## CHEADLE TOWNS FUND INTERIM BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Date	4 <sup>th</sup> September 2020 a	at 3.30pm	
Venue	MS Teams		
Present	Dr Viren Mehta Mary Robinson, MP Cllr. David Meller Cllr. Tom Morrison Rob Munro Rosie Jenkins Caroline Simpson Sharon Seville	<ul> <li>Cheadle Medical Practice</li> <li>MP for Cheadle, Conservative</li> <li>Councillor Cheadle Hulme North, Labour</li> <li>Councillor Cheadle Hulme North, Lib Dem</li> <li>Chair of Cheadle Village Partnership</li> <li>Cities &amp; Local Growth Unit, BEIS &amp; MHCLG</li> <li>Corporate Director of Place, SMBC</li> <li>Stockport Vice-President GM Chamber of Commerce</li> </ul>	
	Observers / Presente		
Apologies	Robert Goulsbra Luke Delahunty Donald Ross James Hinde Rachel Stonehouse David Hodcroft Marge Falconer Simon Elliott Christina Shepherd	<ul> <li>Head of Development and Regeneration SMBC</li> <li>Director, SQW</li> <li>Managing Consultant, SQW</li> <li>Research Director, DJS Research</li> <li>Research Manager, DJS Research</li> <li>GMCA</li> <li>Executive Director, BMI Alexandra Hospital</li> <li>Head of Rail Programme, TfGM</li> <li>Cities &amp; Local Growth Unit, BEIS &amp;</li> </ul>	
	Michael S. Fisher	MHCLG - Development and Regeneration Manager, SMBC	
	Simon Noakes	- GMCA	
	Lou Cordwell Stuart Bradley	<ul> <li>GM LEP</li> <li>Stockport President GM Chamber of Commerce</li> </ul>	
Item			Actions
1	Welcome and Introc	luctions	
	VM chair of the meet The attendees prese Apologies received a VM outlined the agen	nt introduced themselves s above	Noted
2	Actions from Last N	leeting by Caroline Simpson, SMBC	
	CS confirmed that:		Noted

	<ul> <li>Previous minutes had been published</li> <li>The Advanced Funding Package was submitted to MHCLG. RJ advised that Town Fund Boards would hear later in month if successful and what funding would be received. [Post meeting full £500k funding received to SMBC 11 September]</li> <li>CS advised that all project asks where included in the Advance Package submission where possible. Those cases where further work was required would be considered to feed into the wider TIP</li> <li>Noted that Demmings Road/Brookfield Industrial Estate difficult to include in TIP given fragmented ownership and limited investment potential</li> </ul>	
3	Cheadle Town Investment Plan – Update by Luke Delahunty, Donald Ross, SQW	
	LD thanked the Board for the positive feedback on the draft vision statement for Cheadle. Given no further comments raised it is taken as the Board support and agree the wording of the vision statement.	Agreed
	<ul> <li>DR and LD provided update on the proposed non-rail priority project interventions for the TIP.</li> <li>Walking and cycling infrastructure some elements included in the advance works package. Remainder to be in the TIP, further work required on elements of the proposed routes.</li> <li>Eco-Business Park. Seeking technical support from the Delivery Partner (through Savills). However encountered difficulties thus far in receiving support that is required. Demmings Road/Brookfield Industrial Estate rated as 'poor' site for development by Employment Land Review. Birdhall Lane rated as 'good'.</li> <li>Innovation Centre seen as a single development with four key components. Digital and technology incubator, 'grow on' space element where businesses can expand into, traditional space to occupy for small commercial tenants, giving three stages of growth and a walk in co-working hot-desking space for knowledge workers given the latent demand. Challenge to find appropriate site for this option.</li> </ul>	Noted
	LD sought views from the Board on the above considerations. RM suggested potential site locations that could be suitable for the Innovation centre which could be explored further, options included near the proposed station, former surgery near Brookfield Park. Also noted potential Conservation Area constraints in the town centre.	SQW/ SMBC Action
	CS explained that the team were exploring a number of potential projects at the moment, namely the ones presented. CS welcomed the opportunity to consider new options, from the Board or elsewhere. Noted the need to consider what other Towns Fund eligible project options could be considered. As a	Noted

	Board there should be a range of options to consider, currently	
	still part in scoping and options stage, but the Board will need to make some decisions on what the final options are to be prior to submission.	
	SS asked if other co-working spaces had been assessed to see how successful they were and whether viable i.e. is demand there at appropriate rental levels. SS suggested the recent co-working scheme in Stockport and could the team approach the operators. CS noted that the Council knew the developer and operator of the recent Stockport centre [ProFolk]. This was a success and they had seen a strong demand and update for space.	Noted
	<ul> <li>LD noted that a meeting has been arranged with local property office agents for 9 September to discuss the demand.</li> <li>[Post meeting note – positive session with property agents regarding likely demand and rental levels for an innovation centre/co working offer].</li> <li>SS noted the issues looking at historic data and patterns to inform a newer concept. Such a scheme would need to be done appropriately in terms of location, quality, size and operation.</li> <li>VM noted action for SQW and SMBC to explore alternative sites and options.</li> </ul>	SQW/ SMBC Action
4.	Cheadle Station Update & Overview by Caroline Simpson, SMBC	
	SE sent apologies to the Board and CS presented the Rail update prepared by SE.	Noted
	CS proposed that it would be appropriate at the next Board meeting to have an in depth agenda item on the station with SE updating the Board on the progress made and matters progressed.	SE Action
	CS explained to the Board that given the approval and funding routes in the rail sector the feasibility study has been produced to apply both to DfT and the rail audience as well as MHCLG and Towns Fund.	Noted
	CS noted need for further engagement from Pell Frischmann with the BMI Alexandra Hospital.	PF Action
	The outcome of the submitted New Station Fund bid would be known in Autumn. If unsuccessful then there is an opportunity to resubmit and Cheadle would have a much stronger case given the weight of recent work undertaken by PF through the SOBC. CS explained a range of funding options are being investigated which could result in a blended funding solution if successful.	Noted
	One of the key requirements for a station is support from operators. CS noted that a positive meeting held since the last Board with Northern Rail to secure their support.	Noted
	CS advised that the next phase following SOBC is the OBC. This is a significant piece of work in time and cost which would need to	Noted

	CS proposed to the board to invite PF to the following Board to	Agreed
	present with SE a detailed update on station matters.	
	VM thanks CS for the update and asked MR if any additional	
	insight to offer to the Board.	
	MR highlighted the Restoring The Railways funding bid previously	
	submitted and queried current status. CS advised that the bid	
	decision had not been announced but would obtain an update for	SMBC
	the board, however was aware the more limited chances of a	Action
	successful bid through that particular programme.	
5	Public Survey Findings by James Hinde, DJS Research	
	JH thanked the Board for the opportunity to present what were	Noted
	very interesting and informative findings from the Public Survey.	
	JH advised that he was covering the pertinent observations in this	
	presentation but the Board had also been provided by email with	
	the more detailed report on the outcomes of the survey.	
	There was a majority of respondents from residents of Cheadle	Noted
	which was to be expected, however there were also responses	
	from businesses and shoppers so a broad capture of views.	
	JH explained one of the aims of the survey was to assess support	Noted
	for a potential station and what the benefits could be, importantly	
	first in an unprompted way to see what the perceptions were.	
	Then in a prompted and more refined way later in the survey.	
	General information was surveyed initially then a specific focus on	Noted
	the Towns Fund.	
	Extremely strong response to the survey, almost 1,200	Noted
	respondents in total (1,194), 1,016 online and 178 paper returns,	
	exceeding expectations. This means the Board has a large broad	
	sample size and data range which will enable detailed analysis	
	and provides a robust evidence base.	
	JH observed that throughout the survey public transport and	Noted
	connectivity comes out as a weakness and needs improvement.	
	A focus also on the High Street and how to support that. It was	Noted
	noted the Towns Fund may not directly be able to do. However	
	the Towns Fund interventions could well support and maintain the	
	High Street through broader benefits and increased activity and	
	funding.	
	Under things to improve in Cheadle (unprompted) the High Street	Noted
	has 54% as the main answer, however 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup> answers of Train	
	(35%), Metro (30%) and improve public transport (28%) garnered	
	a total of 63%.	
	The survey covered Towns Fund specific bid related questions,	Noted
	namely to what the respondents would want to see delivered.	
	Accessibility by rail and metrolink was selected by 85%, and	
	selected by 58% as the number one priority. The second most	
	popular response was improvement to traffic at 45% selected,	
	and selected by 12% as the number one priority. A marked	
	difference demonstrating a clear priority.	

	Overall nine out of ten people are supportive of a train station and three quarters very supportive. Clear benefits in accessibility brought by a train station came out in the survey. Eight in ten people said they would use the train station. Seven in ten	Noted
	currently identify the connectivity for Cheadle as 'poor'.VM thanked JH for a comprehensive report and detailed presentation summary.	Noted
	DM complimented the thorough report and identified that the Board had a useful data set to assist in decision making and representing the community.	Noted
	MR noted it was a really positive and clear report to support the Board. Highlighted the response to how people would travel to a station; 82% saying would go by foot as opposed to 25% using the car (note multiple answers could be selected).	Noted
	<ul> <li>RM queried the next steps with the information noting that the Survey and findings were 'owned' by the Board. RM sought the permission of the Board for CVP to make the survey findings public. Also whether to seek the views on the intervention projects with the CVP.</li> <li>VM put it to the Board where there any objections to sharing the findings – No objections. CS agreed and that the findings would also be made fully accessible to the public on the Towns Fund webpage that is curated by SMBC.</li> </ul>	SMBC/CVP Action
	CS proposed to circulate a slide outlining the project options to CVP to enable link into the community to seek further open feedback on the ideas to inform the TIP.	Agreed. SQW/ SMBC/CVP Action
	JH offered assistance if required by the Board for presentation of the findings in a more visual format to aid understanding.	Noted
6.	Looking Forwards by Caroline Simpson, SMBC	
	<ul> <li>CS summarised the immediate actions as:         <ul> <li>SQW to progress intervention project cases Eco-Park, Innovation centre, walking and cycling connectivity</li> <li>SQW work up draft TIP report submission and MHCLG templates</li> <li>Specialist property support being sought from Arup/Savills</li> <li>PF to update station SOBC following public survey results and Stakeholder consultations inc. BMI operations</li> <li>Additional rail timetabling work to be undertaken</li> <li>Await New Station Fund bid outcome</li> <li>Detailed station update at next Board meeting</li> <li>Important to liaise with local groups as identified by the Board.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Noted and Agreed
	Next meeting now arranged via MS Teams for <u>Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> October</u> 2020 at 3.30pm.	All Action

## Abbreviations: BCR – Benefit Cost Ratio BEIS – Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy CVP – Cheadle Village Partnership DfT – Department for Transport LEP – Local Economic Partnership MCL – Mid Cheshire Line MHCLG – Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government NR – Network Rail NSF – New Station Fund PF – Pell Frischmann SMBC – Stockport Metropolitan Council SOBC – Strategic Outline Business Case TfGM – Transport for Greater Manchester TIP – Town Investment Plan