

SCR INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE BOARD

15th JULY 2016

AMP, WAVERLEY, ROTHERHAM

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 Cllr John Burrows, Chesterfield BC John Mothersole, Sheffield CC Chris Scholey, Doncaster Bassetlaw NHS Foundation Trust / LEP</p> <p>Apologies were received from Board Members Neil Taylor, Bassetlaw DC, Martin McKervey - Nabarro / LEP</p> <p><u>Also in Attendance</u> Matthew Southgate, CBC Peter Dale, DMBC Ed Highfield, SCC Simon Ogden, SCC (for item 4e) Mark Lynam, BMBC Alison Westray-Chapman, NEDDC Neal Byers, ARUP / SCR Executive Team Dave Allatt, SCR Executive Team Veena Prajapati, SCR Executive Team Mel Dei Rossi, SCR Executive Team Paul Woodcock, RMBC Ben Morley, SCC Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p>	
2	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>As Leader of the sponsoring Authority, Mayor Jones declared an interest in the SCRIF schemes to be considered at items 4b-d and took no part in the discussions.</p>	
3	<p><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></p>	

	None received	
4	<p><u>CIAT Business Cases</u></p> <p>A series of recommendations by the SCR Appraisal Panel, were presented for consideration.</p> <p>The schemes presented, and associated requests were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheffield City Centre: Knowledge Gateway – Full Business Case • DN7: Unity Park – Resolution of conditions • Doncaster Urban Centre: Civic and Cultural Quarter – Full Approval • Doncaster Urban Centre: Colonnades – Full Approval • Claywheels Lane Sustainable Industry Park – Request to resubmit a Full Business Case <p>Regarding the Sheffield City Centre: Knowledge Gateway scheme members requested an explanation of the 5% optimism bias figure. It was explained this is merely an appraisal technique to offset the propensity for the promoter underestimated the actual cost of the scheme and help ensure the appraisal metrics are accurate. It is expected this figure will reduce to zero prior to full award. This is different to the contingency fund figure which mitigates unforeseen cost increases post award.</p> <p>Members requested this be better explained in future reports and suggested that tables of figures should ideally add up to 'total' figures.</p> <p>Action: Neal to revise for future reports</p> <p>Noting the importance of this and other schemes to other Executive Boards, members were advised of a matter discussed at the preceding Transport Executive Board at which it was suggested a means of ensuring the Executive Boards don't work 'in-silo' needs to be developed. IEB members voiced support for such an initiative.</p> <p>At this point Cllr Burrows assumed the chair</p> <p>Regarding the DN7: Unity Park, members were provided with an explanation of the revised conditions of award.</p> <p>Regarding the Doncaster Urban Centre: Civic and Cultural Quarter scheme, it was noted that some public sector take up of some of the office space is planned.</p>	NB

Regarding the Doncaster Urban Centre: Colonnades scheme, an explanation was provided in respect of what is referred to as 'clawback'. It was suggested this in this instance this is actually a means of seeking the restitution of some SCR funding should the funding profile change.

Members discussed the pros and cons of applying clawback conditions and asserted their importance in terms of helping scheme promoters to maintain focus on agreed delivery profiles.

Mayor Jones reassumed the Chair.

Following on from discussing clawback, it was noted that all scheme promoters have been asked to confirm whether their schemes are predicated on the provision of any European funding (in the interests of identifying any potential post-brexit issues). It was confirmed no SCRIF schemes have any European funding and are not seen as at risk from brexit. Members reasserted the view that scheme promoters who find themselves with a funding shortfall, due to the withdrawal of a funder, can't assume SCRIF will fill any shortfall.

A presentation was delivered on the Claywheels Lane Sustainable Industry Park scheme. It was noted the specific planned outcomes of the project have changed since the project was originally approved as part of the SCRIF programme. Though reduced, the forecast GVA outcomes of the project appear to remain good value for money and early deliverability has improved. It was also noted the promoter's ask of the SCR has reduced from £4.63m to £4.4m (to fund enabling works (transport and power)).

Members noted the job creation totals has reduced from 554 to 216. It was explained this is due to a revision in the number of 'general' industrial jobs envisaged but actually includes an increase in the number of skilled jobs planned (as attested by the increase in the scheme's GVA).

It was confirmed officers are appropriately attuned to state aid considerations.

RESOLVED, that the Board:

- 1. Approve the Sheffield City Centre: Knowledge Gateway Full Business case subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table**

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Approve the resolution of conditions for DN7 noting the remaining conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table 3. Approve the award of £0.635m for Doncaster Urban Centre: Civic and Cultural Quarter subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table 4. Approve the award of £2.280m for Doncaster Urban Centre: Colonnades subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table 5. Note the changes to the proposal for the Claywheels Lane Sustainable Industry Park and endorse the resubmission of the Full Business Case (subject to CIAT review) and endorse the principle of SCR commencing discussions with the promoter regarding the likely Funding Agreement conditions. 	
5	<p><u>M1 J36 Lessons Learnt</u></p> <p>A paper was presented to share the outcome of a Lessons Learned session arranged by Barnsley MBC for the M1 J36 scheme.</p> <p>It was noted the lessons identified have been drawn into a wider lessons learned review that has been undertaken by Sheffield City Region (SCR). This wider delivery review will also be reported to the Infrastructure Executive Board (IEB) at a future meeting.</p> <p>Members noted a number of recommendations regarding improving engagements with utilities and discussed the role that was previously provided by the RDA – Yorkshire Forward in co-ordinating engagements. It was suggested the SCR Executive Team might position itself to take on a similar role for the benefit of all districts (and utilities) as part of its delivery of the SCRIP.</p> <p>It was suggested the lessons learnt are also of interest to the developers.</p> <p>Members revisited comments on the importance of clawback, recognising the need to appropriately apply proportionality and flexibility.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the summary of the key lessons learned. 	

	<p>2. Note that Sheffield City Region Executive is undertaking a wider review of delivery, with an update to be provided to the Board at a future meeting.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Programme Dashboard Template</u></p> <p>The Board was reminded of the SCR’s intention to undertake a dashboard approach to managing the performance of SCR Investment Fund projects and programmes and was therefore presented with the information that will feed into the final programme dashboard to be designed for usage by IEB.</p> <p>Members were provided with an explanation of how information pertaining to various milestones would be presented i.e. time, cost, quality and project management controls i.e. risks, issues and change control.</p> <p>Members requested that future reports provide a short narrative to explain what exceedances have been used to determine variance against baseline and thus the red, amber and green classifications.</p> <p>Members also requested the inclusion of an additional ‘direction of travel’ indicator to show whether schemes are falling behind profile or recovering</p> <p>Action: Mel to incorporate these changes</p> <p>It was confirmed that baseline and delivery profiles can be changed if requested by the scheme promoter, subject to the submission of an appropriate change request form and the agreement of the SCR (i.e. the IEB).</p> <p>It was noted the IEB will be presented with summaries of all substantive change requests for consideration.</p> <p>Members welcomed the dashboard and agreed this will be an excellent way to keep the Board informed of the status of all schemes.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board endorses the intended performance dashboard feedback format</p>	<p>MDR</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><u>LEP Prioritisation Workshop Impact on SCRIP</u></p> <p>A paper was presented to provide an update on the early outcome of the LEP visioning workshop. It was noted the purpose of the workshop was to scope out and set a framework within which to take forward the SEP refresh and the LEP</p>	

	<p>identified infrastructure as a key strategic theme alongside transport, housing, business growth, skills, rural and city/town centres.</p> <p>It was noted the LEP also identified Doncaster Sheffield Airport and the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) as important strategic projects. However, members were asked to note the exercise to identify strategic projects is not complete and others are likely to be afforded this status i.e. rail connectivity.</p> <p>It was confirmed the intention is still to present the SCRIP to the 1st August CA and LEP.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes the initial outcome of the workshop. 2. Endorses the proposed changes to the SCR IIP and notes the next steps. 	
8	<p><u>Key Thematic Links – Infrastructure, Housing and Transport</u></p> <p>A paper was presented providing a first draft of a high level account of the key thematic links across all of SCR Executive Boards.</p> <p>It was suggested the workstreams of the SCR Executive Boards are inextricably linked, with a number of work streams of key importance to multiple Boards and to clarify lead responsibilities, the SCR has assigned a ‘Lead Board’ for each thematic area, with the ‘Lead Board’ responsible for strategic direction and the oversight/ sign off of a range of project based activity.</p> <p>Members were also asked to note it has been recognised as essential that other Boards are involved and sighted on some activities of mutual interest.</p> <p>Members reiterated comments made at other Boards which suggested Boards cannot work in isolation and agreed ‘we’ need to continue work to identify and implement the most efficient and effective means of decision management governance, including whether it may be beneficial to revise the Executive Board structure.</p> <p>It was suggested that a Board being ‘sighted’ on a matter may not go far enough and it may be beneficial to joint-Board undertakings to be convened to look at specific projects in the round.</p>	

	<p>Action: Veena to investigate how decision management governance is discharged in other regions.</p> <p>Regarding the Labour Market Review (Skills Board - led with 3 other Boards sighted), it was suggested this needs to be concerned with the mobility of all labour, not just occupations that are transport related.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board note the contents of the report</p>	VP
9	<p><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3rd June were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Regarding the request for a joint session with the SCR Inward Investment Team, it was noted some potential dates have been provided and suggestions for agenda items are invited.</p> <p>Action: All to suggest agenda items for the joint meeting with the Investment Team</p> <p>Action: Veena to confirm the date and venue</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board agree the minutes of the previous meeting are an accurate record.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>VP</p>
10	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>i. <u>SCR Enterprise Zones – Development Fund</u> Members questioned the now significant delay in getting the Fund up and running and asked why this is apparently predicated on the identification of EZ sites (with this work also taking longer than expected).</p> <p>It was requested that an update be provided to the next meeting, with the expectation that this report confirms timescales for the Fund’s implementation and an outline explanation of what the Fund will be spent on.</p> <p>Action: Veena to make arrangements for Andy Gates to present a report to the next meeting</p>	VP
11	<p><u>Date of the Next Meeting</u></p> <p>26th August – Broad Street West, Sheffield, 10.00am</p>	