

Present: Liam Scully (*in the Chair*), Angela Andrews (City of Lincoln Council), Jacqui Bunce (NHS), James Foster (Lincoln College), Charlotte Goy (Visit Lincoln), Caroline Killeavy (YMCA), Ursula Lidbetter, Karl McCartney MP (Lincoln Constituency MP) and Councillor Ric Metcalfe (City of Lincoln Council)

Also in Attendance: Francesca Bell (Assistant Director for Growth and Development), Jaclyn Gibson (Chief Finance Officer), Gill Wilson (Growth Strategy and Funding Manager) and Victoria Poulson (Democratic Services Officer)

36. Apologies for Absence

Liam Scully, Chair of the Lincoln Town Deal Board, opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.

Apologies for absence were received from Tim Chambers, Lord Cormack and Nicole Hilton.

The Democratic Services Officer confirmed the quorum of 6 members.

37. Minutes of the last meeting held on 13 January 2023

It was noted that Ursula Lidbetter no longer represented Lincolnshire Co-Operative due to her retirement.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Lincoln Town Deal Board held on 13 January 2023 be confirmed as a true record.

(a) Matters Arising

Officers confirmed that matters arising further to the Board meeting of 13 January 2023 had been actioned. Future Town Board Meetings had been aligned to provide an opportunity for Members to view and comment on proposed reports to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) prior to submission in June and December.

Ursula Lidbetter requested further information on Governance and the constitutional aspect of new duties further to the Board meeting of 13 January 2023. The request was noted and would be followed up further to the meeting.

Town Deal Board Member Karl McCartney, MP (KM) raised the following queries in respect of the minutes of the Board meeting of 13 January 2023:

- Minute Number 25, final bullet point, 'Lincoln Connected' – Who were Threshold? How much was the total budget? How much was spent by Lincoln BIG? What would remain and what would pass to Threshold?
- Minute Number 26, bullet point 4 – Had works begun on Greyfriars?
- Minute Number 26, bullet points 9 & 10 – Had updates been circulated and if not, when could they be expected?
- Minute Number 27 – A request for comments to be attributed to individual Members

The Chair and Officers confirmed a response to matters arising would be received further to the meeting.

38. Investment Sub-Committee Update

Angela Andrews, Chair of the Investment Sub-Committee:

- a) provided the Board with a brief update following the most recent Investment Sub-Committee meeting held on 7 February 2023. During consideration of the update, the following points were noted: -
 - The Investment Sub-Committee convened on 7 February 2023 in order to consider and scrutinise projects funded under the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF)
 - There was a total of 48 project proposals submitted for UKSPF with a combined value of over £10M. The UKSPF allocation for Lincoln was £2.8M and therefore, the programme was significantly oversubscribed
 - Projects proposals received independent assessment to evaluate if projects met both the Government and Programme criteria for funding
 - The Sub-Committee were presented with ten projects that scored highest against the criteria and were asked to consider if projects met the needs of the City as identified by evidence, would it make a difference and were there any gaps identified
 - The Sub-Committee identified that of the project proposals considered, there were a number of closely aligned projects that would deliver similar outcomes
 - It was concluded that projects offered value and a commission of collaborative work would be beneficial and provide better synergy and value
 - The Sub-Committee identified gaps within the programme. These included holiday support aimed at young school aged children and the older generation which included social isolation and engagement of the older generation in community projects.
- b) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Board

The Chair thanked Angela Andrews for the Investment Sub-Committee update.

Question: Did the ten projects presented to the Sub-Committee total the full allocation of £2.8M?

Response: The ten projects presented to the Board did not total the UKSPF allocation of £2.8M however they scored highest against the criteria. It was concluded that further projects may present over the next two years.

RESOLVED that the update be noted.

39. UKSPF Project Update

Francesca Bell, Assistant Director, Growth and Development:

- a) presented a report to the Board on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) covering the following main points: -
 - The key aims of the UKSPF centred around the UK Government's flagship £4.8billion levelling up agenda

- There were three UKSPF investment priorities and projects would sit within three key pillars. These were:
 - Communities and Place
 - Supporting Local Business
 - People and Skills
 - The levelling up agenda gave everyone access to equal opportunities to prosper, to improve life chances, to narrow the gap on health inequalities, to improve public services, restore a sense of community and local pride and to boost productivity, pay, living and job standards
 - The total funding allocation for Lincoln was £2.8M and the investment plan was derived further to consideration of evidence which demonstrated that there was a high level of deprivation within the City
 - Six key areas of deprivation were identified geographically, in particular the Ermine area to the North of the City. In addition, deprivation in the Sincil Bank area and Abbey Ward.
 - Through partnerships discussions and consideration of evidence that we held as a City Council such as national data around indices of multiple deprivation, key challenges identified included:
 - In work poverty including food poverty
 - Challenges around skills and training levels
 - Health
 - Barriers to accessing City centre offerings e.g. transport
 - Lack of functioning Community Hub
 - Community Engagement
 - Support for Businesses
 - Retention of Skills of Employees
 - The key issues identified within Lincoln fell under the pillar of 'Communities and Place'. As such, £1,787, 433 had been provisionally allocated which totalled 64% of the total UKSPF allocation for Lincoln
 - The totality of investment for the ten highest scoring projects was £1,128, 725 which left £1,682, 048 of the total allocation
 - The identification of the key issues within the City formed the basis of the key priorities detailed within the Investment plan submitted to Government
 - Focus Consultants were procured to provide reporting on:
 - Initial project scoring alignment with the UKSPF interventions
 - Geographical targeting
 - How the project responded to local deprivation
 - Outputs and outcomes and how they aligned with the Investment plan
 - The transformative potential
 - Additionality
 - Prospective projects previous experience with delivery and risk/s
 - It was important to note that the project scores received from Focus Consultants did not consider:
 - Local Knowledge
 - Value for Money
 - Knowledge of the providers
 - Sustainability
 - Added Value
 - Collaboration Opportunities
 - Conflict and/or duplication with other projects
- b) presented a summary of the report received from Focus Consultants which had been circulated to Members of the Board. The report covered analysis of the projects with the highest scoring within the three key investment priorities.

Communities and Place

The Lincoln UKSPF Investment Plan identified specific allocation for Cost of Living Support and a Community Grant Scheme

Cost of Living Support – Lead Organisation (subject to change) City of Lincoln Council

- Funds allocated within the Investment Plan totalled £25,000 in year one and a further £40,000 approximately in years two and three
- There was the potential to work collaboratively with existing or partnership projects to offer support to the project
- The proposal to the Executive was to ring-fence the allocation for Cost of Living Support specifically

Comment: KM did not agree with the proposal and would have preferred the allocation to be ring fenced to support businesses.

Comment: Members supported the Cost of Living and Community Grant allocations. However, applications would be welcomed that focussed on employment, particularly the connection between employment and the social and economic benefits of having a job. If there were to be residual funding, the economy and jobs should be pursued.

Note: Charlotte Goy offered a Declaration of Interest. Reason - Visit Lincoln had submitted to the UKSPF.

Comment: Information on the scope and budget was useful for further discussion. Conversations with local business surrounding 'pride of place' was important to be fed back at a later date.

Comment: KM confirmed that although he was not against proposals, there were lots of other sectors to consider.

Proposal from the Chair: The Board were to contemplate specifics and then consider the scope of funding initially allocated. Further to consideration, Members would then check and challenge the wider mandate.

Response: Members may have identified the emergence of gaps which would be useful for consideration of future commission/s.

Community Grant Scheme – Lead Organisation: City of Lincoln Council & Investors in Lincoln

- The project would be jointly delivered by City of Lincoln Council and Investors in Lincoln
- The project would not be geographically constrained and therefore, would be open across the City in terms of equality
- The project bid was for a total of £150,000 and would be match funded to raise the total to £300,000.
- The Community Grant Scheme would allow small, grass-root community groups to apply for funding for smaller projects such as gardening projects, equipment, coffee mornings and venue hire

- City wide community grants would enable greater involvement from elected Member and stakeholders in specific areas for grants up to the value of approximately £5000.
- The Investment Sub-Committee initially supported the project proposal however there were questions to be answered prior to approval from the Executive

Let's Move – Lead Organisation: Active Lincolnshire

- The project encouraged individuals to improve health and wellbeing through an active lifestyle. The funding request was for a total of £220,000

65 Acres – Lead Organisation: Greater Lincolnshire Food Partnership

- The project included plans to purchase a building to operate from within which would be located in the North of the City
- The funding request was for a total of £438,000 across three years
- The project encouraged individuals to learn how to grow, cook and use food.

Development of Community Hubs – Leader Organisation: Bridge Church

- The project was similar to previous works on Portland Street
- The funding request was for a total of £285,000.

No Wrong Door – Lead Organisation: Acts Trust

- A project bid of £57, 548 to continue to develop and fund volunteering opportunities for signposting software
- The Investment Sub-Committee initially supported the project proposal

c) presented the collective view of the Investment Sub-Committee on projects under the 'Communities and Place' pillar covering the following main points:

- *Let's Move*, *65 Acres* and the *Development of Community Hubs* all scored highly however effectively on the same points
- Delivery between projects was similar which could result in competition
- The potential commission of a combination of the three projects to deliver as a collective presented the possibility of added value for money and removed project conflict. In addition, the collective funding required to deliver the three projects could be less than the total of individual funding
- The Sub-Committee suggested the ring fencing of funding in the interim to allow further scoping of a possible commission

d) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Board

Note: Caroline Killeavy offered a Declaration of Interest. Reason - YMCA had submitted to the UKSPF.

Comment: Of the three projects grouped together, the funding requirement was significant for similar projects with similar outcomes within one specific area. There was potential synergy with another organisation of which worked within the remit of

the 'Greater Lincolnshire Food Partnership' project. Capital investment from an alternative organisation should be considered. There were concerns that '*No Wrong Door*' were very similar to '*Connect to Support*' for Lincoln County Council. Collaborative work may be more beneficial instead. Services were often County-wide rather than City-wide.

Response: The software had been trialled. The difference between '*Connect to Support*' and '*No Wrong Door*' was that proposals included the use of a questionnaire which would be used with an individual to ascertain exactly what support was available for their individual circumstances.

Question: Would it be beneficial to build upon what was already there?

Response: '*No Wrong Door*' was viewed as a step prior to intervention from '*Connect to Support*' and complimentary to the service - specifically for those with multiple needs such as skills, food, and financial support required.

Question: Competition needed to be avoided in the charitable sector. Had there been exploration of all partners best placed to deliver? Where did Citizen's Advice sit within the service? Would a District collaboration on a county basis be an innovative solution?

Note: James Foster offered a Declaration of Interest. Reason – Lincoln College had submitted to the UKSPF.

Comment: The number of project submission was largely higher than the ten placed forward for funding. Was it possible to spread funding out to consider a greater number of projects? The avoidance of duplication was important.

Response: Assurance was provided that the current stage was to start the process to enable spending and to proceed projects. All projects were scored independently, and consideration had been given to the top ten that met the criteria. It would not inherently result in the remaining 38 projects being rejected for funding. Further to the identification of any gaps, remaining project submissions would be given consideration.

Comment: Anchor points had been sought to shape how the funding was distributed. Solutions were sought in addition to consideration of the wider stakeholder mapping.

Comment: Documentation and information prior to the meeting was useful to enable a considered opinion further to a verbal report and synopsis. The three projects were important.

Question: Would the Community Centre operate at Sudbrooke Drive or spread to a wider reach? Synergistic work was sensible.

Response: Initial proposals suggested that the project would be based out of the building, provided it was suitable. The plan would be for the services to parachute into other areas and communities within the City.

Comment: Members expressed concerns with 'No Wrong Door'. It was notoriously difficult to maintain a database, however the project was not objected to.

Supporting Local Business

City Tribe - Retaining Talent

- The funding request was for a total of £115,000
- Investment Sub-Committee was concerned about outputs and made a proposal to fund Year One only and to work with the project to assist how to shape it for Year Two funding
- Elected Members proposed to see the work prior to Year One funding to provide more assurance

Business Lincolnshire Growth Hub

- The project was in existence and provided business support across the entirety of the county
- The request was a representative percentage from all authorities across Lincolnshire to continue to fund the project. Lincolnshire's requirement would be a total of £145, 595
- The Business Growth Hub had a number of advisors to offer support to businesses and therefore tied in with the third project of 'Business Advisor for Lincoln'.
- It was the view of the Investment Sub-Committee that provided other partnerships continued to fund the service, it was in principle, supported. It was further supported by elected Members also.
- It would ensure that local businesses within the City were not disadvantaged when compared to the County

Note: There had been a gap identified in the form of a Business Advisor for Lincoln. This would be an individual who worked for City Council alongside the Growth Hub to offer Business support in Lincoln.

e) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Board

Comment: The funding was offered for levelling up, to support communities and to reach those most disadvantaged. Projects 'City Tribe' and the Business Advisor position needed to reflect that. This could be demonstrated by the Business Advisor role supporting businesses that may otherwise struggle to start or run due to disadvantages. It would be useful to view past examples of social inclusivity in relation to 'City Tribe'.

Question: Would the Business Advisor role be a generic role or specific to a sector need in Lincoln?

Response: The programme was in the early stages and therefore, it could be identified as a preference. Consideration of sectors most in need could be developed and could be considered upon appointment. North Kesteven had a Business Advisor and feedback received had been positive.

Comment: Duplication should be avoided and a collaborative approach would be of benefit to the end user of the service.

People and Skills

There was a requirement from Government which made funding under 'People and Skills' prior to 2024/25, very limited. In order to be successful for 2022/23 and 2023/24 funding, projects were required to have previously secured European funding and evidence was mandatory. Therefore, the project list narrowed significantly due to ineligibility.

The Restore Programme - Act Trust

- Established in 2006 and the funding request was for a total of £122, 248
- The focus was on budgeting, saving and the organisation of bank accounts
- Wellness Recovery Action Plans (WRAP) which empowered individuals to recover and regulate mental wellbeing
- Restore Programme: Life Ready which included goal setting, healthy eating, healthy sleep, self-esteem and healthy living environments
- The project scored well on a numerical basis and was broadly supported by the Investment Sub-Committee and elected Members

Opportunity Lincoln – Framework

- A project bid for a total funding amount of £372,937
- Employment support for economically inactive people
- Courses include basic life skills and career skills
- Activities such as enrichment and volunteering to promote wellbeing
- Intervention to increase levels of digital inclusion
- The project was not broadly supported further to scrutiny by the Investment Sub-Committee, but could be given further consideration once the outputs were better understood

Note - There had been a gap identified in the form of growth barriers and taking on more apprentices, trainees, new employees from the Business Advisor role above.

- f) concluded the summary of the emerging recommendations and welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Board

Question: Was there a view in terms of what the Investment Sub-Committee or the Board considered the balance should be between the lead Local Authority carrying out the work or putting it out for a wider competition?

Response: The balance had not been determined. The Cost of Living Support may be best placed in another organisation. The total funding of £25,000 was only being earmarked for that area. The Community Grant Scheme would be carried out by 'Investors in Lincoln' as opposed to the City Council as they would be better placed for administration. The Business Advisor role may be best placed with the City of Lincoln Council (CoLC). There was not a mathematical calculation of appropriate balance. Lincoln was fortunate to benefit from a strong infrastructure of third-sector organisations and other partners.

Response: Value for money was considered with weight when scrutinising the project scoring. Greater investment may provide greater longevity.

Comment: There were choices between the Local Authority administering proposals themselves or engagement with the community sector. Lincoln Community Foundation could administer the Grant Scheme and could be very positive. There may be better partners identified to administer the Cost of Living Support. The total number of projects that would benefit from UKSPF, would be few. Focus Consultants had graded the projects but had reliability, deliverability and those already within those communities we want to reach with a track record, been considered?

Response: The requested funding was significant however suggestions for a commission arose to ensure the effects would be wider reaching. It was possible only to evaluate projects put forward as a result of independent scoring. There were limited applications for funding under 'People and Skills' due to European funding criteria. The Investment Sub-Committee identified the need for track records. Assurance was provided that all other bids submitted had not been rejected however the programme was in the initial steps.

Question: What scope was there to pinpoint organisations for a commission. Would it require a tender process as that could be complicated.

Response: Careful consideration would be required. Commissioning would need to be framed in a way that made it accessible, particularly in an area that we had not received an application to ensure equal access. Consideration could arise from how other areas had achieved the same or learning from previous funding we had done.

Comment: The one to one business support was critical and needed. However, it was important to remember the wider place agenda in terms of a shared ambition and goal alongside individual action plans.

Comment: Thanks was offered for all of the work that had been carried out and further thanks given to all individuals involved. Clarity had been received though presentations of the security of the Investment Sub-Committee and through questions and answers at Board.

Question: To articulate the depth of the discussion, would all challenges, concerns and conversations be feedback to elected Members? It was important to share the scope of discussions.

Response: Discussions would be represented to Members accurately and in depth. Consideration would be given to delivery mechanisms concerning commissions.

Comment: Within the next phase, the gaps that had been identified by the Investment Sub-Committee and Board Members would be recorded to enable them to feature within the next phase. There could be other areas to consider in the future.

Comment: Pride of place amongst the younger generation was disappearing. There was a number of estates who had experienced a rise in gang culture and anti-social behaviour. It may be useful for intensive work on Pride of Place with those areas and individuals.

The Chair offered thanks to Francesca Bell for the informative and detailed presentation and the subsequent discussion between Members of the Board.

40. Any Other Business

Liam Scully, Chair of the Lincoln Town Deal Board, informed Members of a vacancy within the membership of the Investment Sub-Committee. Nominations could be sent to members of the Team for consideration.

Liam Scully, Chair of the Lincoln Town Deal Board, informed Members that the Communications Sub-Committee had met the objectives that the Sub-Committee was initially set up in order to achieve. It was proposed that the Communications Sub-Committee be dispersed.

Caroline Killeavy, YMCA, added that the Communications Sub-Committee was convened for strategic direction of which had been admirably achieved. The City Council Communications Team now had strengthened resource. The Sub-Committee could be reformed if a new or additional strategic direction were to be identified.

RESOLVED that the Communications Sub-Committee be disbanded.

41. Date and Time of Next Meeting

Date of Time of Next Meeting: Friday 9 June 2023 at 10:00