

MEETING MINUTES

Project Title:

Winchester District UKSPF/REPF Shadow Partnership Board

Author:

Andrew J Moore

Meeting Information**Date, Time & Location:**

Wednesday 2 November 2022

Attendees:

Jo Crocker (JC)	WinAcc
Cllr Mike Craske (MC)	Winchester City Council
Andrew Gostelow (AG)	Winchester City Council
Ian Gray (IG)	Hampshire County Council
Tim Hands (THA)	Winchester College
Tim Houghton (THO)	Community First
Ross McNally (RM)	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Paul Sapwell (PS)	Hampshire Cultural Trust
Susan Robbins (SR)	Winchester City Council
Paul Spencer (PG)	Winchester Business Improvement District
Cllr Lucille Thompson (LT)	Winchester City Council
Kevin Travers (KT)	EM3 LEP
Cllr John Woodman (JW)	Parish Councils representative
Steve Lincoln (SL)	Winchester City Council
Andy Moore	Winchester City Council

Apologies:

Dawn Adey (DA)	Winchester City Council
Steve Brine MP (SB)	MP for Winchester & Chandler's Ford
Flick Drummond MP (FD)	MP for Meon Valley
Liz Keys (LK)	Winchester City Council

MEETING MINUTES

Minutes from meeting

	Agenda item & actions identified:	Owner (initials) & Date:
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p><u>LT</u> welcomed and thanked the attendees for taking a seat on the Shadow Programme Board. Introductions were made.</p> <p><u>LT</u> clarified that the partnership board will become a full board when government funding is received but is currently referred to as a 'Shadow Board'</p>	
2.	<p>UK Shared Prosperity Fund & Rural England Prosperity Fund – Scene setting</p> <p><u>SR</u> provided a background to the funding amount/purpose and role of the board. (An allocation of a £1m grant from the Government's UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) with an additional £745k grant from the Rural England Prosperity Fund (Rural Fund) to support the government's levelling up agenda e.g. boost productivity, pay, jobs and living standards, restore a sense of community, local pride and belonging etc.)</p>	
3.	<p>Draft Governance and Terms of Reference to be agreed</p> <p><u>SR</u> summarised the draft Terms of Reference and invited discussion from partners on areas requiring consideration. These being the recruitment process of the board i.e. invite nominations from existing boards or an Open call process and the frequency of the meetings e.g. quarterly, 6 monthly.</p> <p><u>MC</u> Suggestion that meetings are held in good time ahead of government reporting date to ensure no rush in compiling information/decision making.</p> <p><u>JW</u> Frequency of meetings dependant on how much of the funding has already been allocated. Also noted that funding to projects in Parish Councils is quite low compared to those around Winchester.</p> <p>In response: <u>SR</u> explained that proposed funding allocation was to demonstrate to government that spend was feasible so not a definitive list of projects. There will be a mix of both allocated</p>	SR

MEETING MINUTES

	<p>and available funds that require consideration. Similarly, in regards to rural strands, themes have been identified but opportunities will be available to support projects in Parish Councils areas.</p> <p><u>THO</u> How much influence do the board have on chosen projects? Thoughts on subgroup involvement to help in some capacity? In response: <u>LT</u> advised funding does come with various constraints and supplementing funding may not be possible. <u>SR</u> went on to confirm the idea of the board is not to work in isolation. The Board will have the opportunity to challenge and review high value projects.</p> <p><u>PS</u> Keen to simplify process. The role of the board is in decision-making. Support overall decision in regards to frequency of meetings but preference would be 6 monthly.</p> <p>Action: HCT conflict of interest. Conflict of interest to be clarified in Terms of Reference.</p> <p><u>SL</u> The board includes a broad representation of groups – consider using the board should future funding opportunities become available. Possibly through the 3 year duration of this funding?</p> <p>Agreed: Board to meet 6 monthly decided by a majority show of hands, subject to additional meetings should decisions be required or issues to be resolved.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Process for consideration of projects</p> <p><u>SR</u> outlined the process for inviting proposals. Year one grant beneficiaries of indicative projects to be contacted to ensure projects still planned and funding still required. As per the TOR projects will fall into two categories: low amounts & risk (suggestion of £9,999 or less) and big capital applications (suggested as £10k or more) the latter to come to the partnership board.</p> <p>Agreed: The Board would receive information on small projects but provide a more in-depth review of higher value projects</p> <p><u>THO</u> noted risk is key consideration.</p> <p><u>SR</u> advised funding amounts are set and cannot be rolled over to following year. Monitoring is essential as if projects stop or are</p>	<p>AG</p>

MEETING MINUTES

	<p>running at an underspend the board can look to reallocate to other projects.</p> <p><u>JC</u> suggested that guidelines for minimum and maximum funding amounts should be included within grant applications. Larger projects shape the district more so than smaller individual ones. Could there be bands/thresholds for funding amounts? The impacts of the larger projects would fit in with the objective of local pride.</p> <p><u>MC</u> suggested that the value/difference for each project should be considered underpinned by a scoring mechanism which complement fund objectives.</p> <p>Action: Incorporate a scoring and evaluation mechanism in the business case selection process.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Three Year Investment Plan</p> <p><u>AG</u> summarised the six proposed projects for year one. Four WCC led projects and 2 two delivered by external partners.</p> <p>WCC – Lighting event, Street Market improvements, Sustainable tourism & Made in Winchester (local produce) External – Play to the Crowd Happiness Centre and Hampshire Cultural Trust volunteering programme.</p> <p><u>JW</u> If approving yr1 is the board committing to yr2 & yr3. No detail of the projects at this stage to make informed decision. In response: <u>SR</u> All projects, including those in yr1, will be required to follow due process.</p> <p><u>PS</u> What are the consequences of not signing off funding for yr2 & yr3? Can projects be made aware that approval is for yr1 only and not (at this stage) for yr2 & yr3. In response: <u>SR</u> Decisions on yr1 projects are not being asked to be made today. These criteria will be the same for internal and external projects. See action agreed above.</p> <p><u>PS</u> To avoid being rushed into a decision could comms go out to stipulate that we are looking to achieve meaningful work, this year which won't be impacted, by yr2 & yr3 funding?</p> <p>Action: Agreed that as business case documents are circulated to Year 1 planned grant recipients a note to confirm that this is only a commitment for year one will be included.</p>	<p>AG</p>

MEETING MINUTES

	<p><u>THA</u> Must spend government funding if available. No need for another meeting for yr1 decisions. Marking criteria and conflict of interest in Terms of Reference to be confirmed.</p> <p>Action: Year two call for applications to be undertaken in the coming months</p>	
6.	<p>Reporting and Evaluation</p> <p>Covered in previous sections.</p>	
7.	<p>Communications & Engagement</p> <p><u>AG</u> advised that a series of dedicated pages would be created on WCC corporate website which would:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote the funding opportunities with latest information and advice - a platform to host Case studies of the projects which have been undertaken to create a body of intelligence and a point of reference for future - Forums and other business groups as well as content in enewsletter and related social medial will be undertaken in order to raise awareness of the funding opportunities. 	AG

Next Meeting

Date, Time & Location:

January 2023, date and time TBC