# Minutes of the Goole Town Deal Board
# held on Tuesday 20 September 2022 3.30pm – 6.20pm

Attending: Jos Richardson & Sons (Chairman JR Joseph Richardson), Constituency MP (AP Andrew Percy), Goole Civic Society (MHC Margaret Hicks-Clarke), Siemens (FB Finbarr Dowling), Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth and Tourism (JE Cllr Jane Evison), Goole Town Council (AH Cllr Anne Handley), DLUHC (PC Peter Campey) Junction Theatre and Arts Centre (GW Graham Whitehead, Hull and East Yorkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TC Teresa Chalmers), Environment Agency (PS Paul Stockhill)

Present: Interim Head of Economic Development (CW Claire Watts), Town Deal Programme Manager (HH Helen Hoult), Head of Regeneration (NA Nigel Atkinson), Local Growth Co-ordinator (LJ Leigh Johnson ERYC), David Hern (DH) ERYC/NYCC, Anna Bennett (AB Workforce Skills Development Manager) Dean Hamblin (DHa), Environment Agency.

**1. Welcome and Apologies**

JR welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies were received from Beal Homes (Richard Beal), Croda International (Martin Chapman), Link Agency (Phil Jones), Public Health (Laurie Ferguson) and HEY Smile Foundation (Andy Barber). HH informed that Andy Barber is leaving Hey Smile Foundation to begin a new post. A conversation will be required about his replacement once the business case process is concluded. Claire Watts will join the meeting at 4.00pm.

HH introduced Anna Bennett (Workforce Skills Development Manager) to the meeting, the lead on the One Stop Skills Shop, and Dean Hamblin from the Environment Agency who has led on the Business Case for flood prevention measures and the cycle greenway. The Chairman introduced members to the format of the meeting, to consider business cases including Dutch River improvement works, Goole Leisure Centre, One Stop Skills Shop (now Opportunity Goole), and the Market Hall.

**2. Declaration of Interests** No new interests were declared.

**3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 August 2022** Agreed as a true record, approved by JE, seconded by PS.

**4. Matters Arising** None

**5. Goole Flood Prevention and Greenway Business Case**

JR invited DA and PS to update members on the business case and executive summary informing members to ask questions at the end of the presentation. DH an Engineer and Senior Advisor in Flood and Coastal Management in the Environment Agency (EA) Partnership Team with extensive experience in delivering projects across Yorkshire and responsibility for capital investment, incident response and strategic overview. DH has led on the business case for the flood prevention project. He works with partners on a wide package of works across the Humber to mitigate against flooding. £90 million of investment is programmed to sustain existing defences. The Humber 2100 + project is focused on the strategic management of flood risk across the Humber Estuary.

The Goole project fits with EA plans for investment, the business case frames the flood defence works and promotes the works along the left bank of the northern bank of the Dutch River. The focus is on the lower end of the river Don to the confluence with the river Ouse as a priority area. A scheme has been developed and a business case submitted within the EA for assurance and approval. Partnership funding is an essential element of bringing forward flood preventions schemes. DA explained that supplementing central government funding allows for progression of projects and that is the basis on which the business case has been submitted to the Town Deal Board, for consideration as part of the funding package to accelerate delivery of the Left Bank works and support wider economic growth aspirations. There are two elements to the project. Flood defences and the Greenway.

Options appraisals have been completed with a preference selected using costing exercises culminating in the option to sustain existing defences and support an additional length of greenway with delineation of the cycleway, improving the footway section and addition of a supplementary cycle way along the canal through to Rawcliffe Bridge. Total cost of the project is approximately £7.4 million. (£5.8 million for the flood defence works, £1.6 million for the Greenway). Goole Town Deal is contributing £3.1 million, £1.6m to fully fund the cycleway and £1.5 million towards the flood defence works. Additional grants totalling £1.6 million from other government departments will be secured via the EA; the final element is supplemented by funding of £2.6 million administered by the EA through Treasury routes with a forecast through to 2025 for final delivery. There is flexibility within the delivery profile; some elements of the Greenway can be delivered sooner. Development of the wider scheme from a flood perspective is already ongoing. The Chairman thanked DA for his presentation. Several questions were asked and discussed.

Following a question from AP regarding location, DA explained that the current cycle way at the eastern end near Goole does not fit with local guidance or align with Department for Transport guidance. It is poorly delineated, broken and does not function as it ought to. The project will provide that end provision, and link in with an existing tow path which will be brought up to specification to act as a backbone of the cycleway. PC said he wanted to understand the EA position in terms of looking for other government department funding, obtaining approval for the EA funding and works not coming on stream until 2024 / 2025. GTD funds are scheduled to be spent on the project in 2023 / 2024. He asked what assurances the EA could give that funding will be in place to commence on time for the full objectives of the project to be delivered given that the outline business case for the EA funding had yet to complete and would not be going through assurance until August 2024.

DH explained the EA is between strategic outline case and outline business case. The partnership funding in place presents a strong business case. The Dutch River is a nationally recognised priority scheme. Funding has been allocated but not yet approved until both outline business case and full business case have gone through the assurance process. The justification and need to invest has been clearly presented in the strategic outline business case. He explained the project was originally going to take much longer to come to fruition and has massively accelerated with GTD funding. Improving knowledge and understanding of the cost base around the works required within the appropriate timings is a priority and a reason why this phase is not as advanced as the EA would have liked at this stage. Focus and effort has been put into the supply chain to accelerate the project, much work has been completed in a short time to assess options and bring the preferred option to the table.

DH said the EAs outline business case is expected to be delivered by Summer 2023 followed by detailed design and procurement. It is a staged assurance and approval process that must be completed because of multiple funding streams and partnership funding processes. The full business case will be approved in August 2024, works completed in the financial year 2024 / 2025 with some smaller elements scheduled for completion in 2025 / 2026 once there is more certainty around the partnership funding package. Most of the work can be progressed, with elements of the Greenway accelerated well in advance of any main works on the flood defences, offering a realistic scenario around what could be delivered quickly.

PS explained the EA was confident in ability to draw down funding to support flood defence works across the wider geographic area given the range of partnership opportunities and the significant benefit in securing funding to accelerate elements of the works, such as those coming forward via GTD. The business case for investment around Goole is very strong, 10,000 plus properties are at risk of flooding, this justifies flood risk expenditure. Balancing short term investment against the long-term program (25 years) is the considered risk and this can be countered by flex in funding. AP added data supports the justification for investment. The GTD project has added benefit of the green way and the flood works being completed far earlier than originally intended by the EA given the GTD contribution. This enables EA processes to be unlocked. The vast majority of flood prevention work requires additional funding contributions for works to take place. Goole is no exception to that. £30 million has been designated for the area, because of the high risk, unlocking that will not be a problem given the evidence.

DH considers the justification to be straightforward planning schemes with the knowledge of additional partnership funds ensures works are equitable and gives flexibility for the government grant to be used at a later stage. AP added that a key selling point of the project is GTD can unlock the scheme much quicker, provide an environmental enhancement for residents and help other schemes in Goole to come to fruition much quicker. GW asked why GTD will be investing £3.1 million into the project if it is now thought to cost less than originally anticipated and the area is likely to receive substantial financial support. AP explained that the enhanced benefits of bringing forward the scheme by some years would not be possible without GTD contribution. This allows other money to be unlocked and used elsewhere on substantial improvements and flood prevention measures required in the Goole area. The enhancement of the Greenway would not occur without the GTD contribution.

The Chairman said he would like to move to a Board decision. HH explained Board endorsement for the Business Cases presented would be required to ensure verification of project proposals is in line with aspirations and expectations of the Town Investment Plan and compatible with the Heads of Terms offer. She explained that variance on the spend profile currently agreed across all projects to 2026 would require approval. JR asked if there were any objections for members to raise them now before proceeding to the next stage. He put to the Board that subject to approval for amendments to the spending profile and ERYC seeking confirmation from the EA that they will ensure funding is in place to deliver the project as presented, the Board endorse the Business Case for submission as part of the Goole Town Deal. AP suggested the Business case emphasize what Goole is getting from additional funding, how it is displacing money to be spent elsewhere on flood mitigation measures in the town so people realise the benefits of having the investment delivered earlier than what would be possible without TD funding. HH advised that following today's session, she would compile all project conditions and recommendations from the Board. PS reiterated he had declared an interest and would not vote regarding any decisions about the project. **The Chairman confirmed Board endorsement for the Business Case to proceed to the next stage.**

### 6. One Stop Skills Shop (Opportunity Goole) Business Case

HH outlined the journey from One Stop Skills Shop to Opportunity Goole highlighting the project’s unique position in crossing over several ERYC Directorates. The project is focused on promoting Goole Town Deal, connecting people to opportunities, bridging barriers to skills and career opportunities; it sits within the wider economic development, inward investment, regeneration agenda. The original intention to purchase an empty property to create a new venue in the town centre was not possible due to lack of available properties for sale (a lease is not a capital acquisition). In addition, operating overheads can be reduced by taking a shared space. AB explained the service will include impartial, advice and guidance for current and future residents to access a broad range of knowledge, information, and services through a referral system accessible to all ages. Connecting to new training opportunities, working directly with employers, the base will be the centre point for connecting people to the many new and emerging opportunities coming to Goole. The library building is a well-known well used town centre base and will act as the face of GTD with space for maximum impact communications. Space will be available for networking events and employers to meet with prospective employees. The town's NEETs (not in employment, education or training) will also be supported, and opportunities promoted to looked after children too, so everyone has the opportunity to participate and benefit.

The Flexible Support Fund will help people access training which is not available through any other route. The library offers instant access to IT facilities in a community-based service that will facilitate a range of support through Opportunity Goole. Transport options will be supported enabling Goole residents to access training, education, and employment opportunities further afield through a subsidised wheels to work scooter programme - Kickstart. There's potential to renew and widen the scheme. Visitors will be directed to Opportunity Goole when they enter the building. Space for three desks has been allocated including access to break out rooms and private space for one-to-one meetings. This includes a large window area for publicity and promotion.

The Chairman asked for comments and questions. MHC asked what will happen to the building if the library service relocates to Goole Hub and GTD funds end in 2026. HH confirmed the building would remain as an ERYC asset. How that evolves is yet to be determined. If a need is proven for the project to continue operating following the end of GTD there will be consideration of other funding streams such as the recently launched UK Shared Prosperity Fund which takes the place of European Funding. Initially it was thought to be an intense short-term project during the lifetime of GTD. It will be monitored and evaluated throughout with the hope that it is proven to be valued and demonstrates it is responding to a need.

JR said although there is a risk Opportunity Goole may cease to exist post March 2026 it is worth taking a risk to go ahead as it will have served the purpose it was intended for. HH added that through Opportunity Goole there is a vehicle for all operators providing skills and linking people to opportunities to work collectively to the point where there will no longer be a need for the service by 2026 as people will have found their way through to access the many opportunities being made available. AH expressed her disappointment at the positioning of the project within the library building suggesting she expected it to be exciting, innovative and deliver more additionality than what had been outlined. AP thought the venue provided a sustainable location in the high street with good parking facilities and the venue had been supported as a location by the Board at a previous meeting. He said the offer was important and should be considered within the context of aspirations and broader proposals concerning relocation of the library.

TC offered to discuss how the project can be developed with HH and NA in more detail to add further value into the space. She asked who would run the IAG service in terms of adhering to impartiality and raised thought of colocation of current services such as JC+ and the need for conversation about using the space flexibly. Inclusion of an internet café was part of the original brief, CT thought this should be included in the Opportunity Goole project. A need to look at criteria options for the Flexible Skills Fund was thought a priority to avoid duplication with other funds and gain understanding on the maximum amount of funding available to an individual. PS Asked if the revenue / capital issue had been resolved on the project. JR confirmed Heads of Terms had accepted the revenue element of the project. JE concurred with AP regarding the project venue as all other venue routes had been explored. She reassured the Board that AB's Team were highly experienced in offering this form of specialised support to people who find it most difficult to access work. She ran through the range of services they deliver, partners they work with and the links into business the project base will offer at the library, making connections directly with people and employers, business advisors and those aiming to establish their own small businesses. JE agreed some detailed tweaking was relevant to slightly improve the offer as TC had suggested with the inclusion of an internet café. She said the principle of what was suggested was correct.

GW agreed with AH that there was more potential to the project than had been outlined and asked how the skills fund would support emerging micro businesses and growing SMEs to build a critical mass of businesses requiring support to get off the ground. He suggested they would need access to high quality workspace, offices, and internet capabilities and this was missing in the project. He was also unsure how the scooter costs within the project would greatly benefit a significant number of people given only 20 scooters would be purchased. HH outlined how the project was predominantly about referring people into opportunities and overcoming barriers. The issue to be addressed was not necessarily about people who already engage with JC+. A significant number of highly skilled professionals aged 50+ have no reason to engage with JC+ but are looking for opportunities. The project began as a flexible skills fund identified to assist people in accessing emerging opportunities rather than a fund to plug gaps in skills. Opportunity Goole is focused on creating a brand that people identify with as a point of contact and interaction. It is for businesses seeking support onto the supply chain, for people thinking about starting their own business and aiming to be town centre based, it is not aiming to be a skills centre. AB said the services she and her Team ran were person centred and focused on ensuring individuals could access a range of options and be signposted to the most effective route.

MHC outlined the original intent of the project, to link semi-skilled and recently qualified people with new industry choosing Goole as their base with access to igh-level, high-income job opportunities than those traditionally available in Goole (generally low skilled and low pay with little opportunity for progression) which negatively impacted on the town centre due to limited spending power of locally employed people. CW informed all that the project would not be delivered in isolation but within a mix of much economic activity already taking place and some planned for the near future. Work is proceeding on the UK Shared Prosperity Investment Plan with much focus on supporting micro business. It is expected that Opportunity Goole would signpost people to that provision. Three major European Social Fund programs are currently under delivery, one focused on people and mental health both in and out of employment, another specifically for women in the workforce and a third focused on older workers. They are all delivering and will have links into Opportunity Goole. The People and Skills element of Shared Prosperity fund will kick in during 2023 – 2024. Multiply programme will begin numeracy support. The Communities and Place element will link into Goole offering additional wrap around support.

CW emphasised the Business Case is aiming to identify the aspects of support that are not already being delivered through an alternate funding source and is focused on a space within which those aspects can be brought together. This can make the Business Case seem less focused when it is simply precise and outlines the initial space, service footprint and advisor roles. The intention is for many other things to happen within the space, but they will not be funded through GTD and therefore are not included in the business plan. What is being bought through investment in the project is linkages to all the other programmes totalling millions of pounds and ensuring they occur in Goole in a way that links Goole's residents to opportunities that are happening. The Business Plan reflects this as many aspects of support are being delivered outside of GTD and this project will bring them all together.

The Chairman thanked CW for making the point that Opportunity Goole will evolve in real time given the number of additional elements funded through other sources and how they will positively impact delivery from day one. What will be delivered in the first year may be slightly different to what is delivered in year four as certain gaps are filled along the way whilst other gaps may arise. The Chairman said the project was not as definitively defined as others but the reasons for that had been comprehensively explained. He suggested the Board may like to consider proceeding on the proviso that HH and AB take the open-ended offer from TC to flesh out some more detail in the delivery phase given lack of time available.

CE suggested the Board agree in principle that what had been outlined for the project was the right way to proceed, she emphasised the potential is there, and everybody wants to deliver that potential for the people of Goole therefore it should be agreed for the project and Business case to proceed to the next stage. JR said opinions had been gathered and views aired with a little more work required from East Riding on the detail. He informed the Board he thought the project worth the risk to proceed to the next stage and asked for last views from those present. AP said he supported the decision to move to the next stage on the proviso that work continues to look and potentially develop potentially a model that includes shared working spaces for people who do want to start their own business as there is currently no provision offering this in Goole and possibly via the Property Activation Fund project. JR thanked AP. **No other Board members added further comments and the Chairman said he would accept that the Board was happy for the Business Case to proceed to the next stage.**

## 7. Goole Market Hall Business Case

JT gave a brief overview of the project, the aim of which is to deliver a sustainable destination and vibrant social hub. There is an opportunity for the venue to work in sync with Junction to provide a small performance space and community events outside of operating days. Costed works allow for a full fabric upgrade enabling year-round use and flexibility for other users. The business plan assumes an external operator will manage the venue for the first three years with a management fee payable. This provides an opportunity to retender once established with an option for Junction or a social enterprise to consider the role. On site works would begin in 2023 and complete by March 24. The business plan and the costs within have been informed by specialist market consultancy. Testing the market for operators would commence by the end of the year.

JR asked for initial comments and questions. Following a question from GW, JT confirmed available space negates the option of including a mezzanine floor in the building. JR asked what knowledge and research is available regarding operating companies. JT confirmed private companies operate many similar offers to that outlined in the business case; smaller scale ventures are operated by much smaller local firms and led by the individual operating the bar element of the offer with Key Performance Indicators in place to ensure the venue does not fall into a sports bar or similar venue. Responsibility for hosting community and food events would also be expected. The management agreement would include obligations for certain entertainment events to be organised using contacts nationally or locally with contacts such as GW.

JR asked for executive summaries of business cases to include more detail to provide Board members with a comprehensive overview of the project and utilise for communication with media outlets.

**The Chairman asked if there were any further comments or objections to endorsing the business case to proceed to the next stage. None were forthcoming and the business case for the market hall was endorsed.**

## 8. Goole Leisure Centre Business Case

JT provided an update following the Goole Hub consultation press release. Full feedback will be provided to respondents once the consultation period ends on 7 October. Three areas have been the focus for responses, library relocation, museum space and usage of sports facilities. Clarification will inform that relocation or closure of the museum may not feature as part of the plans for Goole leisure centre. The library will be relocated in a larger building offering additional space for some activities. All activities that take place in the existing library will be able to take place within the new building. The book stock will be of similar size to the current offer. Opening hours will be extended to match the leisure centre opening times. This detail will be released to the public after 7 October. JT informed all that sports hall use had significantly declined since 2019. Income was less than £20k per annum, most clubs are using school halls and the facility stands empty for most of the day. Leisure Centre staff are liaising individually with each of the affected groups to put in place a transition plan which may include financial support. The project offers an excellent high quality new attraction to the town. Cost for the additional health suite is £370,000.

JR thanked JT and made the point that consultation often involves hearing pros and cons from many perspectives which is the point of consultation, to listen, respond and move forwards. MHC asked if the allocated space for the Museum within Goole Hub would be reallocated for library use. JT said it would a flexible space so could be used for library purposes. He explained the building currently housing library services would be retained by ERYC. It is likely the Church Street ERYC building would form part of an asset rationalisation in time. JR thanked MHC for the time she had spent in working through the full business case and asked for further comments. AP shared his thoughts on the purpose of consultation and the importance of ensuring answers are immediately available to any questions raised regarding any aspect of the consultation subject. He also referenced the importance of having sight of any plans involving elements of GTD funding and confirmed he 100% backed the project to go ahead. He stressed the need to rigorously consult and update the public regularly on project development throughout the business case stages and referenced working in other areas of his constituency where measures to stress test consultation were prepared prior to moving to full public consultation so all involved were clear and knew what issues were likely to be raised.

Relocating the library was thought the best way of protecting the service for communities and guaranteeing its future survival. Discussion focused on closing down rumours and wrongful information immediately and providing plans for all Board members to view prior to consultation events. JE shared her thoughts on the project. consultation methods and media. She emphasised the importance of releasing positive firm messages about the benefits of each of the GTD projects from a confident position. Following a meeting with Alan Menzies to discuss communication and publicity JE informed the Board that a member of the East Riding Communication Team would attend Board meetings to observe and write appropriate communications delivered to media outlets. JE proposed HH, JR, AP and herself meet with the allocated press officer to work through what was required to release positive messages as GTD develops and moves forward. The press officer will attend meetings, liaise with the Goole Times and provide regular updates for readers.

JR suggested an interim press release be provided to update on the Leisure Centre consultation. AP agreed suggesting a press release to remind people to have their say prior to conclusion of consultation on 7 October, to include a response to the misconceptions circulating. JT agreed to arrange the press release. PS said reference should be made to the Communication Plan previously devised and agreed by the Board to assist with individual project development and key routes for communication. A low profile had been taken whilst business cases were being developed over the past 6 months. Broader endorsement and progression of the business cases meant the time was now right to articulate where they had developed from, what direction they would be heading in and what would happen next. CE said she would contact the press office to arrange a meeting with JR, AP and HH to consider the business cases and formulate a release. TC suggested consideration of the significant changes anticipated in Goole's population, to remain aspirational and include an element of flexibility within the business case for the leisure centre in relation to the sports hall.

**JR asked the Board if they were happy to proceed on the Leisure Centre. There were no objections, and the Business Case was endorsed to move forwards.**

## 9. Goole Leeds Rail uplift service - Report and Outline Business Case

JR outlined the current position of the Goole to Leeds Rail Link. The Board had previously received a report from HH outlining financial viability issues and concerns in moving the project forwards. HH, NA and DH had proposed removing the £1 million project from GTD and requesting reallocating. A meeting had taken place with Alan Menzies, AP and JE. JR outlined what had been discussed. Going forwards, ERYC would have to subsidise the project at a cost of £1,000,000 per annum meaning it would be unviable. AP had suggested directly asking local authorities in West and North Yorkshire to invest in the project and making an approach to Department for Transport to clarify if funds from alternative sources can be found to subsidise the service. ERYC will write to those authorities seeking a conclusive decision. JR asked PC if there was an option to ring fence the spend allocated to the Goole Leeds rail link until the end of the year until all options had been explored before the Board had to decide.

JR also explained that ERYC were committed to using the business case to consider how it could be delivered through a different channel if it was not going to be delivered via GTD. He asked PC how critical it was for the Board to make a decision now regarding the £1 million spend against the rail project as opposed to awaiting a response from other potential funders. PC advised Government would want to see a programme level spend within this financial year for 2022 / 2023. Submitting documents for approval is vital to ensure spend occurs. If the Board decide the rail project is not viable there is a discussion to be had regarding allocating that amount in revenue to enhance some existing projects. There is no issue in delaying although it may impact on other business cases for projects that could be enhanced using the potential £1 million. The Board need to understand what the arrangements would be and the implications.

The Chairman thanked PC and advised those present that at the last meeting there was discussion for potential uplift for the VPG development using funding previously allocated to and now unrequired for the Broadband project. HH said she had highlighted in the circulated document the breakdown of capital and revenue against relevant projects for the Board to consider those options. Various views and thoughts were discussed in terms of growth, opportunities and anticipated options for the projects. FD emphasised the compelling information from Northern Rail in the business case and the importance of connectivity and the impact it would have on Goole to develop, grow and encourage investment into the area. Without the rail link there is little worth in bringing other projects forward, the focus needs to be on generating new levels of revenue, better jobs in the town, better opportunities for people. Connectivity issues have prevented Siemens from attracting talent into the area. FB said this would be a recurring factor in Goole without addressing genuine connectivity issues such as transport and hotel accommodation which would support self sufficiency in the region and in Goole.

JE said the job opportunities resulting from the rail project would be emphasised in communications with other authority areas and the significant benefits for other areas of Yorkshire. MHC added that Pontefract Civic Society were also pushing West Yorkshire Authority to take the project forwards highlighting the significant improvements it would make for connectivity within the region. JR highlighted it would be an extremely difficult project to forge ahead independent of other support and financial assistance but worthwhile investigating as far as possible for additional and alternate sources of funding within the next three months. GW asked what reassurances could be given that communications would occur with other Yorkshire authorities. He concurred with FD adding that as the town's only organisation aiming to draw people into Goole for culture and art experiences in the evening it was vital connectivity be addressed in terms of transport available into and back out of Goole. He highlighted the need to consider alternate options for connecting the town if the rail project falls from the programme. AP explained that much work had taken place directly with other local authorities and now was the time to ask them to consider using money from devolved transport funding to invest in the rail project. JE addressed GWs comment and informed all that a letter would certainly be sent to other authorities in North and West Yorkshire ascertaining their decision on financial support for the rail project. It was agreed to defer the decision on the Rail project and enter into further discussions on the options and implications.

**10. Summary Projects Update**

HH provided a short update on other projects that would be covered in detail at the next Board meeting. VPG is progressing well. GTC have agreed on Option 2 of those compiled by Steve Wells Associates. This is a transformational option which will require additional GTD funding. Visuals are coming forward for Public Realm works which include space from the rail station to the leisure centre. Much work has taken place to understand technical aspects of the project from underground service points to highway operational technicalities and responsibilities from both a private and public perspective. All this will be presented for Board input with a week or two. The PAF has received a similar level of significant work to bring forward evidence and justification for the PAF and determine considerations including how it will work as a funding program, what the target areas would be, expected outputs and outcomes, size of grants and what will and will not be funded.

AP had to leave the meeting. The Chairman asked a question on behalf of AP regarding opportunities to engage with the public to consider the range of design options proposed and collate that data so stakeholder have had additional input into the GTD programme. JE suggested a consultation event to be held in the former market hall and possibly use of Commonplace, an online engagement platform. HH reminded the Board of several engagement and consultation events that the delivery team had attended during the summer to highlight the GTD programme and further engage with a range of stakeholders attending Goole Jobs Fair, Goole Pride and Goole Youth Action Youth Festival at West Park. CW informed all of the Common Place pilot that had taken place in Driffield that would now be extended to Beverley and coastal locations within the County. She also referenced a budget specifically to consider how Goole works as a place, co-ordinating all Council activities. AH asked if updates could be circulated to Goole Town Council to support local Councillors fielding questions about GTD plans. The Chairman informed all that the plan is in place to work with the press office to deliver key messages to all about the progress of GTD. PS suggested incorporating a short bullet point list of key points for Board members following meetings prior to receiving more detailed Minutes to provide messages out to the wider community.

**11. Proposed Project Variation Funding Requests**

HH outlined a report she screenshared depicting financial variations to the GTD programme. A conversation with PC will occur as variation will be built into business cases and a request document required for approval of financial variance. She highlighted the options for capital and revenue variance highlighting the additional value £1 million capital would provide across projects due to Old Goole Broadband not requiring GTD funds. VPG is potentially going to ask for an additional £1.5 million towards the project. This will need to be formally requested. HH said she was confident this could be justified. The anticipated allocation to the Leisure Centre of £500,00 for the health suite is less than anticipated at £370,178. The additional half a million for VPG could be found through amending the Property Activation Fund allocation from £4.9 million to £4.4 million. The PAF is scalable and the largest project within the Programme which offers one option. A second option would be to plan for use of the rail allocation if the project does not move forwards with GTD funding, leaving a revenue potential of £1 million for reallocation across projects which would require justification given limited revenue across the other projects. Goole Town Council have flexibility within the business case for VPG in terms of revenue and capital split. The Skills Fund could be topped up and there could be an opportunity to increase revenue for the market hall project. Option three would be combining these opportunities to enhance budgets for some of the projects. A conversation is required with PC to consider how variations could be addressed.

The Chairman thanked HH and said an increase on spend for VPG could come straight from the Broadband allocation with the option of utilising some of the PAF budget. HH explained if the Board were inclined to make that decision ERYC, as Accountable Body, would work through the necessary measures to ensure the funding switch was administered as the Board agreed; the same process would be used for the Leisure Centre which needs less than anticipated. The request for project variance would then be authorised for submission by the Chairman and ERYC's Section 151 Officer. The Chairman said he would be happy to approve that process.

GW asked if all other avenues had been explored to support the additional funding required for VPG and highlighted the business plan included potential for funding from Football England. HH informed that £1 million funding would be brought in from the Football Foundation; the ask from GTD is £3.5 million, the project total is £4.6 million.

As some Board members had to leave the meeting early the Chairman proposed they were informed via email of the revised proposal and agree via email following that chain of conversation.

**Action:** *The Chairman agreed with the proposal and asked HH to email all Board members with the proviso they have 48 hours to respond with any concerns otherwise the proposal to utilise funding previously allocated to the Broadband project and from the PAF is passed.*

GW said he had heard of several people hoping to apply to the PAF when launched including developers of the former Arcade and GTCs plan to create a cinema in the town centre. He was conscious that some members may not be aware of these opportunities. HH said all were excellent examples and were referenced in the business case. JR added that reallocating £500k from the PAF would still leave £4.4 million to consider proposals including potential cinema plans. There will be limits and significant governance required. It would be hoped that key sites in Goole come forwards to explore opportunities. The PAF will enable flexibility within the GTD programme. The PAF was a concept project created during a pandemic without full costs applied. The true costs will have increased due to a number of factors including inflation and this will impact on bringing forward projects, but targets must still be met.

**Action:** *HH to refresh the table based on Board discussion and decisions on the most appropriate way forward for VPG and inclusion of the health suite in the Leisure Centre and email for Board members to view and comment upon.*

### 12. Any Other Business

HH requested amending the date of the October Board meeting. It was agreed a date would be circulated via email.

### 13. Date and time of future Board meeting

All meetings will be held in person at person at Raise Business Centre from 2pm to 4pm unless informed otherwise. Following confirmation of the rearranged October date, further meetings will occur on Friday 11 November and Friday 9 December at 2pm