

CWLEP Programme Delivery Board

9th November 2017

Agenda Item 4

Title: Meeting Notes for 21st September 2017

Present

Nick Abell (NA), Martin Yardley (MY)

In attendance:

Paula Deas (PD), Roger Dowthwaite (RD), Andy Williams (AW), Alicia Law (AL), Lucy McGovern (LM), Jodie Clarke (JC) [SLC], Tony Buttery (TB)

Apologies:

Jonathan Browning (JB)

#	Note	Action
1	<p>Kenilworth Railway Station Presentation</p> <p>JC presented a summary of the progress of the project to date, covering major outputs, successes and achievements and lessons learnt.</p> <p>NA asked how many passengers the proposed carriage type (Diesel Class 153) will be able to carry. JC confirmed it would hold up to 72 passengers.</p> <p>NA asked what the demand would be for the service, JC confirmed that the 2020 forecast number of passenger return journeys is 445 per day (275,000 per annum)</p> <p>AL asked when the launch would be, JC advised this would be expected in the new year.</p> <p>LMc advised that the station is set to open on Dec 10th, but the issues detailed later in the meeting, could delay this.</p> <p>The Board noted the absence of a representative from WCC at the meeting</p>	
3	<p>Notes of Meeting 4th May 2017</p> <p>NA comment on section 3 regarding CSW Broadband technology at risk of becoming obsolete. AW advised the board that increased competition within the market had increased the level of private sector investment, resulting in this no longer being an issue and that the successful bidder was looking at putting in fibre to a number of places.</p> <p>The notes were approved.</p>	

#	Note	Action
4	<p>Midlands Engine Investment Fund Update</p> <p>AW gave an overview of the Fund. NA asked if we would get proper feedback from the group, and noted the importance of being able to verify how CWLEP is doing in comparison with other local areas.</p> <p>AW confirmed that Janette Palas (Warwick University Science Park) is CWLEP’s representatives at the Midlands Engine Investment Fund Regional Advisory Board (David Hope is the Alternate) and will provide regular feedback to CWLEP’s SME Business Group and Programme Delivery Board. PD also advised that information from the Regional Advisory Board feeds into the 6 LEP group that JB/NA attends.</p> <p>There was a discussion around the relatively high cost per job, with AW clarifying that this was a reasonable benchmark compared to a number of CWLEP schemes that had been running for a number of years.</p> <p>MY raised the issue of funding from EU investment Bank, and whether there was any risk of this funding being pulled. AW advised this shouldn’t be a risk, but it was agree this should be clarified and minuted at a future Regional Advisor Board meeting.</p> <p>NA asked that the performance of MEIF be reported regularly to the CWLEP PDB not just the impact in C&W but how it compares to all the other targeted areas in the fund. AW to request regular reports to the PDB on performance and impact.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular reports on performance of MEIF to be provided to the Programme Delivery Board. • Clarify and note the risk of funding withdrawal from the EU Investment Bank at a future Regional Advisor Board. 	<p>David Hope (CCC)</p> <p>David Hope (CCC)</p>
5	<p>Growth Deal Programme Report</p> <p>AW provided an overview of the red rated GD10 A5 Corridor project, and 2 amber projects.</p> <p>PD noted that the risk ratings should be put in the context of the whole programme. This will be adjusted for future reports so that the strategic rating of all projects was laid out upfront.</p> <p><u>A5 Corridor</u></p> <p>AW and LMc provided an update explaining that the project had been unable to complete contracting documentation or provide full defrayal evidence. This was deemed to be due to a breakdown of communication with partners</p> <p>AW reminded the Board of the government commitments within the Growth Deal that should support the relationship with Highways England.</p>	

#	Note	Action
5.1	<p>AL agreed to pick up the concerns of the PDB with DfT (Barbara King) to unlock the issues.</p> <p>The board noted the CWLEP is at a potential higher risk than other LEPs, due the number of infrastructure projects it supports, which can be delayed by outside factors, for example by Network Rail and Highways England.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust future PDB reports to place project risk ratings in context. Meeting to be organised with Barbara King (DfT) to support resolution of the issues with the A5 Corridor project. <p>Approved Recommendations:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to be issued to the project (HE), giving them four weeks' notice to submit outstanding documentation or risk loss of funding. DfT and WCC to received prior notification that letter to be sent and that funding is at risk </div>	LMc AL
5.2	<p><u>Kenilworth Station</u></p> <p>AW and LMc provided an update regarding the issues with the project including the change of franchise operator, Network Rail driver training material delays and issues with obtaining Access rights approval.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a summary of the issues facing the project to Barbara King (DfT) and Alicia Law WCC and BK to be invited to the next PDB meeting. <p>Approved Recommendations</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carney Green to look at lessons learnt from this project that could support future rail project delivery. </div>	LMc LMc
5.3	<p><u>Rugby Parkway Station</u></p> <p>The group discussed the project and its unsuccessful application to the New Stations Fund which has left a gap in match funding. There is a meeting with DfT scheduled for early October and the Board requested CWLEP representation at the meeting so the Board can gauge the level of interest from DfT in the project</p> <p>The group would like the lessons learnt from the Kenilworth station applied to the Rugby parkway to reduce the likely hood of repeated delays and issues.</p> <p>AL advised she would organise a meeting with Barbara King to go through the issues regarding Rugby Parkway and requested a summary of the projects to date.</p>	

#	Note	Action
	<p><u>Project Publicity</u></p> <p>The group noted the update to the recent and up-coming publicity.</p>	
<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>Project Update – A46 Stanks</p> <p>The project is projecting a 9 month slippage to its works programme due to a delay in issuing the tenders. There are outstanding issues with Highways England sign off and Opus 40 / Taylor Wimpey signing off proposed delivery plans.</p> <p>The project had requested slippage of £2.08m into 2018/19 and a re-profile of milestones.</p> <p>Approved Recommendations</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board to issue a letter giving the project time to seek resolution of the outstanding issues by 31st October or the funding maybe withdrawn. • Project re-profile provisionally approved on condition resolution of outstanding issues completed by 31st October. • A letter to be issued to HE/DfT to find out the cause of the delay with granting section 6 approval and to seek resolution. </div>	
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p>	<p>Project Update – Coton Arches</p> <p>The board discussed the paper and the delays the project has faced. LMc confirmed that the tenders for works had now been published and as such the delayed work programme should now be achievable. The project has asked to slip £325k of spend into 18/19.</p> <p>LMc cautioned the board this this should be taken as a provisional figure at this time.</p> <p>Approved Recommendations</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board approves the proposed re-profile of spend into 18/19 and the revised milestones for the scheme. </div>	
<p>8</p> <p>8.1</p>	<p>Project Update – Unlocking Development Sites</p> <p><u>Bridge to Living</u></p> <p>The owners of the retail block, London & Cambridge have withdrawn from the project. The project is now no longer deliverable.</p> <p>Approved Recommendation</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board recommends the £350,000 GD funding allocated to the scheme is reabsorbed into the Programme. </div>	

#	Note	Action
8.2	<p><u>Priory Square – Studley</u></p> <p>Despite significant support and dialogue with the Programme Management Team there remains no definite proposal due to the present occupier (The Coop) selling its freehold on the site. This has meant that prospective outputs for this site have changed and the need for GD grant is no longer clear.</p> <p>Approved Recommendation</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The £200,000 Growth Deal funding allocated for the scheme is withdrawn from the project and reabsorbed back into the Growth Deal Programme. </div>	
8.3	<p><u>Bermuda Connection</u></p> <p>The board noted that the project may be withdrawn by WCC and therefore the Growth Deal funding would be withdrawn. Decision due on the 27th of September.</p> <p>Approved Recommendation</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board recommends £1m Growth Deal funding is withdrawn from the project if the decision from WCC on the 27th September is to no longer progress with the scheme, or the scope of the scheme is materially different from the original award. </div>	
8.4	<p><u>Reallocating GD Grant</u></p> <p>In light of decisions noted above the Programme Delivery Board discussed the next steps to relocate the newly unallocated funding</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PMT to provide proposals for an Open Call in November to the next Programme Delivery Board. <p>Approved Recommendations</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The launch of an open call in November 17 to refresh the CWLEP Project pipeline and award the GD funding reallocated from other projects. </div>	
8.5	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing projects which have funding withdrawn are to receive full notice and support to rebid into the November call. </div>	
9	<p>Reviewing the Terms of Reference</p>	

#	Note	Action
9.1	<p>AW talked about the many changes to the board, and its roles and responsibilities and also that the TOR have not been agreed to date.</p> <p>The Board discussed the proposed quarterly scheduling of Programme Delivery Board Meetings. It was felt that information provided at the meetings needed to cover the relevant issues Board should react to without being onerous. NA agreed the move to quarterly meetings.</p> <p>PDB requested the addition of an additional private sector Board member, with the stipulation that the role should be reserved exclusively for the private sector due to the remit of the group.</p> <p>NA discussed the potential for Board Directors to present reports at the CWLEP Board, which would encourage ownership and buy in at a higher level.</p> <p>NA gave examples of the roles and responsibilities shared between the trustees and executive at Shakespeare’s Birthplace Trust.</p> <p>AW recommended that PMT should be given flexibility and additional resource to support project management. For example the ability to able to send escalation letters that would traditionally be issued from for the LEP. NA agreed this change.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDB ToR draft to be updated and forwarded to JB and NA to review and agree via email. • PDB ToR to state the requirement for a third Private Sector Board member – with stipulation that the role cannot be taken by a Public Sector Board member due to the remit of the PDB. <p>Approved Recommendations</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised terms of reference to be submitted to the next Finance and Governance Group to request final sign off. </div>	<p>LMc</p> <p>LMc</p>
10	<p>Growth Deal Forward Planner</p> <p>The board noted the Forward Planner.</p>	
11	<p>Evaluation and Audit Update</p> <p>MY noted the excellent recent audit result and suggested this is included in the forthcoming CWLEP Annual Report.</p> <p>LMc referenced the evaluation supporting the forthcoming Annual Conversation. AL confirmed that BEIS are now looking at dates in late November early December.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm a date for the 2017 Annual Conversation • Audit result to be included in the 16/17 CWLEP Annual Report • Dates to be provided for 17/18 Annual Conversation 	<p>LMc</p> <p>PD</p> <p>AL</p>

#	Note	Action
12	AOB None.	