

### Meeting Information

Meeting Title	Winchester District UKSPF Partnership Board
Location	Walton Suite, Winchester Guildhall
Date	Friday 28 July 2023
Organiser	Megan Bagnall – Shared Prosperity Funding Officer

### Attendees

Megan Bagnall (MB)	Winchester City Council
Ken Baikie (KB)	Winchester City Council
Cllr Neil Bolton (NB)	Shadow Cabinet Member Representative
Lucy Charman (LC)	CLA
Alexander Clayton (AC)	WinAcc
Ellen Evans	Winchester City Council
Andrew Gostelow (AG)	Winchester City Council
Tim Houghton (TH)	Community First
Lydia Mawdsley (LM)	Winchester City Council
Julie Milburn (JM)	Sparsholt College
Emma Noyce (EN)	Hampshire County Council
Cllr Mark Reach	Town Forum
Cllr Lucille Thompson (LT)	Winchester City Council
Zulfiya Truscott (ZT)	Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
Cllr John Woodman (JW)	Parish Councils representative
Alison Woods (AW)	Winchester City Council

### Apologies

Dawn Adey	Winchester City Council
Steve Brine MP	MP for Winchester & Chandler's Ford
Sajid Butt	EM3 LEP
Jo Crocker	WinAcc
Flick Drummond MP	MP for Meon Valley
Cllr Michael Kurn	Shadow Cabinet Member
Andrew Lee	South Downs National Park
Susan Robbins (SR)	Winchester City Council
Paul Sapwell	Hampshire Cultural Trust
Paul Spencer	Winchester BID
Paresh Thakrah	Winchester College
Kevin Travers	EM3 LEP

## Meeting Minutes

1. Welcome, Introductions and REPF Overview	LT / AG
<p><u>LT</u> thanked those attending and made introductions.</p> <p><u>AG</u> provided a background to the funding amount and application criteria. Winchester City Council has received £186,000 funding for 2023/24 and £559,000 for 2024/25. We received ten completed applications for 2023/24 across the following interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable Growth Grants</li> <li>• Cultural Grants</li> <li>• Community Infrastructure Grants</li> <li>• Green Spaces</li> </ul> <p>The scoring methodology includes scoring by three officers, feedback from Prosperity Fund Board, moderation and review undertaken by SR. Applicants will be contacted to confirm that they still require funding and then applications will be ranked and funding made in order of moderated scores.</p> <p><u>TH</u> asked if there is any risk of the application process overrunning timeframes. <u>MB</u> confirmed that all applicants are aware of the timescale and the scoring methodology should take no more than two weeks to complete.</p> <p><u>AG</u> summarised the spread of applications across the district but acknowledging the lack of applications from the Waterlooville area. This area will be targeted in future application windows.</p> <p><u>LT</u> added that the bulk of funding comes in the next round, which potentially offers the opportunity for more comprehensive coverage across the district.</p>	
2. Rural England Prosperity Fund under £25,000	MB
<p><u>MB</u> provided a summary of applications under £25,000 and responded to any points raised by the Board.</p> <p><u>23100007 - Jolly Moon – market garden and outdoor kitchen</u></p> <p><u>JW</u> Are all costs backed up by data?</p> <p><u>MB</u> Grant requests are based on estimates and quotes.</p> <p><u>EN</u> Do all applications presented to the Board meet the criteria?</p> <p><u>MB</u> All applicants have passed scoring and criteria, any queries or amends answered prior to contract.</p> <p><u>NB</u> Is the purpose of this process that there will be a ‘culling’ of applications, and will the financial backing be checked?</p> <p><u>AW</u> We have received more applications than we have funding for, therefore we use scoring to prioritise funding. We also look to see if there is any other funding available.</p> <p><u>MB</u> The financials team have completed background checks to see if the business is sustainable.</p> <p><u>TH</u> Is it possible to pre-approve projects for 2024/25?</p>	

<p><u>LT</u> It is essential to have pipeline projects in case any other projects fall through so that the money is spent within the required timeframe.</p> <p><u>LC</u> For any project requiring planning permission, have these been approved?</p> <p><u>MB</u> The two projects needing planning permission have been approved. It contributes to their 'deliverability' score. The scoring methodology offers us the opportunity to reject applications with a low deliverability score. We can invite them to resubmit for the next application period.</p> <p><u>23100020 – Twyford Parish Council - EV Chargers</u></p> <p><u>JW</u> Have the applicants investigated free options for EV charging stations?</p> <p><u>AC</u> Will this affect residents' cost (i.e. will the chargers be more expensive for residents to run) by going through a private company.</p> <p><b>Action: WCC has established that alternative options were not suitable for the locations earmarked.</b></p> <p><u>23100007 - Zen Forge – Business start up</u></p> <p><u>JM</u> declared conflict of interest in Zen Forge, as she knows the applicants. No questions</p> <p><u>23100024 – Wickham Community Association</u> No Questions</p> <p><u>23100023 – Oakridge Smallholding – Tourism</u> No Questions</p> <p>The Board raised no further questions.</p>	
<b>3. Rural England Prosperity Fund over £25,000</b>	
<p><u>23100018 – Itchen Abbas and Avington Village Hall - Ground source heat pump</u></p> <p><u>MR</u> Do they have environment agency permit?</p> <p><u>MB</u> WCC will seek confirmation.</p> <p><b>Action: WCC to check environment agency permit</b></p> <p><u>LC</u> Retrofitting ground source heat pumps is expensive - have they investigated solar?</p> <p><u>MB</u> They have solar power already and have assessed building efficiency – this is their next step to becoming more sustainable.</p> <p><u>AW</u> A low carbon service audit has most likely been completed.</p> <p><u>23100002 – River Coffee Roasters Ltd - Coffee Roaster</u></p> <p><u>JM</u> Will they match fund the rest of the project?</p> <p><u>MB</u> This is considered an 'exceptional' case, so they will match over £25,000</p> <p><u>LC</u> Do they have a roaster chosen and how many jobs will it generate?</p> <p><u>MB</u> 3 quotes have been delivered, but the application has been worded in case there are any changes. There will be 2 jobs created and 5 safeguarded.</p>	<b>AG</b>

<p><u>23100004 – Winchester District Scout Council – indoor activity space</u></p> <p><u>TH</u> What other grants have they applied for?</p> <p><u>MB</u> We will check for any other grants.</p> <p><u>MB</u> summarised the next stage for REPF. Applications will open in October 2023 for 2024-25 funds. There will be more drop-in sessions and online Q&amp;As. There will be a longer application window of 8-12 weeks. 2023-24 projects will be promoted to help lever new applications for 2024-25. There is also the potential for 2023-24 projects to move to 2024-25.</p>	
<p><b>4. UKSPF 2023/2024 Underspend</b></p>	<p><b>MB</b></p>
<p><u>MB</u> summarised the Kings Walk project application surrounding additional planters. Upon review there was not enough impact, so this was rejected, leading to £8,600 E1 underspend. The amount is insufficient to warrant an open call and therefore WCC will contact those who have enquired about UKSPF but had not progressed to an application.</p> <p><u>MR</u> suggested replacement interpretation boards for the Nunnaminster.</p> <p><u>EN</u> noted that HCT's 878 AD app trail has the Nunnaminster as their first stop.</p>	
<p><b>5. UKSPF 2024/2025</b></p>	<p><b>MB</b></p>
<p><u>Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR)</u></p> <p><u>AG</u> introduced the CWR team to present.</p> <p><u>LM</u> and <u>KB</u> presented on the meanwhile uses of Friarsgate Medical Centre. The Board were provided an overview of what their intended application would include. This will come forward over the summer period and will be determined ahead of the next Board meeting in order to meet necessary timelines. The Board did not raise any concerns regarding this approach. They opened the floor for questions.</p> <p><u>AC</u> Will there be a focus on native species?</p> <p><b>Action: WCC will obtain further information on biodiversity / native species.</b></p> <p><u>TH</u> What is the estimated timeframe of 'meanwhile'? Does it have a risk of becoming too valuable to the community to be removed?</p> <p><u>KB</u> Jigsaw see it as a vital part of the engagement project. Minimum of three years, as the project will only begin in 2024. It is beneficial to get people engaged with the site.</p> <p><u>LT</u> The meanwhile value is greater than the risk of public perception of 'un-spending' money.</p> <p><u>MR</u> This project concerns his ward. He assures the board that this is a community priority and will be seen as beneficial.</p> <p><u>KB</u> The timescale for project / demolition is October (soft demolition). Bat boxes have been approved for the site.</p> <p><u>LM</u> and <u>KB</u> are open to ideas and collaboration with the board for this project.</p> <p><u>JW</u> How was this project originally planned to be funded?</p>	

<p><u>LM</u> Rapid change has meant that the original £500,000 budget can achieve demolition and light archaeology. UKSPF funding will be additional funding for making the site more attractive and beneficial to the community.</p> <p><u>AW</u> tested the concept for events and community usage at the site through an outdoor cinema last year. It was well received and very popular.</p> <p><u>EN</u> Will the archaeology aspect of the project link to Winchester's heritage tourism offer?</p> <p><u>LM</u> Reconstruct, HCT and WCC Tourism will be involved at a later date.</p>	
<p><b>6. Due Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>AG</b></p>
<p><u>AG</u> confirmed that due diligence will be undertaken by the financial team. The formal risk register will be updated when further application decisions are made.</p> <p><u>JW</u> Who makes the final decision for applications?</p> <p><u>AG</u> confirmed WCC officers test and score the projects. Susan Robbins, Corporate Head of Economy and Community has delegated authority and will have final sign off.</p> <p><u>JW</u> requested that the board be given project information before the meeting to have questions / conflicts identified.</p> <p>Following a general discussion AG reiterated that the approved Terms of Reference for this Board, confirming it was not a decision-making committee. AG agreed to consider alternative arrangements for Board members to receive application summaries ahead of future meetings.</p>	
<p><b>7. Future Meetings</b></p>	<p><b>AG</b></p>
<p>27 October 2023</p>	