with inward investment might be strengthened by closer alignments between the transport, infrastructure and housing themes.</p> <p>Members acknowledged that the private sector might be best placed to act as a ‘critical friend’ to the SCR in helping it ensure its ‘products’ are fit for purpose.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes the progress being made by the SCR Inward Investment team. 2. Notes how inward investment links with infrastructure in the SCR and the need for the IEB to maintain close liaison with the Inward Investment Team. 	
8	<p><u>DfT Large Local Majors</u></p> <p>Members were provided with a paper explaining the ‘large local majors’ process.</p> <p>It was noted that DfT has invited LEPs to bid into a £475m Large Local Major Schemes fund, which forms part of the Local Growth Fund and was announced in the 2016 Budget. For the SCR LEP area, the minimum scheme size is £75 million.</p> <p>The target of the Large Local Major Schemes is ‘exceptionally large, transformational schemes that are too big to be taken forward within regular growth allocations and could not</p>	

	<p>otherwise be funded’.</p> <p>It was noted SCR has been working in partnership with local partners to consider potential bids. A call for schemes was issued to local partners and expressions of interest received.</p> <p>It was noted the deadline for bids is the 21 July 2016. SCR will present the proposed draft bids to the June CA and LEP meeting.</p> <p>Members were informed that DfT is expecting to receive no more than one or two bids from a single LEP, however, it has been agreed to submit expressions for 3 bids:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supertram Replacement • AMID / LDV • Pan Northern Connectivity - Trans-Pennine Through Routes <p>Further information was provided in respect of these schemes.</p> <p>It was noted that a 4th suggestion (Doncaster Mass Transit) has been discounted on the grounds it doesn’t meet the funders’ bidding eligibility criteria.</p> <p>Members requested that the Supertram Replacement EoI be given an alternate title e.g. 21st Century Mass Transit Project, and incorporate some of the sentiments contained in the Doncaster Mass Transit scheme.</p> <p>Action: Julie / Dave to address</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes the details of the competition and next steps. 2. Endorses the submission of 3 expressions of interest 3. Requests the Supertram Replacement scheme be retitled and revised (as above) 	
<p>9</p>	<p><u>IEB Minutes</u></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 22nd April were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Members revisited past discussions around the suitability of FLUTE for scheme assessments. It was suggested that FLUTE should be regarded as an ‘informing tool’ rather than a ‘decision making tool’.</p>	

10	<u>Agree Items for CA</u> It was noted that intended DfT Large Local Majors bid and SCRIF Business Case decisions will be reported to the CA for endorsement.	
13	<u>Date of the Next Meeting</u> 3rd June – Broad Street West, Sheffield, 10.00am	